BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZENS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 24, 2018, 6:00 p.m.
100 West Cypress Creek Road,
6th Floor, Suite 650
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309-2181

Present
Chair: John Rude, City of Fort Lauderdale
Vice Chair: Cynthia Baker, City of Lauderhill
District 1: Jose Luis Rodriguez, City of Coral Springs
           Bonnie Campbell, City of Tamarac
District 2: Daniel Bogner, City of Deerfield Beach
           Gregory Gayle, City of Coconut Creek
District 3: [Chair Rude]
           [Vice Chair Baker]
           Ralph Caraglia, City of Oakland Park
District 4: Monique Damiano, City of Hollywood
District 5: Tomy Jacob, City of Miramar
           Paul Girello, City of Pembroke Pines
           Byron Jaffe, City of Weston
Marissa Aquino, Children’s Services Council
Rafael Borrero, Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Patience Cohn, Marine Industries Association of South Florida
Dave Fletcher, Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Nadia Locke, Smart Growth Partnership
John Michael Perez, Rotary Club
Ken Reinhardt, AARP
Susan Robbins, Broward County Board of County Commissioners
Michael Smith, Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Doris Span, Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Anthony Vomero, Florida Department of Health

Others Present
Michael Ronskvitz, Broward MPO Chief of Staff
Conor Campobasso, David Clark, James Cromar, Bill Cross, Carl Ema, Paul Flavien, Peter Gies, Ricardo Gutierrez and Lydia Waring, MPO Staff
Bill Ball, Tindale Oliver
Stewart Robertson, Kimley-Horn and Associates
Michael Mitchel, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

A meeting of the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizens’ Advisory Committee was held at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, in Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Board Room at 100 West Cypress Creek Road, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.
REGULAR ITEMS

1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Recognition of Quorum

Chair Rude called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the Committee members introduced themselves. It was noted a quorum was present.

2. Approval of Minutes – November 15, 2017

Motion made by Mr. Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Baker, to approve. In a voice vote, the motion passed 21-0.

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Vice Chair Baker, seconded by Mr. Girello, to approve. In a voice vote, the motion passed 21-0.

4. Public Comments

None.

Mr. Ronskavitz stated that at the recent MPO Board Annual Retreat, the MPO Board reconfirmed the organization’s Strategic Business Plan and vision and mission statements. The Board also discussed the roles played by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC), whose members are expected to report back to their appointing authorities or elected officials. He advised that MPO Staff will reach out to these entities and/or city managers to re-confirm members’ appointments to these Committees.

ACTION ITEMS

1. MOTION TO RECOMMEND BROWARD MPO APPROVE a Target of Zero for the Federally Mandated Safety Performance Measures

Paul Flavien of MPO Staff recalled that Staff has previously presented an overview of federally mandated performance measures to the CAC. The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act directs the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) to begin implementing these measures in coordination with states and MPOs. The measures have been established, and the states and MPOs are now asked to set targets for these measures.

The first performance target required addresses safety. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) established their targets in summer 2017, and MPOs are asked to
set their own targets by February 27, 2018. These performance measures will be incorporated into all of the MPO’s core products and functions, including the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) (formerly known as the Long Range Transportation Plan [LRTP]), Multimodal Priorities List (MMPL), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and other products.

The MPO was required to establish targets for five performance areas:

- Number of fatalities
- Number of serious injuries
- Rate of fatalities per 100,000,000 vehicle miles traveled
- Rate of serious injuries per 100,000,000 vehicle miles traveled
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

The Broward MPO has coordinated with FDOT to develop a common set of data that both entities will use for reporting. FDOT has adopted a target of zero for all the above performance areas, and the MPO has elected to adopt this same target.

Mr. Borrero asked if the target of zero fatalities is considered a realistic goal, and whether or not there are ramifications to not meeting this target. Mr. Flavien advised that there are no consequences of not meeting this goal at present. He further clarified that adopting a target of zero shows the MPO and state value every life, and their goal is to implement projects that attempt to bring the number of fatalities and serious injuries to zero.

Mr. Smith asked if the rate of fatalities/serious injuries per vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will also apply to rail projects. Mr. Flavien replied that VMT is a multimodal measurement that incorporates all forms of surface transportation. Mr. Smith felt use of this rate would statistically minimize the number of fatalities and injuries. Mr. Flavien explained that the rate is typically used to compare different regions or MPO areas.

Mr. Fletcher asked if benchmarks or standards exist for the last 100 million VMT. Mr. Flavien stated that these figures were provided in the November 2017 presentation and can be sent to the Committee members once more.

Mr. Ronskavitz asserted that the performance targets are part of a new federal mandate. The MPO had the option of adopting the state target of zero fatalities/serious injuries or establishing its own targets; however, because safety is the MPO’s top priority, we chose to adopt the target of zero as well. The organization’s future plans and programs must demonstrate an attempt to progress toward this goal.

Ms. Damiano observed that the target seems to be consistent with the Vision Zero initiative, which is an international movement to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries. She asked if the MPO will track where incidents occur so they can consider what steps should be taken to address safety issues. Mr. Flavien replied that projects will be planned and implemented to alleviate these conditions.
Motion made by Mr. Perez, seconded by Ms. Campbell, to approve. In an electronic vote, the motion passed 21-0.

2. MOTION TO RECOMMEND BROWARD MPO APPROVE the Complete Streets and Other Localized Initiatives Program (CSLIP) Cycle 2 Priority List of Projects, Directing MPO Staff to Work with Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Staff on the Vetting and Programming of Viable Projects

Motion made by Mr. Perez, seconded by Mr. Girello, to approve.

Conor Campobasso of MPO Staff provided an update on the Complete Streets and Other Localized Initiatives Program (CSLIP), which is a funding mechanism used by the MPO to help local partners gain access to federal dollars for smaller transportation and infrastructure projects.

Mr. Campobasso addressed CSLIP Cycle 1, which was recently completed. This cycle funded 18 different projects from eight different agencies/jurisdictions, 13 of which were funded with federal dollars and five of which were funded with state dollars. The first cycle included two separate funding periods, although this is not expected to continue as the Program becomes more formalized. A list of programmed projects is available on the CSLIP web page, and a more detailed funding report can be found in the Broward County Citizens’ Report.

The application process for CSLIP Cycle 2 ended on November 15, 2017. The MPO received 24 applications from 14 different agencies, although one application did not advance due to a lack of information. The ranking process begins with objective criteria determined for CSLIP projects. The second stage is resolution ranking by the applying agency. The final ranking step is policy ranking, which breaks different applications out into funding rounds so no more than one project by an applying entity is funded in each round.

MPO Staff learned the following lessons during the previous application process:

- The application requires further optimization
- Confirmation pages will be more clearly noted
- Application due dates will continue to be in mid-November
- Final documents, including signed resolutions and public outreach, must be submitted with corresponding applications before the deadline

Pending Board approval, CSLIP applications will be vetted by FDOT and MPO Staffs. After preliminary vetting is complete, site visits will occur in spring and summer, followed by one-on-one meetings with applicants to review projects for feasibility and to update cost estimates. CSLIP applications for Cycle 3 will be due November 14, 2018. Mr. Campobasso encouraged potential applications to begin the process, including partner
resolutions, as soon as possible, as the resolution process can be lengthy. All CSLIP updates will be posted to the program’s web page.

In an electronic vote, the motion passed 21-0.

**NON-ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Transportation Planning Guidebook**

Peter Gies of MPO Staff explained that the MPO has recently developed the Transportation Planning Guidebook as a tool for partner agencies. It is intended to serve as a resource to identify, develop, and prioritize transportation projects. The Guidebook takes users through the processes of how to develop a good transportation project and how to develop a transportation plan that prioritizes these projects.

Mr. Gies reviewed the basic steps found in the guidebook for developing a transportation project:

- Identifying the problem or need
- Identifying the data necessary to solve this problem
- Identifying potential solutions to the problem
- Selecting a solution that addresses the problem

Creating a transportation plan means prioritizing a list of projects from a community and vision standpoint to solve the problem.

Both processes end with the development of “program-ready” projects, which mean a project has a scope of work, a cost estimate, collaboration with partners, and a resolution from elected officials in support of the plan. The scope of work should be direct and provide specific details, and cost estimates must be realistic and take all engineering issues into consideration. Partner collaboration means agreement is necessary between agencies and jurisdictions affected by the project. The resolution ensures that public outreach and support from elected officials is provided.

Mr. Smith commented that the Guidebook does not seem to include a comparison of types of transit projects. Mr. Gies replied that the document includes a chapter on how to test assumptions or what happens if assumptions are incorrect. It also includes data resources that can be referred to for purposes of comparison as part of the project development process.

Mr. Reinhardt asked if the Guidebook fully reflects the way the MPO currently does business. Mr. Gies stated that the Guidebook was developed in part because the MPO sometimes receives project proposals that are not fully thought out. The Guidebook is a way to ensure that all member governments and agencies have realistic expectations.
when requesting funds from the MPO. The phases set forth in the Guidebook, from data analysis to public involvement, will help these member governments arrive at a solution that addresses the need they are seeking to meet.

2. **Commitment 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update**

Mr. Gies advised that the MTP, formerly known as the LRTP, provides a 25-year vision for what the future holds in transportation. It considers projects planned for both the near and long terms during this 25-year cycle and ensures there is a plan that is followed to meet transportation needs in the future.

MPO Staff has done some initial work on Commitment 2045, the current MTP, beginning with a public participation plan, as well as preliminary goals and objectives. Key questions to be addressed in the MTP include:

- A shared vision for the future of Broward communities
- How future growth should be addressed
- How to develop a balanced transportation system
- How to integrate effective, efficient, and affordable transit
- How to fund the shared vision for local communities
- What steps must be taken to achieve this vision

One preliminary step is the development of a public participation plan (PPP). Mr. Gies explained that this plan ensures the public is involved from the inception of the Plan and how to best interact with them. He also noted that the TAC serves as the official technical steering committee for the MTP. Next steps in crafting the MTP include outreach to stakeholders and development of a cost-feasible plan.

Bill Ball, representing Tindale Oliver, reviewed the preliminary sources that serve as a starting point for the analysis and planning of the MTP. These include the Strategic Business Plan, federal and state guidance, and the previous LRTP. Committee members may provide additional feedback on the MTP through the end of March 2018.

The MPO’s three key goals are moving people, creating jobs, and strengthening communities. These three themes are reflected in the MTP. Mr. Ball noted that the Freight Transportation Advisory Committee (FTAC) suggested the addition of “and goods” to the first goal. Each goal is tied back to federal guidelines that must be addressed throughout the planning process. A series of objectives have been identified to follow each of these goals.

Mr. Ball also addressed scenario planning, stating that the intent is to put together different scenarios, evaluate what they might look like in the future, and determine what can be learned from these scenarios for the development of the MTP. The scenarios consider factors such as land use, transportation, demographics, and technology, and how they
might affect mobility, resiliency, and accessibility. The following five scenarios are evaluated as part of the planning process:

- Trend or baseline: a scenario that would continue what has been done in the recent past
- Compact development: greater density on selected corridors, hubs, and intersection is considered
- Technology: integration of emerging technologies such as autonomous vehicles and transportation network
- Resiliency: aggressive response to severe weather events and other factors outside the control of the community
- Stakeholder outreach: stakeholders and partners are asked for their local visions and project plans, which are aggregated into a scenario

The intent of scenario planning is to take what can be learned from each of these five scenarios and create a hybrid scenario that offers the best transportation future for Broward County.

The schedule for the MTP includes presentations to advisory committees as well as the MPO Board, followed by additional committee presentations in April 2018 before the Board is asked to adopt the goals, objectives, and scenario concepts in May. These will provide the guiding principles by which the MTP will move forward. The MTP team will continue to update the committees on their progress.

Mr. Gayle asked how quality of life is taken into consideration regarding the MTP. Mr. Ball replied that this is one of the goals and objectives that guides the evaluation of scenarios. A set of performance measures is being developed for each objective to measure the extent to which the objectives are being achieved. The goals and objectives equated with quality of life must be defined before scenarios responding to these goals can be developed.

Mr. Gayle explained that some of the objectives seem contradictory, such as those that want to make improvements but also promote redevelopment. Mr. Ball reiterated that the intent is to arrive at a hybrid scenario that includes aspects of all five planning scenarios. Mr. Gayle pointed out that some recent trends, such as compact or high-density development or aggressive redevelopment, affect quality of life, and may contradict the reason many residents moved to the area. He felt there should be scenarios that rely on quality of life as a driving factor.

Mr. Gies continued that each individual’s definition of “quality of life” will differ. The process will eventually reach a level at which measures are introduced as a third component, along with the goals and objectives, which help judge the performance of each factor. This will allow for the development of a vision of quality of life. He concluded that while the planning factors used by the federal government are very broad, they allow each community to
define its own quality of life. This is another reason why public outreach is vital to the development of the MTP.

Mr. Reinhardt pointed out that a majority of aging residents will want to remain in their homes and communities as long as possible. He stated that this population will form a significant portion of a given community, and planning should reflect their needs accordingly. Mr. Gies replied that this is one reason the objectives emphasize meeting the needs of all system users and strengthening communities for all populations.

Mr. Reinhardt also noted that planning for autonomous vehicles seems to reflect little input from actual prospective users, and that infrastructure changes would be a major factor if these vehicles are widely introduced. Mr. Ball advised that the technology scenario closely examines this and other technologies to determine how it would affect the transportation system over the long term.

Mr. Borrero also expressed concern with emerging technology, pointing out that these improvements might enhance the safety or capacity of roadways. He asked if plans would be sufficiently flexible to take this possibility into consideration. Mr. Ball replied that planning for flexibility is one reason the MPO updates the MTP every five years.

Ms. Locke referred to the scenario pursuing compact development, pointing out that it might also incorporate language referring to smart growth principles, which are intended to improve quality of life. Mr. Gies reiterated that while some scenarios might reflect aggressive pursuit of certain principles, the hybrid scenario is intended to incorporate factors of each individual scenario.

Mr. Ronskavitz advised that the MTP will be presented to the CAC multiple times over the next 12 to 18 months, featuring different elements of the plan and providing follow-up information related to feedback. He emphasized that the MTP does not mean all projects included in the document will be implemented in 2045. Many projects can and will be implemented sooner as long as they are program ready and the correct funding is available. He also pointed out that any project for which the MPO seeks federal funding must be included in the MTP.

3. Complete Streets Master Plan Update

Stewart Robertson of Kimley-Horn and Associates provided an update on the Complete Streets Master Plan. Previous updates addressed overall project goals, the public outreach component, and project development methodology. This methodology identified corridors for future Complete Streets improvements within key areas of the County. These areas were identified on the basis of both need and equity distribution, and are known as Complete Streets “bundle areas.” The corridors comprise the MPO’s transportation network of highways receiving federal aid.
The network also includes “superconnectors,” which are longer projects that connect two or more bundle areas together or connect one bundle area with an existing facility. Since the November 2017 meeting, the currently adopted Work Program has been reviewed to identify already funded projects that are part of the Complete Streets network.

Facility types considered for project recommendations primarily serve both bicycle and pedestrian traffic. These include conventional and buffered bicycle lanes, separated bicycle lanes, intersection traffic control devices, pedestrian lighting and crossings, and “furnishing zones” for sidewalks, which include street trees, bus shelters, and other amenities.

The prioritization process has not only ranked project corridors, but compiled a ranking of facilities and bundle areas. This meant averaging the scores of the individual project components found within the bundle areas.

Mr. Gayle observed that there are some Broward communities that are in need of facilities such as these, and asked if there is a way to encourage these communities to make Complete Streets improvements for their residents. Mr. Ronskavitz replied that the Complete Streets Master Plan considers all of Broward County, regardless of whether certain communities have sought to make improvements on their own. Staff works with representatives of these municipalities to ensure that projects are program-ready and can receive funding.

Mr. Gayle asked if the MPO would reach out to communities in need of Complete Streets improvements. Mr. Ronskavitz stated that MPO Staff met with the majority of Broward municipalities in 2017 to discuss their needs and prospective projects, including local elements that could be funded through programs such as CSLIP. As a follow-up measure, another round of meetings with municipalities is planned as part of the Commitment 2045 process.

Mr. Borrero asked if some cities lack Complete Streets amenities, such as sidewalks, due to lack of demand. Mr. Ronskavitz confirmed this, noting that this is why community outreach and resolutions are important components of any project.

Mr. Perez requested clarification of the dimensions of buffered bicycle lanes. Mr. Robertson replied that the buffer ranges from 2-3 ft. depending upon the maintaining agency. A 5 ft. bicycle lane with a 2-3 ft. buffer is standard.

Mr. Fletcher asked which entity determines what kind of bicycle lane will be used and what criteria are used. Mr. Robertson stated that the maintaining agency, such as FDOT or Broward County, chooses the design of the lane on a particular roadway. The design of buffers or barriers is also important to the maintaining agency to ensure it would create no additional harm to roadway users. Flexible traffic control devices are another type of buffer that provides visual separation, as neither cyclists nor motorists want to hit this barrier;
however, in the event of contact, the collision would be less severe than it would with a fixed object.

Vice Chair Baker suggested that a curb could be safer than a separated lane. Mr. Robertson advised that this concept has not yet been implemented within Broward County, although some streets have been identified that could accommodate a fully separate bicycle lane. He added that data on separated bicycle lanes seems to reflect improved safety, although the lanes do not offer full protection from more dangerous locations for cyclists, such as intersections and driveways.


Mr. Ronskavitz explained that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) serves as the MPO’s two-year business plan and budget. The next UPWP will cover the fiscal years from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020. It identifies planning priorities and how they will be carried out within the metropolitan planning area.

At present, the MPO has issued two requests for feedback: one for the UPWP and one for the MTP. The UPWP contains planning projects, local planning efforts that receive federal funding, staffing and salaries, and feasibility studies, while the MTP and other core products include specific projects. Guidelines for the UPWP are determined by the MPO Program Management Handbook, which is issued by FDOT. This handbook provides a checklist for the creation of UPWP, which must be closely followed.

The draft UPWP will be presented to the TAC and CAC in February, and is due to state and federal agencies by March 15, 2018. Comments from these agencies are returned to the MPO in April, and the revised document is presented to advisory bodies later that month. The MPO must address how and where corrections to the UPWP were made. The final UPWP goes before the MPO Board in May and is submitted to state and federal agencies once more by May 15, 2018 for approval by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The purpose of today’s request is to seek feedback on planning studies and similar efforts from local partners and communities. This feedback is also used to help guide planning efforts, within budget constraints, over the next two years. It also will be used to help the MPO develop a new competitive planning grant program, which will operate in a similar manner to CSLIP.

The first source of federal funding is the FHWA, which provides planning dollars to every MPO based upon population. The Broward MPO receives roughly $1.65 million in FHWA funds each year, an approximation of which is built into the budget. The MPO receives roughly $800,000 in annual FTA funds through the 5305-D program. FTA funds are specific to transit planning efforts. The MPO also receives approximately $3 million each year in Surface Transportation Planning (STP) and $60,000 in Transportation
Disadvantaged (TD) dollars. The final source of federal funding can be FHWA or FTA grants awarded for specific planning efforts, such as the Speak Up Broward program.

The next UPWP will have a new appearance featuring additional graphics and format changes. It will emphasize federally mandated performance measures, as discussed earlier in the meeting. Increased efforts for data collection and analysis will be featured in the UPWP as necessary for the MPO’s planning efforts. The new competitive planning grant program will also be incorporated into the UPWP. More information on this program will be provided over the coming months.

Vice Chair Baker suggested that when studies are undertaken using traffic patterns, potential redevelopers should use data from Broward County roadways rather than nationwide data in determining the appropriate density or intensity for an area. Mr. Ronskavitz explained that scenario analysis, including development patterns, is a necessary part of the MTP in determining how a project affects the transportation network.

Mr. Ronskavitz continued that the MPO works with the Broward County Planning Council with respect to the modeling of traffic impacts and data; the model used for this area is a regional one comprised of data from Broward, Miami-Dade, and Palm Beach Counties. This model, however, is not the only tool used to evaluate the effects of development. Some of the modeling used is beyond the purview of the MPO.

Mr. Rodriguez advised that the primary issue with using local rather than national data is that developers may not be able to take counts at numerous different types of facilities, as this can be expensive and time-consuming.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Member Comments

Mr. Smith noted that Senate Bill (SB) 572 in the Florida Legislature addresses recent fatalities that occurred on rail facilities. He pointed out that the bill seems specifically directed at Brightline. He did not feel it was appropriate for a legislative act to single out a business in this manner, as the bill suggests requirements with which other rail facilities would not have to comply. Mr. Smith concluded that it may be preferable to study the road-rail crossings technology in daily use by other rail systems around the world.

2. 2017 Participation Record

3. Broward MPO Outreach & Events – 2017 in review

4. 2018 Broward MPO Boards and Committee Meeting Dates

5. Posting of the Annual Obligations List of Projects
6. Broward MPO Call for Projects for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) – Commitment 2045

7. The Broward MPO and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) will perform an interim roadway functional class assessment upon request, with special emphasis placed upon public roads not currently eligible for federal aid funds from the Florida Highway Administration (FHWA) for disaster recovery and other purposes. For agencies interested in participating in an interim assessment, please visit: http://browardmpo.org/index.php/federal-functional-classification

8. Safe Streets Summit – February 1-2, 2018


10. The Broward MPO will be hosting an All-Hazards Recovery Training on March 5-6, 2018. For more information, please visit: http://www.browardmpo.org/index.php/current-projects-studies/adapting-to-climate-change

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: FEBRUARY 28, 2018