



## Project Management Team Meeting – Summary

### Pompano Education Corridor Transit Study

*City of Coral Springs, Development Services Building – 2730 University Drive*

**Thursday, July 23, 2015 @ 9:30 a.m.**

Attendees: Paul Carpenter (City of Coral Springs), Maggie Barszewski (City of Pompano Beach), Odalys Delgado (HNTB), Matt Vinke (HNTB), Oliver Rodrigues (FTE), Paul Calvaresi (Broward MPO), Jessica Dimmick (Renaissance Planning), Sheila Rose (City of Coconut Creek), Jim Hickey (City of Coral Springs)

#### Greetings and Introductions

- There was general discussion regarding the end result of the study. Sheila Rose and Jim Hickey discussed that funding and administration strategies should include:
  - BCT- could have them run the service or adjust their service to provide route needs
  - FDOT TSDP Grants-to operate the new route. However, these are only for operations and cities would have to find funding after that.
  - Implementation of a TMA that would run the corridor service
    - There could be one commissioner from each municipality on the TMA Board in order to better coordinate planning efforts, which also includes funding arrangements
  - If it were possible for the MPO to administer the service, which is not completely out of the question.
  - Creation of a TIF or BID that would overlay the study corridor. This would provide funding for operations
  - Having a “lead city” procure and administer the service
    - None of the cities would want to be the lead, nor think having a lead city would work
  - Having Broward College as a future (funding) partner for this proposed service
    - Similar to other colleges, a transit/transportation fee could be assessed to each student as a part of the tuition fees, which could be used to fund some of the O&M costs of the proposed service
  - Funding from a future County penny sales tax



- Paul recommended that the representatives from each of the cities confer with the current “administrator / manager” of their respective community bus programs

- All of these strategies will be documented in the next technical memorandum and can be used by the cities to lobby for funding.

## Presentation

- Oliver presented some of the information that is included in Tech Memo 2 – Existing Transportation Conditions and System Opportunities
  - Oliver mentioned that Sample Rd has paved shoulders, which are good enough for bikes.
    - Sheila mentioned that Sample Rd is not a safe road for bicyclists despite having “adequate bicycle facilities”. She referenced FDOT’s new standard for bicycle facilities along State-owned facilities – 7’ protected bike lanes. She encouraged that our recommendation include 7’ protected bike lanes for Sample Rd, or at least supportive ‘commentary’
  - Oliver also recommended enhanced crosswalk improvements at 85<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Sample Rd
    - This improvement is already programmed
  - Oliver mentioned that bicycle lanes should be provided along Coconut Creek Parkway between SR 7 and Banks Rd as well as between Broward College and the Florida Turnpike
    - The segment between SR 7 and Banks Rd is already programmed and scheduled for construction soon.
    - Paul urged Oliver contact Peter Gies at the Broward MPO to coordinate with the latest complete streets improvements program and to vet these recommendations as well
    - Sheila mentioned that Coconut Creek’s CIP includes another mid-block crossing along Coconut Creek Parkway
  - Oliver then recommended a full built-out reconstruction of MLK, Jr. Blvd between the Florida Turnpike and Powerline Rd because there are no existing sidewalks or bike lanes
    - This would include drainage construction, etc. which would increase the cost per mile
  - Oliver recommended bike lanes throughout MLK, Jr. Blvd from the Florida Turnpike to Dixie Highway, although the segment between I-95 and Dixie Highway (where the speed limit drops to 25 mph), he recommends a sharrow treatment due to the low travel speeds



- There was some resistance from the PMT regarding the sharrow treatment, with Paul mentioning the pushback the MPO has towards implementing sharrows, unless there is a road diet within this segment.
  - Sheila and others would like to see the protected bike lanes throughout the entire corridor.
  - Oliver will follow up with Peter at the MPO and vet this concept further
- 
- Oliver listed some of the recommended transit improvements, which mostly consisted of adding benches to stops that do not currently have benches
    - Jim questioned why shelters were not recommended, to which Oliver responded by saying the ridership at these stops do not justify a shelter according to BCT's standards for providing shelters (minimum average of 100 daily boardings)
  - Oliver briefly went over the evaluation criteria that will be used to evaluate and ultimately select the preferred service alignment
  - There was a brief discussion regarding how the service could be phased in, both in terms of service and operations, but also for route alignment
    - The phasing scenario would be helpful to the one-transfer alignment if selected
- 
- Matt and Odalys presented some of the information that is included in Tech Memo 3 – Transit Service Plans with Capital and O&M Costs
    - Matt presented three different service planning scenarios and associated annual O&M cost savings
    - Matt briefly described the various no-transfer and one-transfer alternative alignments, the major differences between them, and the pros and cons when deciding between either the one-transfer and the no-transfer alternatives
    - Proposed stop locations and the methodology for selecting stop locations were presented to the PMT.
    - The estimated travel times for each alignment were presented, which stated the fastest roundtrip time for any of the alignments was 108 minutes (includes dwell time).
      - The most direct route (minimal circulation in the various downtown areas) had a roundtrip time of 65 minutes (not including dwell time)



- Jim questioned how much spacing between stops is actually needed – which is merely a function of the overall purpose of the service and the expectations for passengers accessing the stops (minimum distance required to walk to stop – ¼ or ½ mile?). There is also a cost implication associated with stop spacing / the number of stops required
- The TRIPS program was presented along with the vehicle options, costs, and characteristics
- The annual O&M costs and number of required vehicles for each of the alignment alternatives and for each service planning scenario was presented to the PMT.
  - The cheapest possible alternative has an annual O&M of \$1.14 million and would require 6 vehicles. The most expensive has an annual O&M of \$3.67 million and would require 18 vehicles.
  
- For comparison purposes, all the existing routes (12) for the four municipalities combined O&M is roughly \$1.4.
- Estimated infrastructure costs for transit stop improvements, sidewalk improvements, and bike lanes were presented.
  - Depending on the specific treatment for MLK, Jr. Blvd (sharrows vs. no sharrows), these estimated costs could change
- Jessica then quickly summarized the public involvement efforts to date, which mainly consisted of the survey and the responses collected so far
  - Only 14 surveys received so far, some of which are not completely filled in – such as missing home address information
  - Starting to see a pattern in terms of opinions and concerns with the existing transit services
  - There was a discussion as to how to better market the survey and garner more responses
    - Jessica reached out to each of the cities to get a final push to get the survey on their respective websites
    - She also mentioned the possibility of coordinating with the various educational institutions during their student orientations prior to school starting again
      - This would be a great opportunity to get that final push of respondents before wrapping up the survey.



- Will need to coordinate with the schools to organize this effort. Perhaps schools could somehow require or incentivize students to take this survey as a part of the orientation process
- Jessica then talked about the approach being considered for the land use analysis task
  - Originally, the plan was to use the 'TOD-readiness' tool to assess the existing land use within the corridor – which analyzes land use from an economic development perspective. This tool is really more for premium transit service corridors which this is not. This may not be the best approach.
  - Instead, it may make more sense to address the land use from an accessibility perspective first. Therefore, a transit accessibility index or analysis would be performed first, which would feed into the land use analysis process by recommending policy changes such as revised setback requirements for buildings, etc.
  - The PMT was supportive of this approach and agreed that the accessibility index would be more applicable to the corridor. Sheila mentioned the Sample at SR 7 example of where this approach would highlight actual needs.
- Will vet this with the MPO prior to committing to this approach. Have since received approval from MPO to use this approach
- Jessica then discussed the upcoming public outreach efforts slated for September, including approach, expected results, and other logistics
  - Where should the meetings be held? Broward College? Community Centers?
  - The content of the meeting must be thought out.
    - The number of alternatives presented to the public. The current number (13) is too many. Perhaps limiting it to 2 – 4 alignment options.
    - Electronic preference surveys were mentioned
    - Should not go to the meeting with a selected alignment already, should get input from the public first
    - The meeting could be an open format to allow for a better exchange of info
    - It was decided that one meeting would be in Coconut Creek and would cover Coral Springs as well and one meeting would be in Pompano. Potentially one



meeting could be at the Broward College campus on MLK. Maggie will provide potential locations and availability for the Pompano meeting in late September.

- Sheila discussed the planning efforts that have been underway (and continue) for the Sample Rd / SR 7 interchange, such as the Kimley-Horn study, the MPO's mobility hub efforts, as well as the on-going SR 7 study. She mentioned how big of an obstacle this interchange is to the overall character and vision for the study area.

#### **Next Steps and Next Meeting Date:**

- The August PMT meeting will focus on the content and approach to the public meetings that will be held in September
  - Tech Memos 1 and 2 will be provided to the PMT for their review and input.
  - Will attend and/or prepare information, etc. for the orientations at the various educational institutions, specifically focusing on Broward College and Atlantic Technical Center. Will reach out to the local high schools to potentially coordinate with their orientation process.
  - Will be beginning to prepare for the September meeting
- The next meeting (August 27) will be hosted by Coconut Creek