

SR 7 Multimodal improvements Corridor study

CHAPTER 5: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REVISED FINAL



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

Table of Contents

Section 5.1: Introduction	5-1
Section 5.2: Project Prioritization	5-1
Priority Tier 1: Systemic Improvements	5-2
Priority Tier 2: Network Connectivity Projects.....	5-3
Priority Tier 3: Major Intersection “Hot Spot” Projects.....	5-14
Section 5.3: Implementation Plan	5-16
Implementation Plan Funding Options.....	5-17
Funding Options Available to Deliver Priority Tier 2 Projects	5-17
Funding Options Available to Deliver Priority Tier 3 Improvements.....	5-18
Implementation and Funding Plan	5-19
Applying for CSLIP Funding.....	5-22
Program Training and Participation.....	5-22

List of Tables

Table 5-1: Network Connectivity Project Prioritization Factors, Criteria, and Weights	5-4
Table 5-2: Prioritized Network Connectivity Projects	5-7
Table 5-3: Summary of Network Connectivity Projects by Project Ranking.....	5-11
Table 5-4: Major Intersection Concepts Ranking Criteria	5-15
Table 5-5: Preferred Funding Plan	5-20

SECTION 5.1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter documents the prioritization and funding of the capital improvements recommended in Chapter 4 as well as next steps for project implementation. Recommended improvements are prioritized first based on the timeframe in which they can reasonably be implemented and then as relative priorities within each implementation timeframe.

This chapter also includes a discussion of “next steps” for project implementation as well as a financial plan showing how corridor-specific and categorical funding identified within the MPO’s Commitment 2040 LRTP can be used to fund network connectivity and “hot spot” intersection improvement projects.

SECTION 5.2: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Project recommendations identified in Chapter 4 are grouped into the following three main categories each of which fall into short, medium, and long term implementation priority tiers:

- > **Priority Tier 1 – Short-Term Systemic Improvements (Less than 5 Years):** These recommendations are generally consistent with new FDOT standards and/or common low-cost safety countermeasures that would typically be retrofit to existing roadways as part of resurfacing projects, signal maintenance, or programmatic, proactive pedestrian safety improvements. With the exception of recommendations to enhance intersection lighting to meet FDOT’s updated Plans Preparation Manual Chapter 7.3.2.2, these recommendations do not require a formal design phase and may be implemented using either state funds or federal Highway Safety Improvement Program Funds (HSIP), neither of which require MPO prioritization.
- > **Priority Tier 2 – Mid-Term Network Connectivity Projects (5 to 10 Years):** These projects are generally consistent with the Broward MPO’s countywide Mobility Projects program and, for the most part provide for bicycle lanes, sidewalk projects, and shared use pathways along SR 7 or along collector and arterial roadways connecting to the SR 7 corridor. The vast majority of these projects require no right-of-way and most require no reconstruction/relocation of existing curb and drainage structures or utilities; however they do require a formal design phase and must be individually programmed within the MPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and FDOT’s 5-Year Work Program
- > **Priority Tier 3 – Longer-Term Hot Spot Intersection Improvements (Greater than 5 years):** To address safety and efficiency for transit users and buses, this study identifies concepts to modify several major intersections along the corridor to provide for reduced right turn radii, bus bypass lanes, and bus/pedestrian islands with queue-jump infrastructure. These

improvements are designed to locate bus stops closer to the existing traffic signals, reduce pedestrian exposure, and provide travel time advantages for buses. While these concepts do not impact adjacent private property structures, parking, or driveway access, they do, for the most part, require some right-of-way acquisition. Also, those concepts that propose pedestrian/bus islands will require investments in ITS infrastructure and corresponding concept-of-operations protocols to facilitate queue-jump operation with near-side stop placement. Because of the need to incorporate a formal design phase, acquire right-of-way, and overcome technology gaps these projects will require more time to implement.

PRIORITY TIER 1: SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENTS

Systemic project recommendations, detailed in Chapter 4, Table 4-1, include the uniform implementation of the following improvements at all signalized intersections along the corridor.

- > Countdown Pedestrian Signals (Priority Tier 1-1)
- > R10-15 “Right Turn Yield to Pedestrian” Signs (Priority Tier 1-1)
- > High Emphasis Crosswalk Markings (Priority Tier 1-2)
- > Intersection Lighting Improvements
 - Within segment currently being reconstructed (Priority Tier 1-1)
 - Outside of segment of SR 7 currently being reconstructed (Priority Tier 1-3)

These recommendations are consistent with recent updates to FDOT standards and/or are low-cost best practice safety countermeasures. Of these recommendations, the most expedient to implement, and therefore the first priority, are retrofitting existing pedestrian signals with countdown inserts and installation of R10-15 “Right Turn Yield to Pedestrian” signs at all signalized intersections along the corridor.

Generally, high-emphasis crosswalk markings can be retrofit between existing crosswalk bars without removing existing markings, however this improvement may require assessment of the condition of existing markings and the pavement condition within the intersection area and therefore may not be implemented as quickly as the countdown signal and yield sign retrofits.

Signalized Intersection lighting improvements will require a complete inventory of existing intersection lighting as well as formal design to meet the illumination and consistency requirements specified in the Plans Preparation Manual Chapter 7.3.2.2 and ensure that sub-surface and overhead utilities conflicts are resolved. As such, these will require more time to implement. However, this study recommends that enhanced intersection lighting be considered

for immediate implementation as part of the ongoing SR 7 widening project at the following nine intersections:

- > Pembroke Road
- > Washington Street
- > Walmart Entrance (New Signal)
- > Hollywood Boulevard
- > Fillmore Street (New Signal)
- > Johnson Street
- > Taft Street
- > Sheridan Street
- > Osceola Drive

PRIORITY TIER 2: NETWORK CONNECTIVITY PROJECTS

The network connectivity projects presented in Chapter 4 were prioritized through a point-based system to determine the relative priority of each project based on the following factors:

- > Traffic characteristics and quality of existing multimodal facilities
- > Demand potential
- > Completion of a critical network link
- > Anticipated safety benefits
- > Relationship to Environmental Justice Target Areas
- > Presence of sufficient right-of-way (ROW)
- > Impacts to existing infrastructure
- > Required community input and stakeholder coordination

These factors, criteria and weights are summarized in Table 5-1.

Detailed tabulation of prioritization factors are provided in Technical Appendix G.

Table 5-1: Network Connectivity Project Prioritization Factors, Criteria, and Weights

Index	Prioritization Factor	Criteria	Points	Max			
A	<p>Traffic Characteristics and Quality of Existing Multimodal Facilities: Projects along higher-volume, higher-speed roadways are more essential than projects along lower-speed, lower-volume roadways where it is less dangerous to walk or ride a bicycle along the roadside. Projects to provide sidewalks, marked bicycle lanes, or multi-use trails along or across roadways with no pedestrian or bicycle facilities are, all else being equal, prioritized above projects to enhance roadways with partial facilities (e.g., wide outside lanes for cyclists or sidewalks along one side of the street).</p>	Roadway	Arterial street	5	50		
			High-volume collector (>8,000 ADT)	3			
			Lower-volume collector (<8,000 ADT)	2			
			Local street	1			
B			Pedestrian	No sidewalks or substantially incomplete		5	
				Contiguous sidewalk on one side only		3	
				Trail/multiuse pathway		2	
				Complete sidewalks on both sides of the road		0	
C				Bicycle		No bicycle facilities	5
						Un-marked shoulder	3
						Trail/multiuse pathway	1
						Bicycle lanes	0
D	<p>Demand Potential: Projects in higher-density areas that provide access to Mobility Hubs or higher-frequency transit routes are more likely to provide a safety, congestion management, and/or livability benefit than projects that serve lower-density areas and do not connect to transit.</p>			Transit	Mobility Hub	5	25
					Premium Transit Corridor	3	
					Local/community bus route	1	
					No transit service nearby	0	
E				Density	High (> 40 persons + jobs / acre)	5	
					Medium (31–40 persons + jobs / acre)	3	
					Low (11–30 persons + jobs / acre)	2	
					Very Low (≤ 10 persons + jobs / acre)	1	
F	<p>Critical Link: Projects that provide for multimodal connectivity or address congestion issues where alternative routes are not available are a higher priority than enhancements that complement adequate existing routes.</p>		Crosses limited access highway or water body or direct connection to transit stop		5	5	
			Neighborhood connectivity		3		
			None – facility complemented by other routes		0		
G	<p>Safety Benefit: Projects that directly address a documented traffic crash issue are a higher priority than projects that implement safety best practices or are not relevant to improving safety for all road users</p>		Addresses documented crash issue		5	5	
		Safety best practice – arterial street		3			
		Safety best practice – collector street		1			

Index	Prioritization Factor	Criteria	Points	Max
H	Environmental Justice (EJ): Projects that serve disadvantaged populations are prioritized above projects where environmental justice populations are not as prevalent.	High percent disadvantaged population (>20%)	5	5
		Medium percent disadvantaged population (5 – 20%)	3	
		Percent disadvantaged population (< 5%)	0	
I	Sufficient Right-of-Way (ROW): Projects with sufficient right-of-way are prioritized higher as they will have less cost impacts and time delays than projects with insufficient or gaps in right-of-way.	Sufficient right-of-way to construct project	5	5
		Minor modifications to project design or further review needed to address minor gaps in existing right-of-way	3	
		More significant evaluation likely needed to address right-of-way issues (but not considered a 'fatal flaw')	1	
J	Impacts to Existing Infrastructure: Projects that will not impact existing infrastructure (drainage, utilities, driveways, trees, etc.) are prioritized higher as they will have less cost impacts and time delays than projects where infrastructure conflicts must be addressed.	No identified infrastructure conflicts.	5	5
		Minor infrastructure conflicts identified	3	
		More considerable infrastructure conflicts identified (but not considered a 'fatal flaw')	1	
K	Community Input and Stakeholder Coordination: Projects that do not require community input or stakeholder coordination outside of the typical project development process are prioritized higher as they are likely to have less cost impacts and time delays than projects where additional community input must be collected and addressed.	Minor levels of community input and additional stakeholder coordination may be needed to advance project	5	5
		Moderate levels of community outreach and stakeholder coordination is anticipated	3	
		More significant community outreach and stakeholder coordination is anticipated to address such issues as access management, design preference, infrastructure impact mitigation, etc.)	1	

For each project recommendation, points were assigned to each prioritization criteria to determine the relative priority of each project based on the factors, criteria and weights previously summarized in Table 5-1.

The total (105 maximum) points for each project are calculated using the following formula:

$$[A \times (B + C)] + [D \times E] + [F + G] + [H + I + J + K]$$

or

$$[\text{Traffic Characteristics} \times (\text{Existing Pedestrian} + \text{Existing Bicycle})]$$

+

$$[\text{Transit Service} \times \text{Population \& Employment Density}]$$

+

$$[\text{Critical Link} + \text{Safety Benefit} + \text{Environmental Justice}]$$

+

$$[\text{Sufficient ROW} + \text{Infrastructure Impacts} + \text{Community Input/Stakeholder Coordination}]$$

Table 5-2 summarizes the prioritized list of projects following application of the criteria. Table 5-3 presents the prioritized list of projects in order of highest to lowest priority. Three sub-tiers of prioritized projects were identified based on the total points awarded: Tier 2-1 includes projects awarded 55+ points; Tier 2-2- includes projects awarded 40-54 points, and Tier 2-3 includes projects awarded less than 40 points.

Table 5-2: Prioritized Network Connectivity Projects

Project #	Working Group	City	Project Description	Length (mi)	On Street (to/from)	Total Project Cost	A - Roadway	B - Pedestrian	C - Bicycle	D - Transit Demand	E - Density	F - Critical Link	G - Safety	H - EJ	I - ROW	J - Infrastructure	K - Community & Stakeholders	Total Score	Project Rank (of 22)
1	South	Hollywood	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	1.50	Taft St (from SR 7 to N 40th Ave)	\$2.02 M	3	0	5	3	2	3	5	3	3	3	3	41	15
2	South	West Park, Miramar	Provide shared lane arrows (Sharrows) and bicycle lanes	1.70	SW 25th St (from SW 62nd Ave to SW 40th Ave)	\$480,000	1	5	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	5	5	44	13
3	South	West Park, Pembroke Park	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	2.15	Countyline Rd (from SW 68th Ln to SW 48th Ave)	\$3.8 M	5	0	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	3	3	55	6
4	South	Dania Beach, Hollywood	Reconstruct median and modify lane markings to for bicycle keyholes	0.20	Griffin Rd (from SR 7 to SW 44th Ave)	Removed from prioritization process due to finding of insufficient right-of-way to construct project.													N/A
5	South	Davie	Provide shared use path construct a path along the center median of SR-7 between Oakes Rd and the New River Greenway (0.90 MI)	0.90	SR 7 (from Oakes Rd/SW 36th St to New River Greenway Trail)	\$2.2 M	5	5	5	3	1	3	5	3	3	1	1	69	2
6	Central	Lauderdale Lakes	Provide mid-block crossing at the C-13 Greenway Canal Trail	< 0.10	SR 7 at the C-13 Greenway	Removed from prioritization process since project is already programmed for funding (included as #7 in Chapter 4, Table 4-2).													N/A

Project #	Working Group	City	Project Description	Length (mi)	On Street (to/from)	Total Project Cost	A - Roadway	B - Pedestrian	C - Bicycle	D - Transit Demand	E - Density	F - Critical Link	G - Safety	H - EJ	I - ROW	J - Infrastructure	K - Community & Stakeholders	Total Score	Project Rank (of 22)
7	Central	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	Eliminate 3rd eastbound lane to NW 38th Ave and widening pavement from NW 38th to NW 31st to provide bicycle lanes	1.00	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 31st Ave)	\$2.1 1M	1	5	5	3	2	5	5	3	1	1	3	34	18
8	Central	Lauderhill	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	0.55	NW 16th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	\$974,000	1	0	5	3	2	5	5	5	5	3	3	37	17
9	Central	Lauderhill	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	0.60	NW 19th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	\$1.06 M	3	0	5	3	2	3	5	5	5	3	3	45	11
10	Central	Lauderhill, Lauderdale Lakes	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	0.87	NW 26th St (from NW 49th Ave to SR 7)	\$1.4 M	3	0	5	3	2	5	5	5	3	3	3	45	11
11	Central	Lauderhill, Plantation	Continue trail to NW 31st Ave and enhance SR 7 crossing	1.10	Sunrise Blvd Canal (from SR 7 to SW 31st Ave)	\$615,000	5	0	0	3	2	5	3	5	3	3	3	28	21
12	North	Margate	Provide 12' sidewalks	1.60	SR 7 (from Seton Dr to NW 31st St)	\$320,000	5	0	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	5	5	59	3
13	North	Margate	Provide protected bicycle lane with landscaped buffer (Alt 3)	0.40	SR 7 (from Merrill Rd to Seton Dr)	\$600,000	5	0	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	5	5	59	3
14	North	Margate, Coconut Creek	Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	1.00	Copans Rd (from SR 7 to Lyons Rd)	\$2.6 M	5	0	5	3	2	5	5	3	3	3	3	53	8

Project #	Working Group	City	Project Description	Length (mi)	On Street (to/from)	Total Project Cost	A - Roadway	B - Pedestrian	C - Bicycle	D - Transit Demand	E - Density	F - Critical Link	G - Safety	H - EJ	I - ROW	J - Infrastructure	K - Community & Stakeholders	Total Score	Project Rank (of 22)
15	North	Margate	Widen pavement to provide bicycle lanes	0.40	Coconut Creek Pkwy (from SR 7 to Banks Rd)	Removed from prioritization process as subsequent field review identified existing bicycle lanes within this section.													N/A
16	North	North Lauderdale	Road diet to provide bicycle lanes; potential roundabout at SW 64th	2.10	Kimberly Blvd (from SW 81st Ave to SR 7)	\$3.7 M	3	0	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	5	5	49	9
17	North	Margate	Widen pavement for bicycle lanes or shared lane arrows and widen sidewalks	0.75	SW 11th St (from SR 7 to SW 49th Ter)	\$1.1 M	1	0	5	3	1	3	5	3	3	3	3	28	21
18	Central	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	Widen pavement to provide bicycle lanes	1.00	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 31st Ave)	Removed from prioritization process as this project is a duplicate to Project #7.													N/A
19	North	Margate	Mid-block crossing with pedestrian hybrid beacon for multi-use trail and wide sidewalks	0.10	SR 7 at Cypress Creek Greenway/C-14 Canal	\$150,000	5	5	5	3	1	5	3	5	5	3	5	79	1
20	South	Davie	Construct sidewalk on east side of SR 7, sidewalk exists on west	0.65	SR 7 (from SW 45th St to Oakes Rd/SW 36th St)	\$330,000	5	3	0	3	1	5	5	3	5	3	3	42	14
21	South	Davie	Construct wide sidewalk along north side of road	0.45	SW 45th St (from the Turnpike to SR 7)	\$268,000	1	5	5	3	2	3	0	3	1	5	3	31	20
22	South	Miramar	Complete gaps to provide sidewalk on north side (1/4 mile)	0.50	SW 25th St (from SW 64th Ave to SR 7)	\$350,000	1	5	5	1	2	5	0	5	5	3	3	33	19

Project #	Working Group	City	Project Description	Length (mi)	On Street (to/from)	Total Project Cost	A - Roadway	B - Pedestrian	C - Bicycle	D - Transit Demand	E - Density	F - Critical Link	G - Safety	H - EJ	I - ROW	J - Infrastructure	K - Community & Stakeholders	Total Score	Project Rank (of 22)
23	South	West Park	Delineate sidewalk from paved parking along north side	0.13	Hallandale Beach Blvd (from Edmund Rd to SW 58th Ave)	\$50,000	5	3	0	3	2	5	3	5	5	5	5	49	9
24	South	Miramar	Complete sidewalk along north side of road	0.25	SW 33rd St (from SW 62nd Ave to SR 7)	\$120,000	1	5	5	3	2	3	5	5	5	3	3	40	16
25	North, Central	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	Complete sidewalk along south side of road	0.25	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 36th Ave)	\$170,000	3	5	5	3	1	3	5	5	3	3	3	55	6
26	Central	Plantation	Provide pedestrian hybrid beacon, median modifications, and bus stop relocation	0.10	SR 7 (north of Broward Boulevard)	\$250,000	5	0	5	3	2	5	3	5	5	3	5	57	5
26A	North	North Lauderdale	Sidewalk on north side connects to SR 7 via Blvd of Champions	0.11	W McNab Rd (from SW 66th Ave to SR 7)	Removed from prioritization process as there is insufficient right-of-way to construct this project and construction would result in significant impacts to existing utilities and driveway access points.													N/A
27	North, Central	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale, Broward County	Sidewalk on south side; connects to SR 7 via ramp sidewalk	0.70	W McNab Rd/NW 62nd St (from NW 35th Ave to SR 7)	Removed from prioritization process as subsequent field review identified an existing concrete sidewalk as recommended.													N/A

Table 5-3: Summary of Network Connectivity Projects by Project Ranking

Project Description	On Street (From/To)	City	Project Length (mi)	Total Score	Project Rank
Priority Tier 2-1 Projects (55+ points):					
Project #19: Mid-block crossing with pedestrian hybrid beacon for multi-use trail and wide sidewalks	SR 7 at Cypress Creek Greenway/C-14 Canal	Margate	0.10	79	1
Project #5: Construct a path along the center median of SR 7 between Oakes Rd and the New River Greenway	SR 7 (from Oakes Rd/SW 36th St to New River Greenway Trail)	Davie	0.90	69	2
Project #12: Provide 12' sidewalks	SR 7 (from Seton Dr to NW 31st St)	Margate	1.60	59	3
Project #13: Provide protected bicycle lane with landscaped buffer	SR 7 (from Merrill Rd to Seton Dr)	Margate	0.40	59	3
Project #26: Provide mid-block pedestrian hybrid beacon, median modifications, and bus stop relocation	SR 7 (north of Broward Boulevard)	Plantation	0.10	57	5
Project #3: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	Countyline Rd (from SW 68th Ln to SW 48th Ave)	West Park, Pembroke Park	2.15	55	6
Project #25: Complete sidewalk along south side of road	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 36th Ave)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	0.25	55	6

Project Description	On Street (From/To)	City	Project Length (mi)	Total Score	Project Rank
Priority Tier 2-2 Projects (40-54 points):					
Project #14: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	Copans Rd (from SR 7 to Lyons Rd)	Margate, Coconut Creek	1.00	53	8
Project #16: Road diet to provide bicycle lanes; potential roundabout at SW 64th	Kimberly Blvd (from SW 81st Ave to SR 7)	North Lauderdale	2.10	49	9
Project #23: Delineate sidewalk from paved parking along north side of road	Hallandale Beach Blvd (from Edmund Rd to SW 58th Ave)	West Park	0.13	49	9
Project #9: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	NW 19th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill	0.60	45	11
Project #10: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	NW 26th St (from NW 49th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill, Lauderdale Lakes	0.87	45	11
Project #2: Provide shared lane arrows and bicycle lanes	SW 25th St (from SW 62nd Ave to SW 40th Ave)	West Park, Miramar	1.70	44	13
Project #20: Construct sidewalk on east side of SR 7, sidewalk exists on west	SR 7 (from SW 45th St to Oakes Rd/SW 36th St)	Davie	0.65	42	14
Project #1: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	Taft St (from SR 7 to N 40th Ave)	Hollywood	1.50	41	15
Project #24: Complete sidewalk along north side of road	SW 33rd St (from SW 62nd Ave to SR 7)	Miramar	0.25	40	16



Project Description	On Street (From/To)	City	Project Length (mi)	Total Score	Project Rank
Priority Tier 2-3 Projects (<40 points):					
Project #8: Widen pavement and reduce lane widths (if possible) to provide bicycle lanes	NW 16th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill	0.55	37	17
Project #7: Eliminate 3rd eastbound lane to NW 38th Ave and widening pavement from NW 38th to NW 31st to provide bicycle lanes	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 31st Ave)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	1.00	34	18
Project #22: Complete gaps to provide sidewalk on north side	SW 25th St (from SW 64th Ave to SR 7)	Miramar	0.50	33	19
Project #21: Construct wide sidewalk along north side of road	SW 45th St (from the Turnpike to SR 7)	Davie	0.45	31	20
Project #11: Continue trail to NW 31st Ave and enhance SR 7 crossing	Sunrise Blvd Canal (from SR 7 to SW 31st Ave)	Lauderhill, Plantation	1.10	28	21
Project #17: Widen pavement for bicycle lanes or shared lane arrows and widen sidewalks	SW 11th St (from SR 7 to SW 49th Ter)	Margate	0.75	28	21

Note: In some instances two projects were awarded the same number of points through the prioritization process and received the same project rank; therefore, the subsequent project rank is skipped to recognize the previous tie.

PRIORITY TIER 3: MAJOR INTERSECTION “HOT SPOT” PROJECTS

Because of additional coordination needs, concept development and design, and right-of-way easement/acquisition needs, the Major Intersection “Hot Spot” recommendations will take the longest to implement and therefore fall within the third prioritization tier.

Table 5-4 shows the six locations for which detailed design concepts were developed along with key prioritization measures for each. While additional coordination between the Broward MPO, Broward County Transit, and FDOT is necessary to group and or prioritize within this set of projects, the intersections of SR 7 with Oakland Park Boulevard and with Commercial Boulevard have the greatest need from a safety perspective and also have very high ridership.

Because the Oakland Park Boulevard is already being studied by FDOT for Mobility Hub implementation, and because Commercial Boulevard has a high potential for transit vehicle travel time savings, consideration should be given to developing a “pilot” project at Commercial Boulevard both to test the effectiveness of the bus queue bypass strategies and the operating characteristics and technology requirements of a pedestrian/bus island with near-side queue-jump functionality.

Table 5-4: Major Intersection Concepts Ranking Criteria

Location	City	Total Bus Stop Ridership	Total Pedestrian & Bicycle Crashes	Environ. Assessment (# active sites)	Impact to Bus Travel Time (sec) - AM (PM)			
					NB	SB	EB	WB
Miramar Pkwy/ Hallandale Beach Boulevard	Miramar, West Park	2,655	6	3	-9 (-10)	7 (2)	7 (-5)	13 (-16)
Davie Boulevard	Plantation, Fort Lauderdale, Unincorporated Broward County	1,456	12	0	-12 (-8)	-45 (-33)	-2 (-52)	-37 (-5)
Broward Boulevard	Plantation	2,694	18	0	4 (-3)	3 (-5)	-4 (-1)	-3 (-9)
Oakland Park Boulevard	Lauderdale Lakes	6,160	40	1	-11 (23)	2 (-5)	-6 (0)	-5 (10)
Commercial Boulevard	Tamarac	2,131	27	1	-6 (5)	-7 (1)	-39 (10)	-18 (29)
Atlantic Boulevard	Margate	1,423	18	0	11 (9)	7 (9)	-22 (9)	-3 (1)

SECTION 5.3: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Project specific implementation issues/needs are discussed in Technical Appendix E, which details each individual multimodal network connectivity project and Technical Appendix F, which provides details for each major intersection concept. General implementation considerations for each of the three priority tiers are discussed below.

- > **Priority Tier 1 – Short-Term Systemic Improvements (Less than 5 Years)**
 - Coordinate with FDOT Traffic Operations to develop push-button task work orders for implementation of countdown signal, sign, and pavement marking improvements.
 - Contact the FDOT SR 7 Widening Project Construction Project Manager to request signalized intersection lighting upgrades consistent with PPM Chapter 7.3.2.2 be incorporated in the ongoing project(s).
 - Coordinate with FDOT Safety Office to prioritize Highway Safety Improvement Program or other funds and develop scopes for upgrades to signalized intersection lighting outside of the ongoing widening project(s).
 - Facilitate discussion between FDOT and communities along SR 7 to allow communities to pay for the incremental costs of lighting that uses community decorative lighting standards.
- > **Priority Tier 2 – Mid-Term Network Connectivity Projects (5 to 10 Years):**
 - Provide project priorities to FDOT Office of Work Program to allocate funding
 - Participate in project scoping process.
 - Participate in local public engagement process to vet projects with each community and secure resolutions of support from subject city commissions.

- > **Priority Tier 3 – Longer-Term Hot Spot Intersection Improvements (Greater than 5 Years):**
 - Conduct follow-up discussion with BCT, Broward County Traffic Engineering, and FDOT to develop detailed concept of operations for each major intersection improvement concept.
 - Establish a Memorandum of Understanding or other similar agreement between Broward County, the Broward MPO, and FDOT to implement one or more sites as a pilot project.
 - Complete necessary design, right-of-way, and construction phases.
 - Evaluate pilot site performance and adjust other intersection concepts accordingly.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FUNDING OPTIONS

This section documents the implementation plan outlining the schedule and costs of delivering the Priority Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 projects and improvements previously developed through this study.

Funding Options Available to Deliver Priority Tier 2 Projects

The Broward MPO's Complete Streets and other Localized Initiatives Grant Program (CSLIP) provides funding for small local transportation projects that will improve the safety and mobility for all transportation users in Broward County. CSLIP funds are comprised of federal Transportation Management Area (TMA) and Transportation Alternatives Urban Area (TALU) funds. Over the 22-year term of Commitment 2040, FDOT estimates CSLIP will maintain a budget of \$571.6 million.

All urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000 are designated as a TMA. Over the 22-year term of Commitment 2040, FDOT estimates that the Broward MPO will be provided \$520.5 million in TMA funding. All estimated TMA funding may be used for 'off-system' local government roads.

Reauthorization for federal surface transportation funding signed into law in 2012, known as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), established Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds to provide for a variety of alternative transportation projects, including many that were previously eligible under separate programs. The TALU program is one of two programs within the TAP. Over the 22-year term of Commitment 2040, FDOT estimates that the Broward MPO will be provided \$51.2 million in TALU funds. Eligible uses of the TALU funds include:

- > Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation.
- > Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.
- > Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users.
- > Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
- > Community improvement activities, including:
 - Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
 - Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
 - Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
 - Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under 23 USC.
- > Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to:
 - Address storm water management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff; and
 - Reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.

Funding Options Available to Deliver Priority Tier 3 Improvements

The Transit program provides technical and operating/capital assistance to transit, paratransit, and ridesharing systems. Over the 22-year term of Commitment 2040, FDOT estimates that the Broward MPO will be provided \$819.6 million in Transit program funding to deliver regionally significant transit projects throughout Broward County. The Broward MPO combined these funds with the Other Arterial Construction & ROW funds to provide for the best mix of transportation investments for a total Transit program budget of \$840.4 million. Eligible uses of Transit program funds include:

- > Capital and operating assistance to public transit systems and Community Transportation Coordinators (CTC), through the Public Transit Block Grant Program.
- > Service Development projects, which are special projects that can receive initial funding from the state, including:

- Up to 50% of the net project cost can be provided by the state;
 - Up to 100% can be provided for projects of statewide significance (requires FDOT concurrence); and
 - Eligible costs include operating and maintenance costs (limited to no more than three years) and marketing and technology projects (limited to no more than two years).
- > Transit corridor projects that are shown to be the most cost effective method of relieving congesting and improving congestion in the corridor.
 - > Commuter assistance programs that encourage transportation demand management strategies, ridesharing and public-private partnerships to provide services and systems designed to increase vehicle occupancy.
 - > Assistance with acquisition, construction, promotion and monitoring of park-and-ride lots.
 - > Assistance to fixed-guideway rail transit systems or extensions, or bus rapid transit systems operating primarily on dedicated transit right-of-way under the federal New Starts Transit Program.

IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING PLAN

Commitment 2040 includes CSLIP dollars averaging \$142.9 million (in year of expenditure-YOE) per time period available for Priority Tier 2 projects and \$386.2 million in YOE of Transit program funding in the 2031-2040 time period available for Priority Tier 3 improvements.

Table 5-5 presents a preferred Funding Plan to implement all proposed projects and improvements well under the estimates documented in Commitment 2040. This implementation plan assumes for two successful CSLIP applications per year to fund Priority Tier 2 projects from highest to lowest ranking.

Table 5-5: Preferred Funding Plan

Project ID	Priority	On Street (From/To)	City	Funding Source	Cost (2016 \$) ⁽¹⁾	Implementation Period (YOE \$) ⁽²⁾			Total
						2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2040	
Priority Tier 1 Projects⁽³⁾									
n/a	n/a	SR 7 (corridor-wide)	N/A	Non-SIS DDR	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000
Priority Tier 2 Projects⁽⁴⁾									
19	1	SR 7 at Cypress Creek Greenway/C-14 Canal	Margate	CSLIP	\$ 150,000	\$ 395,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 395,000
5	2	SR 7 (from Oakes Rd/SW 36th St to New River Greenway Trail)	Davie	CSLIP	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 3,242,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,242,000
12	3	SR 7 (from Seton Dr to NW 31st St)	Margate	CSLIP	\$ 320,000	\$ 488,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 488,000
13	3	SR 7 (from Merrill Rd to Seton Dr)	Margate	CSLIP	\$ 600,000	\$ 913,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 913,000
26	5	SR 7 (north of Broward Boulevard)	Plantation	CSLIP	\$ 250,000	\$ 393,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 393,000
3	6	Countyline Rd (from SW 68th Ln to SW 48th Ave)	West Park, Pembroke Park	CSLIP	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 5,976,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,976,000
25	6	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 36th Ave)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	CSLIP	\$ 170,000	\$ 276,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 276,000
14	8	Copans Rd (from SR 7 to Lyons Rd)	Margate, Coconut Creek	CSLIP	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 4,224,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,224,000
16	9	Kimberly Blvd (from SW 81st Ave to SR 7)	North Lauderdale	CSLIP	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 324,000	\$ 1,522,000	\$ -	\$ 1,846,000
23	9	Hallandale Beach Blvd (from Edmund Rd to SW 58th Ave)	West Park	CSLIP	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 235,000	\$ -	\$ 285,000
9	11	NW 19th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill	CSLIP	\$ 1,060,000	\$ 312,000	\$ 1,467,000	\$ -	\$ 1,779,000
10	11	NW 26th St (from NW 49th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill, Lauderdale Lakes	CSLIP	\$ 1,400,000	\$ -	\$ 2,427,000	\$ -	\$ 2,427,000
2	13	SW 25th St (from SW 62nd Ave to SW 40th Ave)	West Park, Miramar	CSLIP	\$ 480,000	\$ -	\$ 832,000	\$ -	\$ 832,000
20	14	SR 7 (from SW 45th St to Oakes Rd/SW 36th St)	Davie	CSLIP	\$ 333,000	\$ -	\$ 627,000	\$ -	\$ 627,000
1	15	Taft St (from SR 7 to N 40th Ave)	Hollywood	CSLIP	\$ 2,200,000	\$ -	\$ 3,940,000	\$ -	\$ 3,940,000
24	16	SW 33rd St (from SW 62nd Ave to SR 7)	Miramar	CSLIP	\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ 462,000	\$ -	\$ 462,000
8	17	NW 16th St (from NW 47th Ave to SR 7)	Lauderhill	CSLIP	\$ 974,000	\$ -	\$ 1,801,000	\$ -	\$ 1,801,000
7	18	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 31st Ave)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	CSLIP	\$ 2,100,000	\$ -	\$ 4,013,000	\$ -	\$ 4,013,000
22	19	SW 25th St (from SW 64th Ave to SR 7)	Miramar	CSLIP	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$ 229,000	\$ -	\$ 229,000
21	20	SW 45th St (from the Turnpike to SR 7)	Davie	CSLIP	\$ 268,000	\$ -	\$ 17,000	\$ 81,000	\$ 98,000
11	21	Sunrise Blvd Canal (from SR 7 to SW 31st Ave)	Lauderhill, Plantation	CSLIP	\$ 615,000	\$ -	\$ 213,000	\$ 1,001,000	\$ 1,214,000
17	21	SW 11th St (from SR 7 to SW 49th Ter)	Margate	CSLIP	\$ 1,100,000	\$ -	\$ 52,000	\$ 244,000	\$ 296,000
4	N/A	Griffin Rd (from SR 7 to SW 44th Ave)	Dania Beach, Hollywood	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
6	N/A	SR 7 at the C-13 Greenway	Lauderdale Lakes	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
15	N/A	Coconut Creek Pkwy (from SR 7 to Banks Rd)	Margate	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
18	N/A	W Prospect Rd (from SR 7 to NW 31st Ave)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
26A	N/A	W McNab Rd (from SW 66th Ave to SR 7)	North Lauderdale	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
27	N/A	W McNab Rd/NW 62nd St (from NW 35th Ave to SR 7)	Fort Lauderdale, North Lauderdale, Broward County	Project deemed infeasible prior to project prioritization process.					
Subtotal - Priority Tier 2 Projects						\$ 16,593,000	\$ 17,837,000	\$ 1,326,000	\$ 35,756,000

Project ID	Priority	On Street (From/To)	City	Funding Source	Cost (2016 \$) ⁽¹⁾	Implementation Period (YOE \$) ⁽²⁾			Total
						2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2040	
Priority Tier 3 Projects									
n/a	n/a	Broward Boulevard	Plantation	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 261,000	\$ 77,000	\$ 361,000	\$ -	\$ 438,000
n/a	n/a	Commercial Boulevard	Tamarac	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 302,000	\$ 89,000	\$ 418,000	\$ -	\$ 507,000
n/a	n/a	Atlantic Boulevard	Margate	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 316,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 437,000	\$ -	\$ 530,000
n/a	n/a	Oakland Park Boulevard	Lauderdale Lakes	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 268,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000	\$ -	\$ 465,000
n/a	n/a	Miramar Parkway / Hallandale Beach Boulevard	Miramar, West Park	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 296,000	\$ -	\$ 513,000	\$ -	\$ 513,000
n/a	n/a	Davie Boulevard	Plantation, Fort Lauderdale, Broward County	Regionally Significant Transit Project	\$ 312,000	\$ -	\$ 541,000	\$ -	\$ 541,000
Subtotal - Priority Tier 3 Projects						\$ 259,000	\$ 2,735,000	\$ -	\$ 2,994,000

- Notes:
- (1) Source: Table 5-2
 - (2) Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars are dollars that are adjusted for inflation from the present time to the expected year of construction. By using YOE dollars, this ensures that the more accurate cost estimates are used in planning, programming and implementation of the project. An annual inflation rate of 3.3% is used to adjust the 2016 costs to YOE costs.
 - (3) Funding source for Priority Tier 1 improvements is assumed to FDOT District Dedicated Revenue (DDR) for non-Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) facilities programmed within 2017-21 TIP, FM No. 4385181.
 - (4) Assumes two successful CSLIP applications per year from highest to lowest ranking.

Applying for CSLIP Funding

Each year, the Broward MPO administers a programmatic process to assist with funding qualifying non-regionally significant projects using CSLIP funds. To participate, applicants must complete an application, which will be evaluated for eligibility and ranked along with other applicants for program funding.

Before submitting an application, an applicant should:

- > Create an account with Broward MPO. Upon the submittal of a web-based Account Form, applicants will be provided via email a unique identification number that will be used to track and reference submitted application(s); and,
- > Produce project documents. A web-based Application Form requires applicants to upload a variety of required and supplemental documents, including:
 - Required project information:
 - Map of project location;
 - Page(s) from plan or program that references the project;
 - Meeting minutes, reports, and/or public workshop results demonstrating public support for the project; and
 - FDOT Cost Estimate Form.
 - Required resolutions from governing boards:
 - Project approval;
 - Project approval from owner of right-of-way where the project is proposed approving the project (applicable only if applicant does not have ownership or property rights); and
 - Commitment to fund the project's operation and maintenance (O&M).
 - Supplemental information (not required):
 - Cross-section of the project;
 - If applicable, page(s) from Broward MPO endorsed corridor study where the project is referenced; and
 - Supporting data and/or technical analyses that supports the purpose and need.

Program Training and Participation

The Broward MPO holds an annual CSLIP training workshop. This educational outreach event informs local agencies, specifically individuals selected as their authorized representatives, on how to create an account and submit an application.