

AGENDA

Date: November 12, 2014
Time: 1:00PM – 3:00PM
Location: Board Room | GoToMeeting
Subject: Steering Committee Meeting No. 11

For complaints, questions or concerns about civil rights or nondiscrimination; or for special requests under the American with Disabilities Act, please contact: Christopher Ryan, Public Information Officer/Title VI Coordinator at (954) 876-0036 or ryanc@browardmpo.org.

1. **Welcome and Sign-inGreg Stuart**
2. **Agency Comments and Responses Paul Flavien**
3. **Steering/TCC Comments and Responses Paul Flavien**
4. **Update on Programmatic Approach.....Michael Ronskavitz**
5. **Open Discussion Paul Flavien**

GoToMeeting Information

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/506451821>
Dial +1 (571) 317-3112
Access Code: 585-460-973
Meeting ID: 585-460-973

[Page Intentionally Left Blank]

This document is designed for two-sided (duplex) printing.

Agenda Item
No. 2

[Page Intentionally Left Blank]

This document is designed for two-sided (duplex) printing.



move people • create jobs • strengthen communities

SHORT REPORT

AGENCY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Broward MPO has engaged in coordination and consultation on *Commitment 2040* with its transportation planning partners, including but not limited to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), Community Involvement Roundtable (CIR), and local public works, transportation and/or planning managers. The first draft of the plan, published September 3, 2014, was distributed to these parties for review and comment. The following table provides a summary of comments provided by the deadline to the MPO for consideration.

Summary of Agency Comments Received

Source	Letter	Email
Federal Agencies	0	0
State Agencies	1	0
Regional Agencies	0	1
Local Agencies	0	0
County Agencies	2	1
County Committee	1	0
State Elected Officials	0	0
Local Elected Officials	0	0
Organizations	0	0
TOTAL	4	2

The following agencies submitted specific comments regarding the draft of *Commitment 2040* (version dated September 2014).

- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
- South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA)
- Port Everglades
- Broward County Planning and Redevelopment Division
- Broward County Planning Council
- Bicycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), Broward Co., Board of County Commissioners

Specific agency comments and MPO responses are provided below.

Reviewer: FDOT

Comment 1 – This document would be appropriate, with changes to mapping, for a public marketing document however it does not provide the base line data and technical analysis to make sound recommendations. The Department’s understanding is that additional technical reports will be provided.

These reports in combination with this current document will need to address the checklist of expectations outlined in the Chapter 4 (Long Range Transportation Plan) of the *MPO Program Management Handbook* (revised for MAP-21) and *Federal Strategies for Implementing Requirements for LRTP Updates for the Florida MPOs* (November 2012).

Response 1 – *Commitment 2040* was generated with the intent of being a concise plain-speak document, while providing technical and supportive documentation on the MPO web site. The plan’s final chapter, *Further Reading*, outlines such supportive material including background data and technical reports.

Comment 2 – Additional comments may be provided later when the Department formally reviews the Broward MPO’s LRTP.

Response 2 – The MPO acknowledges that the Department may have additional comments.

Comment 3 – Introduction – Recommend the statement below be revised as the ICTF is complete.

“When complete, the new Intermodal Container Transfer Facility will be ready to take advantage of the Panama Canal expansion and make...”

Response 3 – The text has been revised to read “The newly completed Intermodal Container Transfer Facility is gearing up to take advantage...”.

Comment 4 – Page 2 – Recommend text addition and a map be provided showing the Broward MPO Urban Boundary

“Who is the Broward MPO?”

We are a governmental agency responsible for creating transportation policy and identifying the best use of tax dollars on transportation projects for the area with the Broward County Urbanized Area.”

Response 4 – This text has been revised to read “the Miami Urbanized Area within Broward County”.

Comment 5 – Page 3 – Were italics intended to be used here? There does not appear to be a reason or reference.

“County entities, called departments, *component units* or *enterprise divisions*, include the County’s Traffic Engineering Department, Broward County Transit (BCT), Port Everglades and Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.”

Response 5 – This text has been revised to read “County entities include the County’s Traffic Engineering Division, Broward County Transit...”.

Comment 6 – Page 4 – Recommend the BCT TDP be referenced similar to the reference for SFRTA. One possible approach is provided below.

“South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) is a legislatively enabled transportation policy-making body made up of representatives from county government, FDOT and private citizens. SFRTA was created by Florida’s legislature to provide Tri-Rail commuter rail service in Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade counties. The authority’s mission is to develop and operate a viable regional transportation system in South Florida. SFRTA develops and implements a transit development plan (TDP), as does Broward County Transit, which is are integral to the LRTP.”

Response 6 – This text has been revised to read “SFRTA develops and implements a transit development plan (DTP), as does BCT, which are integral to *Commitment 2040*.”

Comment 7 – Page 7 onward – Building the 2040 Plan, The Historical Context section (page 8) is well written for the public; it provides a framework that this process ends up in real life projects. Recommend that a similar level of information about the future be added, describing the projections for 2040 (population and employment growth) to provide context and background for the plan. One suggestion is to elaborate in the section on page 12 shown below.

“Understanding today’s conditions and tomorrow’s needs is important to a successful long-range plan. We use demographic and travel demand forecasts for the year 2040 as one way to assess the needs for transportation investments throughout Broward. In addition to existing and future travel conditions, other aspects of the transportation system are considered as well including safety, operation and regional connectivity.”

Response 7 – An additional infographic has been created within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section, expanding on what is anticipated for the future relative to the population, labor force and population characteristics. Furthermore a new section, named *What’s Changed Since the Last Plan*, has been added to include additional background information and context.

Comment 8 – Page 20 – We have several recommendations on this map and the associated table:

- The table for Affordable Projects and the map should use consistent naming. The table uses state road numbers and the map local names.
- The table should use complete street names, such as Oakland Park Blvd. instead of Oakland Park or University Dr. instead of University. This also is important because roads with numeric titles could be Streets, Avenues, Courts, etc. (e.g. NW 4th to NE 6th).
- Florida’s Turnpike (not Florida Turnpike) is the title to use.
- Recommend including more road titles to assist with readability of the map on page 20.
- The disclaimer on the map undermines the entire plan as the system is being proposed as the LRTP Cost Feasible Plan. Rephrasing to state “For Planning Purposes Only” might suffice. Additionally when the plan is published and the consultant contract subsequently ends how will, or will, the referenced website be transferred to the MPO?
- The Table on Page 21 is not friendly for public use and understanding.

Response 8 – The requested adjustments have been made to the Affordable Projects map and Affordable Projects tables, located within the *Improvements We Can Afford* section.

Comment 9 – General – Recommend including maps of existing facilities: roadway, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and greenway. This could relate to how the plan describes operations and maintenance of the existing system.

Response 9 – An interactive map has been created and displays existing and proposed transportation improvements and projects. The map will be accessible via a web link on the MPO web site.

Comment 10 – Page 22 – Clarify the wording “to us” in the first bullet and clarify the second bullet

“Funding source(s)

- Approximately 571.6 million (\$27.2 million/yearly) of discretionary funds allocated to us by Federal agencies.
- State funds may be included per FDOT requests.”

Response 10 – This bullet has been revised to read “Approximately 571.6 million (\$27.2 million/yearly) of discretionary Federal funds.”

Comment 11 – Page 22 – If this is to be the guiding document for implementation of the LRTP there must be some detailed mutually exclusive language. The use of “etc.” below to identify program eligible projects is going to cause some implementation issues. Projects are to be described in sufficient details to develop cost estimates.

“Example of candidate projects

- Complete Streets – Bicycle, pedestrian, transit facilities, etc.
- Safety and Security – Education, traffic calming, etc.
- Sustainability Initiatives – Mobility hubs, greenway, etc.
- Technology Advancement – Intelligent systems, etc.”

Response 11 – The use of “etc.” has been removed from the above examples, located in the *Improvements We Can Afford* section, *Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program* sub-section of the plan.

Comment 12 – Page 23 – Recommend another picture of a bus shelter (*used within the plan*) be used as the advertisement seems to be the subject of the photo that could be interpreted that immigration is under the purview of the MPO.

Response 12 – A different photo has been used within this section.

Comment 13 – Page 24 – The MPO Planning Area has not been defined. Further the text goes on to identify projects within the planning area that are owned maintained and operated by other agencies. The purpose of this section should be revisited and appropriate text should be revised.

“Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area

There are a number of agencies and private entities responsible for the development of transportation plans and projects that extend beyond our planning area.”

Response 13 – Within the introduction of *The MPO Story* section, *Who is the Broward MPO?* subsection, the geographic area of concern has been clarified as “the Miami Urbanized Area within Broward County (our “Planning area”).” Additionally throughout various sections of the plan, further information is provided regarding the MPO’s planning partners, their individual efforts, and links to where additional information can be obtained.

Comment 14 – Page 24 – Indicates that the SIS was last updated in 2013. That is incorrect it was updated in 2010.

Response 14 – We have verified with FDOT that the last update was conducted in 2013.

Comment 15 – Page 31 – Issues associated with the map on the page 21 also apply here.

Response 15 – Similar adjustments, to those cited above, have been made to the Unfunded Needs Projects map and Unfunded Projects tables, located within the *If More Funding Becomes Available* section.

Comment 16 – Page 33 – See comments relative to page 24. Reconcile the overlap.

“Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area
There are a number of agencies and private entities responsible for the development of transportation plans and projects that extend beyond our planning area.”

Response 16 – The response provided in Response 13, above, addressed this comment.

Comment 17 – Page 37 – Provide baseline thresholds and targets for measures.

Response 17 – Baseline data has been provided in the various supportive and technical documents. Specific targets, however, are not planned for this round of the LRTP but will be established at a later time once additional determination is made concerning performance measures.

Reviewer: SFRTA

Comment 1 – Are there additional appendices that will accompany the draft document? If not, the document by itself lack the details typically associated with LRTPs and needed to meet USDOT requirements.

Response 1 – *Commitment 2040* was generated with the intent of being a concise “plain-speak” document, while providing technical and supportive documentation on the MPO web site. The plan’s final chapter, *Further Reading*, outlines such supportive material as well as directs the reader to the necessary checklists and provides links to the appropriate locations on the web for confirmation of compliance with relevant local, state and federal requirements.

Comment 2 – The term “Broward Region” is used in the title and multiple times throughout the document. This is not a commonly used term and seems in conflict with the Regional LRTP and many other planning documents that refer to the region as South Florida or Southeast Florida. Since the LRTP document appears to be geared towards the general public (rather than transportation professionals), I suspect use of “Broward Region” will generate confusion.

Response 2 – Within the introduction of *The MPO Story* section, *Who is the Broward MPO?* subsection, the geographic area of concern has been clarified as “the Miami Urbanized Area within Broward County (our “Planning area”).” Through the remainder of the document, “planning area” has been used to replace “Broward Region”.

Comment 3 – Quotes are commonly used in the document, but are not attributed to anyone. Perhaps the quotation marks should be removed if these statements are to be included in the final version.

Response 3 – The quotations, previously used to highlight certain text similar to that of the “Did You Know” call-outs, have been removed throughout the document.

Comment 4 – While the photos throughout the document are a nice, pleasant touch, captions for the photos would be helpful to the user. In many instances, it is not clear what area or facility is being shown.

Response 4 – Aside from the photos separating the different chapters of the plan, captions have now been added to the remaining photos.

Comment 5 – “Insure is used extensively throughout the document. It appears that “ensure” should be the properly used term in most instances.

Response 5 – Reference to “Insure” was found in two infographics within the *Building the 2040 Plan* and *Monitored for Success* sections of the plan, but have since been corrected.

Comment 6 – Charts, tables, or descriptions of the available revenue (sources of revenue) and trends related to these revenue sources are lacking in the draft document. This lack of detail amounts to zero justification of the need for additional transportation revenue for a more robust, multi-modal future transportation system.

Response 6 – Additional text, as well as a new infographic on revenue, has been provided within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section. Links to supportive and technical information, relative to funding and transportation needs, is also made available.

Comment 7 – Multiple members of the Steering Committee recommended that the document should include some iteration of maps showing SIS and the Tri-Rail Coastal Link projects. No such maps are included in the draft document.

Response 7 – An interactive map has been created and displays existing and proposed transportation improvements and projects. The map will be accessible via a web link on the MPO web site.

Comment 8 – The frequent use of “we” is not typical for a LRTP or technical transportation or planning document. If “we” is going to be used, be clearer on who the “we” is. Does “we” refer to the MPO, or all of the transportation partners in Broward County? Please clarify. This is most confusing on page 19, where “we” is referenced for operations, yet the MPO does not operate any transportation services or facilities. Another case is on page 12, where “we” completed the Oakland Park Boulevard corridor study that was actually led and conducted by FDPT District 4.

Response 8 – The term “we” was used to identify the MPO and intended to maintain the plan as a user-friendly “plain speak” document. As such, the MPO is continuing the use of this term throughout the document.

Comment 9 – Page 11 – it is not clear what “Monitored for Success” is.

Response 9 – Language has been added within this referenced infographic to clarify that *Monitored for Success* is a specific section of the LRTP, which is found later in the document

Comment 10 – Page 13 – sources for the data should be cited.

Response 10 – The data source is now provided within the referenced infographic.

Comment 11 – Page 15 – the prioritization of “regionally significant transit initiatives” seems inconsistent with the draft 2040 LRTP, considering this LRTP does not directly include the SIS, Tri-Rail or Tri-Rail Coastal Link and does not cite the Regional LRTP effort.

Response 11 – To avoid confusion, the definition of Regionally Significant Projects has been included within the definitions section at the beginning of the plan. Clarification has also been provided throughout the document to identify the MPO’s planning partners and their own transportation master plans and efforts.

Comment 12 – Page 18 – the eight vehicle total cited for the SunTrolley is inconsistent with the 15 vehicle total shown in the table on page 21.

Response 12 – The reference to 15 vehicles has been made in the *Improvements We Can Afford* section, for consistency with the table.

Comment 13 – Page 18 & 19 – listing some of the corridors that are part of the Broward Signalization Network upgrades would be a helpful detail for the reader.

Response 13 – Within the Affordable Roadway Projects list, the Broward Signal Network and FDOT signal Network upgrades are identified as county-wide efforts, therefore individual corridors have not been specified.

Comment 14 – Page 24 – “the CSX Railway” is cited as a SIS facility that has been improved. The proper term is South Florida Rail Corridor, which is owned by the State of Florida. Perhaps mentioning that it is the former CSX/Seaboard Railway corridor would be helpful to the reader.

Response 14 – Since the CSX Railway has been improved, it has been removed from the text as suggested.

Comment 15 – Page 25 – please rewrite to indicate that the last TDP Major Update was completed in 2013.

Response 15 – This has been corrected in the Improvement *We Can Afford* section, *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area* sub-section text.

Comment 16 – Page 30 – the statement that “a central Broward East-West corridor study has been completed and only lacks the funding for construction to begin” is factually incorrect and misleading. This corridor has received no environmental clearance, still needs to go through the FTA Project Development phase, and has no funding for operations.

Response 16 – The above referenced text has been revised to read “A central Broward East-West corridor study has been completed, but lacks Federal clearance and the funding for construction, operation and maintenance.”

Reviewer: Port Everglades

Comment 1 – The 2040 LRTP has very little to no reference of the movement of goods within the County. We are aware that the Regional Freight Plan is being developed (as a component of the LRTP) to facilitate goods movement within the County; however, this LRTP made little reference of that plan and/or how it links to/relates to overall long range transportation planning for freight/goods movement in Broward County.

Response 1 – Additional references to movement of “goods” have been provided within the plan. Additional text on the Southeast Florida Regional Freight Plan has been provided within *The MPO Story* section of the plan. Further language and links to Port Everglades has also been included within the *Improvements We Can Afford, If More Funding Becomes Available*, and the *Further Reading* sections.

Comment 2 – The document uses multiple acronyms throughout but does not contain a glossary or acronyms page for the general public. This type of public document should have a glossary or acronyms page for the average reader who is not technically familiar with transportation planning.

Response 2 – A list of acronyms has been added toward the beginning of the plan.

Comment 3 – The document contains multiple graphics/images/photos, etc. – but none include a title and/or caption to indicate what the image is/what it is portraying, the possible location, etc.

Response 3 – Aside from the photos separating the different chapters of the plan, captions have now been added to the remaining photos. Captions have been added to other graphics.

Comment 4 – We’d be happy to supply you with a better photo of Port Everglades to replace the one being used at the front section of the document.

Response 4 – The existing high resolution photo was obtained from the Port Everglades web site and is a good representation of that facility.

The following Port Everglades text edits, that accompany the comments, are identified with deletions shown in ~~strike through~~ and additions in underline font.

Comment 5 – Page i: Comment that the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility was recently completed and is currently operational.

~~“When complete, the newly completed~~ Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) ~~will be ready~~ is gearing up to take advantage of the Panama Canal expansion and will make it possible ...These improvements will help to reduce the number of trucks on the roads and some of the associated negative effects of the transportation system, such as greenhouse gases (GHG) and congestion...”

Response 5 – This section has been revised to read “The newly completed Intermodal Container Transfer Facility is gearing up to take advantage of the Panama Canal expansion and will make it possible to move cargo containers directly from ships to railcars. These improvements will help reduce the number of trucks on the roads while also strengthening the local economy.”

Comment 6 – Page ii: Comments concerning the *Table of Contents* relative to *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area* and referenced on page 33: You may want to re-check numbering in TOC + the entire document – Example: this sub-title is started/titled on page 24; then has the same title on page 33.

Response 6 – The *Table of Contents* and document pagination have been updated.

Comment 7 – Page 1: Paragraph 2: Suggested revision as follows: “...system that moves people and goods, create jobs...”.

Response 7 – The suggested text change has not been done in this circumstance, given that this statement was to be consistent with the overall “branding” of the plan *Move People, Create Jobs, Strengthen Communities*. However text references to “goods” have been added in the document, as well as additional information on the Southeast Florida Regional Freight Plan and Port Everglades.

Comment 8 – Page 2: Would be good to include a short paragraph/or make reference to the federal statute that mandates the MPO, as well as the creation of the LRTP. Also, addition of a paragraph of Florida’s statute that supports/requires transportation planning would also be educational for the average citizen/reader.

Response 8 – Additional explanation regarding the above topic has been provided at the beginning of the plan within the *Governing Laws and Legal Definitions* section. Also a new section, named Further Reading, provide material for the general education of the reader.

Comment 9 – Page 3: Under *Broward County government and departments*: Question/revision in the following sentence: “...component units or enterprise funds divisions...”.

Response 9 – This sentence has been revised to read “County entities include the County’s Traffic Engineering Division, Broward County Transit (BCT), Port Everglades and Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.”

Comment 10 – Pages 3-4: Suggested revisions as follows: “...are active participants in the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) steering committee...”.

Response 10 – This sentence has been revised to read “Representatives from each agency are active participants in the TCC and *Commitment 2040’s* steering committee, which both provide technical guidance and serve as advocates for public outreach and education.” An acronym list is provided at the beginning of the plan to clarify the TCC.

Comment 11 – Page 4: Suggestion to edit/re-phrase the following sentence – it sounds a little misleading the way it currently reads.

“Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is Florida’s multi-modal transportation agency responsible for planning, designing, constructing and maintaining state roadways, Florida’s Turnpike, the national highway system, seaports, airports and other major transportation infrastructure.”

Response 11 – This sentence has been revised to read “Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is Florida’s multi-modal transportation agency responsible for planning, designing, constructing and maintaining state roadways, Florida’s Turnpike, the national highway system and other major transportation infrastructure.” Under state law FDOT is responsible for the above activity. However, FDOT may not be the precise party that actually conducts design, construction or maintenance of such facilities. (Please see Florida Statute 20.23 and Chapters 334-339 for further information).

Comment 12a – Page 5: Under the *United States Department of Transportation and other Federal Agencies* section: Suggested revisions as follows:

“...Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and research institutions...”.

Comment 12b – Also on Page 5, Under the *Regionalism – our larger region* section: Suggested revisions as follows:

“Broward County sits in the center of one of the most prosperous regions in the country. The County serves as one of the urban areas of a tri-county Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) of Southeast Florida, comprising Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties...”

Response 12a – Reference to acronyms is now clarified on the acronym list located towards the beginning of the plan.

Response 12b – Given that the MPO’s intent is to maintain “plain speak” language within the document, and that the general public may not know what a Metropolitan Statistical Area is, it was determined to not include language concerning MSAs. However, for clarification the geographic area of concern has now been identified as “the Miami Urbanized Area within Broward County (our “Planning area”). This reference is found within the introduction of *The MPO Story* section, *Who is the Broward MPO?* subsection.

Comment 13 – Page 9: Under the *Move People* section: Should add “...and Good” – i.e. to move people and goods (cargo/freight). Under the *Create Jobs* section: A sentence re the movement of good should somehow be incorporated in this summary.

Response 13 – The suggested text change has not been done in this circumstance, given that this statement was to be consistent with the overall “branding” of the plan *Move People, Create Jobs, Strengthen Communities*. However text references to “goods” have been added in the document, as well as additional information on the Southeast Florida Regional Freight Plan and Port Everglades.

Comment 14 – Page 10: Under the *Strengthen communities* section: General comment regarding the above sentence, that it might be edited/rephrased. Suggested revision as follows:

“Our Complete Streets initiative will ~~strengthens~~ communities by creating environments where all modes of transportation and all users are accommodated without interrupting or hindering each other.”

Response 14 – This sentence has been revised to read “Our Complete Streets initiative – which is a series of programs and includes multiple mobility improvements – will strengthen communities by creating environments where all modes of transportation and all users are accommodated without interrupting or hindering each other.”

Comment 15a – Page 11: In reference to the mention of *Monitored for Success* it would be good to add where this can be located – what page?

Comment 15b – Also on Page 11: In reference to the *Move People* column, inquiry regarding prior comment of movement of good (cargo/freight).

Comment 15c – Also on Page 11: In reference to the *Create Jobs* column, inquiry on reduced travel time to economic centers for good or people?

Comment 15d – Also on Page 11: In reference to the *Strengthen Communities* column, use of “Insure” vs “Ensure”.

Response 15a – *Monitored for Success*, as identified within this infographic, is clarified as another section of the plan that is located later in the document.

Response 15b – The suggested text change has not been done in this circumstance, given that this statement was to be consistent with the overall “branding” of the plan *Move People, Create Jobs, Strengthen Communities*. However text references to “goods” have been added in the document, as well as additional information on the Southeast Florida Regional Freight Plan and Port Everglades.

Response 15c – Although reduced travel time is applicable to the commuting public, as well as economic centers relative to good and people, including these revisions was thought to possibly over-complicate the infographic.

Response 15d – Reference to “Insure” was found in two infographics within the *Building the 2040 Plan* and *Monitored for Success* sections of the plan, but have since been corrected.

Comment 16 – Page 18: At conclusion of the *Regionally significant projects* heading, there is reference to 42 regionally significant projects and four Complete street programs. Comment is that, before transitioning into “Highlighted Projects” (and since only a few are highlighted) – suggest you indicate where the reader can locate the list of these projects – what page? You could add something like: “...These can be located on page xx...” or “...These are further discussed on page xyz...” , etc.

Response 16 – The *Building the 2040 Plan, Improvements We Can Afford, and If More Funding Becomes Available* sections have been revised to better clarify how the projects were developed and where they can be found.

Comment 17a – Page 19: Under the *Oakland Park corridor* section: Suggested revisions as follows:

“...and complementary facilities, including bus shelters and pike and pedestrian...”

Comment 17b – Also on Page 19: Additional comment to rephrase the sentence that reads “Ultimately, this project will increase ridership, reduce traffic congestion and provide greater accessibility to the larger system.” Would it be more appropriate to say something like: “...is aimed at increasing ridership...”?

Comment 17c – Also on Page 19: Under the *University Drive corridor* section, suggestion that BCT be first spelled out then identify the acronym in brackets.

Comment 17d – Also on Page 19: Under the *Comprehensive list* section, general comment that the sub-title may be somewhat confusing – it seems a little incomplete.

Response 17a – This sentence has been revised to read “This *Commitment 2040* project will enhance bus service by increasing the number of buses, and by including shelters, and bike and pedestrian amenities.”

Response 17b – This sentence has been revised to read “Ultimately, this project will increase ridership, reduce traffic congestion, increase community mobility, and provide greater accessibility to the larger system.”

Response 17c – The acronym for BCT is now identified on the acronyms list towards the beginning of the plan.

Response 17d – Additional language has been added under the *Comprehensive list* section to provide a more complete description.

Comment 18 – Page 21: Identification that the table needs to be titled + have a possible Title/Image number.

Response 18 – Various adjustments have been made to the Affordable Project tables, including reformatting to separate out transit projects from roadway projects, as well as adding titles.

Comment 19 – Page 22: In reference to “these projects” (those falling under the Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program), a question is posed as to where they can be located.

Response 19 – Additional language has been drafted for this portion of the *Improvements We Can Afford* section. It clarifies that the programmatic effort is still under development and describes how the projects will be identified, the award process, project screening and analysis that will take place. During the development of *Commitment 2040* a significant number of projects were identified within a needs assessment process, of which many may qualify for the *Complete Streets* program. That list is available for review.

Comment 20 – Page 25: Request to spell out SFRTA then identify acronym in brackets.

Response 20 – The acronym for SFRTA is now identified within the new acronym section located at the beginning of the plan, as well as identified throughout the document when South Florida Regional Transportation Authority is discussed.

Comment 21a – Page 26: Question regarding why the Port Everglades (PEV) Master Plan/Vision (or the Airport’s) isn’t referenced or summarized here, or elsewhere, in the LRTP document? It should be referenced in the LRTP since federal funding for port projects requires that the projects be consistent with the LRTP of the County/region. We understand that this is planning within Broward County/MPO planning area; however you could indicate that comprehensive project planning within the Port/Airport is consistent with the LRTP (and include a summary of the PEV Master Plan or a reference to it. It is important for the LRTP to show that the Port’s Plan is consistent with it.

Comment 21b – In regards to I-95 Corridor: Didn’t see any reference to the I-95 corridor Study/future corridor land use development/transportation planning to address mobility on this corridor – came from County Transportation Element – in conjunction with FDOT/MPO and other partners. Not sure if it’s addressed in another element of LRTP...?

Response 21a – Additional language has now been identified throughout the plan regarding Port Everglades and Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport, as well as links for additional information.

Response 21b –Regarding I-95, additional information regarding the corridor study was deemed beyond the scope of this section. However additional language on FDOT and the SIS has now been incorporated within *The MPO Story, If More Funding Becomes Available, and Further Reading* sections of the plan.

Comment 22a – Page 30: Is there a reason why the Port’s People Mover/IMC (“Sunport”) project was not also highlighted/reference here as one of the unfunded transit-related projects?

Comment 22b – Regarding the *Comprehensive list* section, question if this sub-title might be somewhat incomplete.

Response 22a – The Port’s People Mover would be considered a SIS facility and is located on the SIS list of unfunded needs, so it was not specifically referenced in the plan. However a number of sections have been added throughout the document to better identify the Port, its plans and activities.

Response 22b – Additional language has been added under the *Comprehensive list* section to provide a more complete description.

Comment 23 – Page 32: Identification that the table needs to be titled + have a possible Title/Image number.

Response 23 – Various adjustments have been made to the Unfunded Projects tables, including reformatting to separate out transit projects from roadway projects, as well as adding titles.

Comment 24 – Page 33: Regarding *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area* section: This section seems confusing/somewhat disconnected – since similar section title and sub-titles are documented and discussed on page 24. Suggest you show the linkage with what’s on page 24; or integrate the write-ups for these two pages.

Response 24 – The *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area* section has been revised to assist with ease of reading.

Comment 25a – Page 37 within the Infographic: Under the *Move People* section: comment regarding addition of goods movement (i.e. cargo/freight).

Comment 25b – Page 37 within the Infographic: Relative to the sub-heading *Improve accessibility for all users of the system*: As you know, not all users use the system for jobs. You may want to include other measurements of accessibility – example; availability of the system (various modes) to different communities/user group (including non-work-related users), cost to use the system, timing/frequency, etc.

Comment 25c – Page 37 within the Infographic: Relative to the sub-heading *Shorten project delivery* and in relation to reducing the number of projects requiring right-of-way, the question was posed as to “How this will be achieved?”

Comment 25d – Page 37 within the Infographic: Under the *Create Jobs* section and in relation to reducing the amount of time and money spent by all travelers, the question was posed as to “How this will be measured?”

Comment 25e – Page 37 within the Infographic: Under the *Strengthen Communities* section, suggestion to include bullets reading “Increase community/public involvement” and “Increase the number of public/private partnerships where the majority of residents make 50% less than the median income.”

Comment 25f – Page 37 within the Infographic: Under the *Promote environmental sensitivity* sub-heading and in relation to reduction of ozone and greenhouse gases, the following questions were posed: “Any targeted range?” and “What was it in 1990?”

Response 25a – Due to size limitations on the infographic, additional discussion of goods movement was not included.

Response 25b – Thank you for this observation. The MPO will continue to consider this as the plan is implemented.

Response 25c – Thank you for this observation. The MPO will continue to consider this as the plan is implemented.

Response 25d – Thank you for this observation. The MPO will continue to consider this as the plan is implemented.

Response 25e – Community involvement is inherently presumed to be included in the activities of the MPO, hence another bullet reading “increase community/public involvement” was not included. A bullet reading “Increase the number of public / private partnerships where the majority of residents make 50% less than the median income” is found within the *Promote redevelopment* sub-heading.

Response 25f – Due to size limitations on the infographic, additional discussion of ozone and greenhouse gasses was not included.

Reviewer: Broward County Planning and Redevelopment Division

Comment 1 – It is recommended that the draft plan be revised to more fully emphasize a focus on Complete Streets, bicycle and pedestrian enhancements. The Broward MPO, Broward County, FDOT, municipalities and other partners have demonstrated a strong, ongoing commitment to Complete Streets, bicycle and pedestrian enhancement and expansion of other non-motorized forms of transportation in Broward County. The “Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program” section of the draft LRTP does not fully reflect all of the planning and coordination that has occurred to date, focusing instead on a proposed annual process that is still under development. It is also noted that there is no discussion of the multimodal projects that were prioritized in the 2035 LRTP, many of which have been programmed into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Response 1 – Additional sections and language have been added in the plan to address the substantial prior, and ongoing, work relative to bicycles, pedestrians and *Complete Streets* efforts. New language has also been included within the *If More Funding Becomes Available* section regarding how the MPO and its planning partners will continue to pursue such transportation improvements.

Comment 2 – It is recommended that the proposed annual “Complete Streets and other Localized Initiative Program” award process be developed to ensure a transparent process including a project selection procedure that is open to applicants and the public, with accompanying documentation on award selection discussion and scoring. We also suggest that projects in previous LRTPs be considered as a ranking component of the new annual award application process.

Response 2 – Thank you for the suggestion. Additional language has been included within the *Improvements We Can Afford* section, *Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program* sub-section.

Comment 3 – Regarding the proposed annual “Complete Streets and other Localized Initiative Program” award process, it is recommended that the MPO staff identify potential applicants and hold a public workshop to inform potential applicants of the specifics of the application requirements and review selection process.

Response 3 – Thank you for the suggestion. Additional language has been included within the *Improvements We Can Afford* section, *Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program* sub-section.

Comment 4a – It is recommended that the Plan’s full support data and analysis be included in the upcoming Broward MPO TCC meeting backup materials, as well as to Broward MPO members and the general public for the upcoming MPO Board adoption hearing. The draft Plan does not include detailed support documentation to inform the reader how potential projects for funding were identified and reviewed.

Comment 4b - In addition, the draft does not include information about how projects on the recommended “Affordable Projects” list were selected.

Comment 4c – It is our understanding that this information is available via the MPO website. Although we support a streamlined and readable approved Plan document, and a process that minimizes the use of paper, for the upcoming important final review and adoption hearings, it is recommended that the Plan’s full support data and analysis be included for the above referenced meeting.

Response 4a – The supportive data, technical analysis and background reports are being provided for review. Additionally, the plan has been revised to provide more clarification on how projects were identified and reviewed for potential funding.

Response 4b – Additional language has been added in the *Building the 2040 Plan* section to better clarify how projects were reviewed and selected.

Response 4c – Yes, the plan was created with the intent of being a concise plain-speak document with significant background and technical information made available on the web-site for those who may be interested. The MPO intends to keep the supportive documentation in electronic format and has revised how it is accessed online, which will assist an interested party if they choose to print the material to a hard copy.

Comment 5 – Page 1: A reference to bicycles should be included within the existing references to mass transit, pedestrian and roadway projects is important to highlight Broward’s commitment to expanding the bicycle network.

Response 5 – The above referenced text edit has been made at the beginning of *The MPO Story* section

Comment 6 – Page 5: A reference to Collier County in addition to Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties is suggested.

Response 6 – The MPO is dealing with the South Florida region and Collier County doesn’t fit this context. Therefore, Collier County has not been included in this text

Comment 7 – Page 7: “...with stakeholder to **identify** and **find** funding...” – suggest modifying ‘find’ to ‘secure’.

Response 7 – This sentence has been revised to read “We do this by working with stakeholders to identify and secure funding for improvements to Broward’s transportation infrastructure.”

Comment 8 – Page 9: Within the ‘Move People’ section it is suggested that safety be identified as a priority and a demonstration of how safety was a factor in the selection of Affordable Projects.

Response 8 – A reference to “safety” has been included within this section. During the development of *Commitment 2040*, a needs assessment was conducted with area transportation stakeholders (as discussed within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section). It was during this process that stakeholders assessed the need for certain improvements as well as their justification, including safety concerns.

Comment 9 – Page 10: Consider modifying “Projects which provide for pedestrian connection help build a sense of community...” to include Complete Streets and bicycle references, as these all are important components to quality of life and building a sense of community.

Response 9 – This sentence has been revised to include reference to bicycles as well as pedestrians. Additional “links” to bicycles have been provided throughout the document and can generally be found along with the discussion of *Complete Streets*.

Comment 10 – Page 12: Suggest adding examples of how previous plans, including the 2035 LRTP, are incorporated into this LRTP within the ‘Existing plans and programs’ section.

Response 10 – An additional section, identified as *What’s Changed Since the Last Plan*, has been added at the beginning of the plan to provide some explanation of what has changed since the 2035 LRTP.

Comment 11 – Page 18: It is suggested that greenways be included in the “Regionally significant projects” section. Greenways are designed to provide travel across long distances and in some instances to neighboring counties. These types of projects do not appear to be consistent with the definition included in the ‘Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program’ section that identifies eligible projects as non-regionally significant. A concern is that by default, greenway development will be limited because it is not adequately addressed in the LRTP.

Response 11 – The definition of “regionally significant”, as used within the plan, has been included in the definition section. Given that greenways are not included in the regional model per the federal definition, the MPO has not included them as regionally significant projects. Greenway projects have been generally identified as improvements that would fall under the new Complete Streets program. The substantial list of projects, which was generated during the needs assessment, include a number of greenway projects that will be considered as part of *Complete Streets* or when other funding sources become available.

Comment 12 – Page 21: Although total project costs provided in the draft LRTP can be calculated, it may be useful to readers if a total dollar amount is included at the bottom of the “Affordable Projects” list.

Response 12 – Total dollar amounts have been provided on the Affordable Projects tables and Unfunded Projects tables.

Comment 13 – Page 26: It is noted that All Aboard Florida is discussed in the section on “What We Can Afford.” It is suggested that the reference may be better located outside of that section.

Response 13 – Discussion of All Aboard Florida has been maintained in this *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area* sub-section, along with the SIS, Port Everglades, Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport, and SFRTA. It is understood that a concern exists on whether it should be maintained in this section, however due to its regional transportation importance, placement in this part of the plan seemed appropriate. Additionally, the MPO has provided some clarifying language on its various planning partners and their plans that are being incorporated by reference.

Reviewer: Broward County Planning Council

Comment 1 – Page 3: Broward County Traffic Engineering Division (not Department)

Response 1 – The above referenced text edit has been made within The MPO Story section of the plan.

Comment 2 – Pages 5, 10, 12, 14, 18 – “Quotations” is unattributed

Response 2 – Quotations have been removed where unattributed.

Comment 3 – Page 8 – “Quotation:” Broward has had a **long transportation range** plan (long range transportation plan)

Response 3 – The above referenced text edit has been made.

Comment 4a – Page 13 – Each of these charts show the past condition (2000) below the axis, which generally indicates a negative value. The presentation of this data may be confusing.

Comment 4b – We like how the “Affordable Projects Regionally Significant, 2019-2040” Map and Table face each other on pages 19 and 20. Perhaps the “Unfunded Needs Regionally Significant, 2019-2040” Map and Table (currently pages 31 and 32) can face each other also?

Response 4a – The MPO created the comparison of data sets for two different *time periods*. The infographic is not intended to identify values on either an X or Y axis, which could denote positive or negative values.

Response 4b – The plan has been modified to ensure maps and tables face each other.

Comment 5 – Page 21 – “Affordable Projects Regionally Significant, 2019-2040” Table:

Comment 5a – All road-type identifies omitted (Avenue, Street, Boulevard, etc.) – causes confusion (i.e. Davie Boulevard or Davie Road?)

Comment 5b – All road-direction identifiers omitted (NE, SW, etc.)

Comment 5c – Use of State Road Numbers as identifiers should include a legend, or identify in text

Comment 5d – Use of State Roads inconsistent Example: [Reconstruct intersection at Flamingo and SR 820] – why not [Reconstruct intersection of SR 823 and SR 820]?

Comment 5e – (1) Wave Streetcar: Construct new streetcar route on Andrews Ave. from SE 17th St. to SE 7th St. and on Andrews Avenue ~~at~~ from NW 4th Ave. to NE 6th Ave.

Response 5 – Various changes have been made on the Affordable Projects tables, including reformatting and use of titles.

Response 5a – Road types have been added.

Response 5b – Various road-direction identifies have been provided as necessary.

Response 5c – The MPO has attempted to provide clarification between the map and the tables.

Response 5d – The MPO has attempted to be consistent in the use of roads being referenced.

Response 5e – Due to size limitations in the table, references to Andrews has not been included. However “St.” and “Ave.” have been incorporated.

Comment 6 – Page 32 – “Unfunded Needs Regionally Significant, 2019-2040” Table

Comment 6a – B Hallandale Beach Blvd. / Miramar Parkway Corridor upgrades to support enhanced bus service between I-75 to SR A1A \$84.0

Comment 6b – C County Line Rd. Construct new 4 lane roadway between University and Hillsboro \$54.0 (connect to Hillsboro Blvd – City of Parkland has renamed former County Line Road as Hillsboro Blvd.)

Comment 6c – G Oakes R. Construct new 4 lane roadway, including overpass between Davie Road and SR 7 / US 441 \$40.0

Comment 6d – H SW 184th ~~St.~~ Avenue Add 2 lanes (from 4 to 6) between Sheridan and Miramar \$32.0

Comment 6e – S SR 838 / Sunrise Blvd. Reconstruct roadway to include turn lanes between Sawgrass Corporate Center and Sawgrass Expressway \$5.0

Comment 6f – V SW 196th ~~St.~~ Avenue Add 2 lanes (from 2 to 4) between Pines and Pembroke \$3.0

Comment 6g – X Intersection Improvement Reconstruct intersection ~~between~~ at SR 7 / US 441 and Hollywood \$2.0

Comment 6h – Z Intersection Improvement Reconstruct intersection ~~between~~ at Pines and University \$1.0

Response 6 – Various changes have been made on the Unfunded Projects tables, including reformatting and use of titles.

Response 6a – Due to size limitations in the table, the project is named “SR 585/Hallandale Beach Blvd.”

Response 6b – “County Line Rd.” has been renamed “Hillsboro Blvd.”

Response 6c – Reference to “Road” has been used, now identified as “Davie Rd.”

Response 6d – “St.” has been changed to “Ave.”

Response 6e – Use of “Expy.” is now identified in the table.

Response 6f – “St.” has been changed to “Ave.”

Response 6g – The project location is now identified as “SR 7/US 441 and SR 820/Hollywood Blvd.”

Response 6h – The project location is now identified as “SR 820/Pines Blvd. and SR 817/University Dr.”

Reviewer: BPAC

The BPAC previously provided a letter, dated September 10, 2014, to the MPO regarding general comments on Commitment 2040. Subsequently, the MPO also supplied a letter in response to BPAC that was dated September 17, 2014. Both letters have been included for reference.

For additional information on the Broward MPO and *Commitment 2040*, visit www.browardmpo.org

BICYCLING AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

September 10, 2014

Mayor Barbara Sharief, Vice Mayor Tim Ryan, Commissioner Martin David Kiar,
and Commissioner Kristin Jacobs

Broward County Government Center
115 South Andrews Ave.
Ft. Lauderdale, FL. 33301

Dear Mayor Sharief, Vice Mayor Ryan, Commissioner Kiar, and Commissioner
Jacobs,

I am writing you on behalf of the Broward County Bicycling and Pedestrian
Advisory Committee (BPAC) to urge you to insist that several serious
weaknesses in the MPO Draft 2040 LRTP are amended prior to its approval.

First, the draft LRTP is missing an updated Bike/Ped Projects List from the 2035
LRTP. Representatives of the MPO told the BPAC directly that this list of
projects would be incorporated into the 2040 LRTP, and this has not been done.
We also understand that similar representations were made to the MPO's own
LRTP Steering Committee as well. We question why the MPO appears reluctant
to document currently funded projects for which it has full-time staff doing project
management. The lack of bicycle and pedestrian projects in the draft 2040 plan
is particularly puzzling in the light of quotes such as these included in the draft:

*"Enhancing Broward's infrastructure to allow businesses to grow
effectively and efficiently, is a core goal of Commitment 2040."[sic]
Projects which provide for pedestrian connections help build a sense of
community and entice new, young employees to relocate to the Broward
region."*

*Commitment 2040 prioritizes improvements emphasizing people-based
forms of mobility – transit, bike and pedestrian projects.*

Second, the draft LRTP does not contain a single bicycle or pedestrian project of
regional significance, despite the fact that several multi-city projects are currently
under consideration. We think this omission speaks poorly for the MPO's stated
commitment to multi-modal transportation.

Third, this draft plan proposes to change the way that bicycle and pedestrian
projects are proposed and approved, but it is unclear exactly how this new

application and approval process will work, and what will happen to funds earmarked for bicycle and pedestrian projects if not enough applications are received by municipal planners. We were first told by MPO staff that projects in the 2035 LRTP would be funded independently of the application process the MPO is proposing to set up, but now we hear that previously approved projects would have to re-apply for funding.

We believe that opaque processes are not the hallmark of good governance, and in that respect, this draft LRTP does not rise to the high standard set by previous MPO plans. Furthermore, we question whether the abandonment of bicycle and pedestrian planning by the MPO to the cities under this new, ad-hoc process is in the best interest of Broward County citizens.

Finally, the plan appears to lack relevant, quantitative performance measures for bicyclists and pedestrians, such as:

- Increase mode share for bicycles and pedestrians by 5%
- Reduce injury accidents and fatalities for bicyclists and pedestrians by 50%

For those performance measures which are specified, there appears to be no detailed plan as to how the performance measures will be achieved. We recommend that you insist on the inclusion of specific plans for achieving the stated goals.

The Broward MPO has a long history of strong support for bicycling and pedestrian planning in the county, and this plan is a significant step backward from that history of commitment. We urge you to remedy the points listed above immediately, and not to approve the draft LRTP until they are addressed.

Regards,



David Marshall
2014 Chair
Broward County Bicycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Copies to:

Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Bertha Henry, Broward County Administrator
Commissioner Richard Blattner, Broward MPO Chair
Gregory Stuart, Broward MPO Executive Director
John Rude, MPO Community Involvement Roundtable Chair
Jeffrey Weidner, FDOT, District IV
Kevin Fischer, Board Liaison, BPAC

September 17, 2014

David Marshall, 2014 Chair
Broward County Bicycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

RE: Commitment 2040, Bicycle and Pedestrian Component of the LRTP

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for taking the time to review and comment on the bicycle and pedestrian investment strategies identified in the draft *Commitment 2040*, the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). We welcome your comments and look forward to continue working with the BPAC to advance the construction of safer and more complete facilities so that Broward County residents can travel by whichever means most suits their needs.

As you are aware, the 2035 LRTP specifically identified bicycle and pedestrian projects by line item on a very detailed scale. This approach helped raise awareness of bicycling and pedestrian issues and set in motion a process to identify and more fully develop community outreach, design and funding that could be tailored to the needs of each of Broward's communities. Since the 2035 plan was developed, the MPO has implemented a process to evaluate and advance these projects including the assignment of a staff member to refine and shepherd proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects through the development pipeline.

While the approach of defining individual bicycle and pedestrian projects in the LRTP does have its benefits, it has proven to have liabilities as well, including delays in project implementation due to lack of proper vetting. To improve upon the current process and facilitate the implementation of more complete streets projects which include bicycle and pedestrian facilities, (*Commitment 2040*) embraces and codifies the following approach.

- First, *Commitment 2040* increases the total budget for bicycle and pedestrian improvements from 8% in the 2035 LRTP to a minimum of 12% of the total plan's dollars. By maximizing the funding for these projects, *Commitment 2040* meets the MPO Board's stated goal and vision to advance a truly balanced multi-modal transportation system.
- Second, MAP-21 requires that the MPO find innovative ways to more quickly advance project delivery. We have found that our approach to assign a staff member to directly coordinate with our planning partners to identify, prioritize and more fully flesh out bicycle and pedestrian projects, allows us leverage funding and gives us the best opportunity to get projects "on the ground" as quickly as possible. Since most of these projects have relatively short project development timelines, they can be built in response to clearly identified needs such as safety concerns or to fill in gaps in the network such as safe routes to school, sidewalks bridging cities or neighborhood accessibility to transit facilities.

Chair

Richard Blattner
Vice Chair
Bryan Caletka
Second Vice Chair
Bruce G. Roberts

Members/ Alternates

Mikie Belvedere
Mark Brown
George Brummer
Yvette Colbourne
Joy Cooper
Harry Dressler
Walter Duke
Freddy Fitzkell
Gary Frantel
Toby Feuer
Javier Garcia
Tom Green
Patricia Good
Ron Jacobs
Kristin D. Jacobs
Sandy Johnson
Eric H. Jones, Jr
Richard J. Kaplan
Martin David Kiar
Lisa Malozzi
Shari L. McCartney
Ashira A. Mohammed
Frank Ortis
Romney Rogers
David Rosenof
Richard Rosenzweig
Tim Ryan
Barbara Sharief
Joanne Simone
Lawrence A.Sofield
Gregory Sollitto
Larry Vignola
Leroyd Williams

Executive Director

Gregory Stuart
General Counsel
Alan Gabriel

- Third, all bicycle and pedestrian projects identified through the fifth year of the TIP are included in *Commitment 2040* as the TIP is a subset of the LRTP. The programmatic/complete streets classification of bicycle and pedestrian projects applies to years 2019 forward. Once the MPO Board adopts *Commitment 2040*, the MPO staff will work with the MPO Board, BPAC and other committees to develop a clear and open process to formally advance all projects under the “Complete Streets and Other Localized Initiatives” program. This process will dovetail with performance goals, monitoring, environmental justice and other MPO planning requirements. As part of that process, our staff will provide outreach and technical assistance to those municipalities that do not have the resources to identify and fully develop bicycle pedestrian projects so as to have them constructed in the shortest possible time. This is the point when a detailed plan can best be developed once all of the project’s details are fully known and vetted through local outreach.
- Fourth, we recognize that funding, process, data and list of projects by themselves do not guarantee timely project delivery. As part of the programmatic project advancement process, outreach to the neighborhoods and communities where these projects are proposed for advancement will be conducted. In this way, we can be certain that the projects are wanted by the residents, tailored to the needs of the communities, satisfy the MPO’s goals and fulfill the MPO’s responsibilities under Title VI.
- Fifth, because (*Commitment 2040*) recognizes the importance of providing safe mobility options for all, we have strengthened the language for “What will the Plan Achieve?” and “How the Objectives will be Measured?” sections of the document.

We thank you for the observation that the MPO has a long history of support for bicycle and pedestrian planning in the County. We feel that by increasing the share of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and by putting a formalized, yet streamlined process in place to refine project definitions, construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities can rapidly advance. Through close coordination with our planning partners and neighborhoods, the MPO can maximize the positive outcomes of bicycle and pedestrian facility investments in Broward County.

We look forward to working with the BPAC and our other planning partners to refine and streamline our project delivery process.

Sincerely,



Gregory Stuart, AICP
Executive Director

Agenda Item
No. 3

[Page Intentionally Left Blank]

This document is designed for two-sided (duplex) printing.

STEERING COMMITTEE/TCC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

In the development of *Commitment 2040*, Broward MPO has consulted with its transportation planning partners, including the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), Community Involvement Roundtable (CIR), and local public works, transportation and/or planning managers. Written feedback has been solicited from those entities as well as the general public.

On September 24, 2014 the MPO also met with the Steering Committee and TCC to discuss the plan. Comments, questions and suggestions were verbally raised by the committees at that time and were documented by the MPO. The documented items below reflect these discussions. Responses by the MPO, where appropriate, have also been provided.

Comment 1 – Provide summary of programs/plans by reference, provide “crosswalk” links directly to document for more technical or detailed information. Links provided are weak and do not tie to the plan or how it was developed.

Response 1 – Additional explanation has been provided throughout the document on the efforts of the MPO and its planning partners. Additional links have been provided through the document for ease of locating more technical and detailed information. A new section located at the conclusion of the plan, identified as *Further Reading*, also provides more explanation on plans/programs and where interested readers can access additional information.

Comment 2 – Many comment submitted were not addressed.

Response 2 – The MPO has documented comments received from the general public, agency comments, and now those obtained verbally from the Steering Committee and TCC. Responses have been drafted regarding whether changes have been made and, if so, where in the document. These comments and responses are being provided for consideration by reviewers of the draft plan.

Comment 3 – Bike/Pedestrian list? Where is it? What is the plan? How will Bike/Ped. projects be addressed outside the programmatic approach? More emphasis is needed for this mode.

Response 3 – Bicycle and pedestrian projects are generally considered to be funded through the *Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Program*, which is discussed within the section titled *Improvements We Can Afford*. However, within the *If More Funding Becomes Available* section, additional discussion is provided on the needs that go beyond what is financially affordable and how the MPO intends to continue pursuing ways to fund improvements. Furthermore, lists of bicycle and pedestrian projects are being provided in the technical/support documentation.

Comment 4 – Port projects should be separately listed, not part of SIS.

Response 4 – Additional references are made throughout the document to Port Everglades as well as their Master Plan and links to it. Within the *Further Reading* section, various plans are incorporated by reference including that of FDOT's SIS and, separately, such entities as Port Everglades and Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.

Comment 5 – No language or documentation on how we came with the recommendations/list of projects. Need data and analysis to support recommendations.

Response 5 – Additional explanation, on how projects were determined, is found within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section (specifically within and after the sub-sections titled *Major factors contributing to the plan's development*). Additionally, the technical documentation that supported the list of projects is being made available via the MPO web site.

Comment 6 – How did you get to the Cost Feasible Plan? More charts and graphs are needed on funding and other areas to show how we got to the Cost Feasible Plan.

Response 6 – As identified in Response 5, additional explanation has been provided within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section. Additionally, a new infographic has been generated within this section which provides more detail on revenue.

Comment 7 – Great marketing document but no technical support and thus difficulty to recognize as a planning document.

Response 7 – Additional text, links and infographics have been included throughout the document to better identify the supportive and technical material.

Comment 8 – Document noted that there were “shortcomings” but did not identify what the shortcomings are.

Response 8 – Reference to “their shortcomings”, within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section, has been revised to read “identifies deficiencies in these facilities”.

Comment 9 – Does not describe vision.

Response 9 – Development of the 2040 plan did not include an effort to develop a vision separate from that of the existing MPO's mission and vision, which have provided overall guidance. Within the *Overview* section, a general reference is made relative to Commitment 2040's reaffirmation of the “long-term vision and types of improvements designated” in Transformation 2035.

Comment 10 – Concerns that projects not listed in the document or only by reference may not be eligible for grant funding.

Response 10 – The MPO recognizes concerns that exist when projects are not specifically identified in the plan. If a project is being considered for a grant application, a funding recipient can request a letter be generated by the MPO. The letter would identify that the MPO will be amending its LRTP to include the project on its list of improvements being considered for funding in the event the grant is awarded.

Comment 11 – Existing plus committed projects not referenced or described.

Response 11 – We have modified language in the *Building the 2040 Plan* and *Further Reading* sections to better reference the TIP.

Comment 12 – No reference to Sea Level Rise or Climate Change Action Plan.

Response 12 – Additional language regarding climate change has been incorporated at the conclusion of *The MPO Story* section of the plan.

Comment 13 – Why is AAF listed as it is a private company? Why call out one project? Alternative would be to add language about public/private partnerships and AAF and others listed as examples only.

Response 13 – Language regarding public/private partnerships has now been included as a new subsection within the *If More Funding Becomes Available* section of the plan. Due to its regional significance, All Aboard Florida has been maintained as an example within the *Improvements We Can Afford* section, under *Facilities extending beyond the MPO planning area*.

Comment 14 – Need better/more lists.

Response 14 – Additional explanation of project lists has been provided in the *Building the 2040 Plan*, *Improvements We Can Afford*, and *If More Funding Becomes Available* sections. Additionally, the projects lists (beyond those identified as Affordable and Unfunded) are also included in the technical/supportive documentation.

Comment 15 – Address environmental justice.

Response 15 – Additional EJ language has been included at the beginning of the document, within the *Governing Laws and Legal Definitions* page, as well as within the *Building the 2040 Plan* and *Improvements We Can Afford* sections.

Comment 16 – Pembroke Road project should be on unfunded list.

Response 16 – The Pembroke Road improvement is now identified on the Unfunded Roadway Projects table.

Comment 17 – Place comments receive on web site.

Response 17 – Comments received in letter format, via emails, or verbally from Steering Committee and TCC meetings, as well as responses provided by the MPO, will be made available for public review on the web site.

Comment 18 – Have Steering Committee meeting a week before TCC meeting. Invite all TCC members.

Response 18 – The intent is for TCC members to also be invited to any Steering Committee meeting. Such meeting dates are currently being formalized. The intent is to allow Steering Committee members sufficient time to review the LRTP and associated material prior to the TCC.

Comment 19 – Suggested of addition Fact Sheets on Transit and Bike/Ped.

Response 19 – Additional Fact Sheets on Transit and Bicycles/Pedestrians will be developed.

Comment 20 – Re-incorporate the paragraph inadvertently omitted/deleted (discussed during meeting).

Response 20 – Language that was previously omitted in the draft plan is now addressed in the SFRTA references identified within *The MPO Story*, *Improvements We Can Afford*, and *Further Reading* sections of the plan.

Comment 21 – Need to identify one of the highways (Hwy 84?) on map for funded projects, believe referenced as projects 33 and 16.

Response 21 – The highway has been identified on the Affordable Projects map.

Comment 22 – Somehow include reference in the plan document that there is additional/supportive information on the web (or otherwise better clarify all the supporting materials/work).

Response 22 – Additional language and links have been provided throughout the plan to better reference the supportive documentation and material that is available via the web.

Comment 23 – Desire to reference bike & ped. efforts.

Response 23 – A number of references to bike, pedestrian and Complete Streets efforts have been made throughout the document, such as additional clarification within the *Improvements We Can Afford* and *If More Funding Becomes Available* sections of the plan.

Comment 24 – Overall comment that the various other planning efforts and stakeholders do not feel they have been sufficiently identified in or referenced by the plan.

Response 24 – Additional language and links have been included throughout the document to better identify our transportation planning partners and their efforts.

Comment 25 – Possibly include some reference towards the beginning of the plan such as “This plan includes this specific LRTP document as well as substantial additional analysis and documentation, which is hereby incorporated by reference. Such materials are referenced on page XYZ and includes ___”.

Response 25 – Additional language regarding how the plan was developed, as well as the supportive and technical documentation, is identified within the *Overview* and *Further Reading* sections of the plan.

Comment 26 – Include the topic areas where the Steering Committee members felt it was lacking, such as needs assessment, etc. Also possibly include some additional language on process that was taken, various components, etc.

Response 26 – Additional explanation on the components of the plan, the process that was taken, and the needs assessment can now be found within the *Overview* and *Building the 2040 Plan* sections.

Comment 27 – Identification of needs assessment.

Response 27 – The needs assessment is discussed within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section as well as within the technical/supportive material accompanying the plan.

Comment 28 – Vision statement.

Response 28 – The response provided in Response 9 addresses the vision statement inquiry.

Comment 29 – Add data (etc.) in different formats on the web (i.e. right now some material just in GIS).

Response 29 – Data will be made available on the MPO website in varied formats.

Comment 30 – Comment on inclusion of sea level rise and climate change.

Response 30 – The response provided in Response 12 addresses the climate change inquiry.

Comment 31 – Suggestion of public/private partnership as general topic but not highlight a specific project or entity (i.e. All-Aboard FL, given it is a private endeavor).

Response 31 – The response provided in Response 13 addresses the public/private partnerships inquiry.

Comment 32 – Maybe tell the difference between 2035 and 2040 plans including what is now financially feasible and why.

Response 32 – A new section identified as *What's Changed Since the Last Plan* discusses differences between the 2035 and 2040 plans.

Comment 33 – “Did you know” blurbs possibly removed and replaced with “more meaningful” graphics.

Response 33 – These blurbs have been retained to highlight specific topics and maintain the plan as a reader friendly document. Additionally, two infographics within the *Building the 2040 Plan* section have been updated in addition to two new infographics within the *Improvements We Can Afford* section.

Comment 34 – Towards beginning of document, provide more thorough explanation of process, what the plan is, and info on what has been done, supportive documents (list) at end of the document (and that actual materials can be found on the web).

Response 34 – Additional explanation is provided within the *Overview* section to identify how the plan is structured. A new section, identified as *Further Reading*, is also provided at the conclusion of the plan to provide further explanation on the supporting material. Links have also been incorporated throughout the document to direct the reader to additional information.

For additional information on the Broward MPO and *Commitment 2040*, visit www.browardmpo.org.

[Page Intentionally Left Blank]

This document is designed for two-sided (duplex) printing.



Trade Centre South · 100 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 850
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309-2112

+1 (954) 876-0033 Phone · +1 (954) 876-0062 Fax
www.browardmpo.org