APPENDIX M – SUMMARIES OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Carter Burgess

Meeting Report

PROJECT: Central Broward Transit Alt. Analysis

PROJECT NO.: 411189 2 2201

PRESENT: See Attachment

DATE: 9/11/02

The first Team Workshop for the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis was held on February 3, 2003, from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM, at the Florida Department of Transportation District IV offices in the New Auditorium. Workshop participants included senior staff from FDOT, Tri-Rail, and Broward County, as well as representatives from the consultant team.

Mr. Scott Seeburger from the Department opened the meeting by discussing the purpose of the day's activities. The main function of the group was defined as acting as the Steering Committee for the course of the study. The plan for this meeting was to give an overview of the project's activities to date, and to conduct an evaluation that would yield the four alignments to be carried into the Tier 1 analysis.

Mr. Joe Yesbeck from the consultant team gave a presentation outlining project activities and issues encountered thus far. He explained that the purpose of the study is to present a sensible transit alternative based on the multiple transit initiatives currently being considered in Central Broward County. Two of the most prominent alternatives that have been studied recently are the I-595/I-95 Master Plan alternative, and the Tri-Rail Long Range Master Plan light rail alignment along Broward and Sunrise Boulevards; therefore these alignments function as the starting point of this analysis. Additionally, several transit technologies are under consideration, including express bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light-Rail Transit (LRT), and Automated Guideway Transit (AGT).

Next, the planned program of public involvement was outlined. Specifically, Technical Advisory and Citizen Advisory committees were formed in order to provide feedback from government agencies, members of the business community, and special interest groups. Additionally, a series of workshops and a public hearing are planned to help facilitate interaction with the general public. Newsletters and project website are also being developed in order to provide regular updates for the project.

Some key issues and concerns regarding public involvement were listed as costs/economic impacts, ridership and travel time, effects on congestion, environmental effects, station locations and types, and transit-land use linkages. Several additional issues were recognized during the discussion as having an impact on public consensus building:

- The potential for transit to encourage development and redevelopment.
- The identification of funding sources for capital and operating expenses.
- The implementation timeframe for building a new transit system.
- The interconnectivity of the system to other existing or planned facilities.
- The analysis of travel demand and identification of transit markets.

The presentation also focused on the topic of the "New Starts" process and the procedure for applying for federal funding. It was discussed that projects with cost-effective characteristics and local matching funds are typically the most competitive in this process. The following points were noted:

- Local governments cannot expect the same level of federal funding as in previous years.
- Because federal money is limited, the process to receive these moneys is extremely competitive.
- Mr. Mike Williams from Tri-Rail indicated that his agency is in the process of compiling a legislative package for authorization. He explained that the specifics of the project were not needed- the purpose is only to have the general project recognized to help facilitate the process in the future.

Additional topics discussed were the overall project schedule, as well as the steps that would follow this study.

Descriptions were then given for the ten boards that were on display around the room. These included:

- An aerial photograph of the study area, including notations of major roads, cities, and activity centers.
- Existing transit services and significant stations, including Broward County Transit (BCT) bus routes, community bus routes, TMAX bus routes (downtown Fort Lauderdale), Tri-Rail alignment and stations, and Tri-Rail station area bus circulators.
- Existing transit studies in the study area, including the I-595 Master Plan, Tri-Rail Long Range Master Plan, I-75 Master Plan, the Airport to Seaport Peoplemover, Broward Intermodal Center, Transit "Bridge" Study, Plantation Central Development District Study, Broward County Mega-Transport Zone, South Florida Education Center Transit Access Study, Regional Activity Center Sub-Area Mobility Study, and the FEC Corridor Study.
- 2025 Congested Roadways Network.
- Population and Employment density by Traffic Analysis Zone.
- Socioeconomic information, including household density by census block-group, low-income households density by census block-group, and minority population density by census tract.
- Broward County Future Land Use Classifications.
- Environmentally Sensitive Lands
- Potential Alignments to be considered for future evaluation.
- Alternative Alignments modeled in SERPM

The presentation continued with an overview of comments received at the scoping meetings. The comments were summarized into seven categories; financing, alignment, technology, land use, property specific, public involvement, and general planning.

Mr. Reed Everett-Lee from the consultant team followed with an assessment of technology types. The assessment looked at several technologies, including bus, light rail, commuter rail, heavy rail, automated guideway transit, and monorail. The criteria used to evaluate these technologies were cost, cost effectiveness, capacity, implementation, and compatibility. The ensuing discussion produced several useful comments:

- One primary technology type that fits the entire corridor is desirable in order to reduce any transfer penalties and maximize connectivity, thus ruling out AGT and monorail, which may be appropriate east of I-95, but not in the west part of the corridor.

- Heavy rail was ruled out due to an analysis of travel demand within the corridor.
- At this stage of the analysis, any cost estimates for alternatives generated by the model are useful mainly for comparative purposes relative to one another.
- It was agreed that speed or travel time should be added to this evaluation.
- The effect that vehicle type, urban design and station location can have on creating a sense of place or community signature.

Mr. Jeff Bruggeman from the consultant team led a discussion about the initial Southeast Regional Planning Model (SERPM) analysis performed thus far. He explained how this first set of model runs included several aggressive assumptions in order to appreciate the potential of the system. These included speeds achievable under a relatively controlled environment, some level of signal priority, and high frequency peak headways at six minutes, which was based on the Miami Metrorail system peak headway. The six modeled alignments and corresponding station locations were displayed:

- I-595 ROW Express Bus
- I-595 ROW HPV-A
- I-595 ROW HPV-B
- Sunrise-Broward HPV
- Sunrise Boulevard HPV
- Griffin Road HPV

Input was received about the alignments as well as the initial ridership estimates:

- Specific connectivity issues (i.e. to other transit systems, activity centers) will be dealt with in the next phase of analysis. The purpose of this level of analysis is to identify the most probable alignments.
- For comparative purposes, the I-595 ROW HPV-B alignment is somewhat skewed because it is actually 2 separate routes, running on the same alignment in the west portion of the corridor, but then splitting to different destinations in the east, thus producing higher ridership estimates.
- Some of the more detailed functions of modeling, such as the impact on other transit services, will be used in later analysis, but not at this point.

Mr. Everett-Lee discussed some of the preliminary cost estimates for the initial alignments for both Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light-Rail Transit (LRT). Questions arose about some of the characteristics of the BRT alternative, and Mr. Everett-Lee described the system as operating in shared-use lanes (not with acquired ROW), with signal priority, and with stations that resembled large modern bus stops with some Information Technology amenities.

Mr. Yesbeck then turned the discussion to the evaluation matrix, with which the alignments could be evaluated in more detail. An initial comment was made regarding the inclusion of the Oakland Park Boulevard as one of the alignments to be evaluated. It was explained that the Oakland Park Boulevard alignment was one of the early possibilities, but that it didn't offer anything markedly different from the other more direct alignments in that area, so the decision was made not to run it through the model. It was necessary, however, to include it one the matrix to ensure that it was not prematurely discarded.

Through the discussion of the matrix criteria, it was determined by the group that a simplified matrix with more qualitative and less quantitative measures would be more appropriate at this stage of the analysis to better address the purpose and need of the study. The revised criteria were listed as:

- Redevelopment/Development Potential
- Destinations Served
- System Connectivity
- Community Disruption
- Commuter Service
- Local Service
- Mode Split
- Local/Agency Support
- Environmental Justice

Mr. Yesbeck explained that function of the matrix is not only to address the purpose and need of the study, but also to narrow down the corridors from more to fewer. A general consensus was reached by the group that both the Oakland Park Boulevard and Griffin Road alignments should be eliminated for both operational and political reasons. Specific rationale behind this decision was based mainly on the outlying location of these alignments relative to the study corridor, and the potential impact that transit on these corridors would have on east-west commuter trips in the central Broward corridor.

Through this discussion of alignments and evaluation measures, a few key issues were identified for further analysis:

- The importance of Sawgrass Mills as an activity center relative to the reduction of peak hour commuter trips on I-595.
- The alternative alignment of SR-7 versus University Drive on the Broward-Sunrise alignment, because this may better serve land uses.
- The cost analysis for BRT should include ROW costs to be more realistic.
- Combining the alignments on I-595 and Sunrise-Broward into a single alternate alignment.
- The political necessity to show reduction in trips on the I-595 corridor.
- The need to illustrate what the corridor will look like in the “do nothing” scenario.

REPORTED BY: Joe Yesbeck

Carter Burgess

Steering Committee Meeting Report

PROJECT: Central Broward Transit Alt. Analysis

PROJECT NO.: 411189 2 2201

PRESENT: Scott Seeburger, FDOT
Nancy Bungo, FDOT
John Krane, FDOT
Paul Lampley, FDOT
Gerry O'Reilly, FDOT
Lloyd Robinson, FDOT
Gus Schmidt, FDOT
Howard Webb, FDOT
Jeff Weidner, FDOT
Beatriz Caicedo-Maddison, FDOT

Mario Aispuro, Broward County MPO
David Anderton, Port Everglades
David Daniels, Broward County Transit
Jennifer Schaufele, Broward County MPO
Stephen Wilson, Broward County Aviation
Enrique Zelaya, Broward County MPO

Alan Danaher, Kittelson & Associates

Joe Yesbeck, Carter & Burgess
Karl Peterson, Carter & Burgess
Reed Everett-Lee, Carter & Burgess
Jill Quigley, Carter & Burgess
Angela Perez, Carter & Burgess

Paul Kissinger, EDSA

DATE: 06/16/03

Mr. Seeburger began the meeting with a review of its purposes: to present the results of the Tier 1 evaluation, typical stations, and prototypical station designs; discussion of modeling issues; presentation of the evaluation criteria; and results of the evaluation.

Mr. Seeburger noted that the project began in July of 2002. During that period the Purpose and Need statement was reviewed by Federal Transit Administration (FTA) staff. The Purpose and Need statement in the Steering Committee packets reflects comments received from FTA staff. Mr. Seeburger gave the schedule for the next meetings:

June 23:	TCC
June 26:	Public Workshop, Plantation High School, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m.
July 10:	Broward County MPO

Mr. O'Reilly requested that the schedule for future meetings of the committee be determined and provided to the group for future scheduling efforts. Mr. Weidner asked for clarification on the date and time of the public workshop.

Mr. Yesbeck pointed out that today's meeting could be seen as a continuation of the February meeting presenting the results of the Initial Corridor Screening. The project has moved from many alternatives to a smaller set of alternatives and after the Tier 1 evaluation will move to even fewer alternatives for Tier 2 analysis. Mr. Yesbeck reminded the committee that an "alternative" consists of an alignment and a transit technology (bus rapid transit, BRT or light rail transit, LRT). For the Tier 1 analysis, there are four alignment alternatives and two transit technologies for each alignment.

Mr. Yesbeck stated out that the consultant team would be seeking input and review from the steering committee on ridership and modeling, financing and other issues. He also suggested that the steering committee meetings should continue on at least a quarterly basis until the conclusion of the project.

Mr. Yesbeck described the key points of the Purpose and Need statement. The Study Area (defined generally by the Intracoastal Waterway on the east, I-75 on the west, Oakland Park Boulevard on the north and Griffin Road on the south) currently contains about one-third of Broward County' population and employment, even though it is less than one-third of the county's area. Projections for 2025 indicate that the study will have approximately one-third of Broward County's population and employment at that time as well.

One of the key purposes of the project is to address the growing congestion on east-west roadways that is a result of the rapid development of the western portion of the county. As shown in the traffic statistics from the I-595/I-95 master plan, I-595 currently exceeds its design capacity. The predominant traffic pattern on I-595 is eastbound in the morning, westbound in the afternoon peak periods.

In order to better understand travel patterns in the study area, TAZs (traffic analysis zones) were aggregated into districts. The distribution of origins and destinations among these districts for home-based, work trips were analyzed, Mr. Yesbeck explained. One of the key findings of this analysis was that four districts (Fort Lauderdale, the Central Business District [CBD], CBD South and Plantation South) attract the majority of work trips that originate within the study area. These same four districts also attract the majority of work trips that originate outside the study area that have a destination within the study area.

There was considerable discussion of this topic. Key questions were raised regarding the apparently low number of work trips going to the airport, why the focus of the analysis was on work trips, and the number of trips going to the South Florida Education Center (SFEC). It was pointed that the analysis focused on work trips because a large majority of trips made on transit are for work purposes. The SFEC and the airport are in the South East Regional Planning Model (SERPM) as "special generators," therefore; the non-work and off-peak trips that these activity areas generate and attract should be accounted for in the next series of model runs for the Tier 2 analysis. There was also some discussion of the number of employees at the airport as reported on their website versus the number of employees identified in the demographic data set used in SERPM.

Mr. Yesbeck briefly discussed the other key purposes of the proposed project: economic development and connectivity. He then reviewed a map depicting all four alignments. Some questions/issues raised during this discussion included:

- Do all of the alignments go to the airport?
    - As currently defined, yes.
- Why isn't there an alignment that follows I-595 all of the way to I-95?
    - The I-595/SR84 alignment was used because of potential 4(f) impacts and neighborhood opposition along I-595 between the interchanges of I-595 with SR84 and I-95.
- Is the alignment between the Fort Lauderdale and the airport on the FEC right-of-way or Andrews Boulevard or US 1?
    - As currently shown, it is on Andrews Boulevard. The alignment could be on the other rights-of-way. As the project proceeds and the alternatives are defined in more detail a single alignment will be recommended.
- There needs to be a decision regarding the eastern end of the study area and how much this study will address downtown circulation.
- Was use of a water-based mode on the Dania Canal/New River considered?
    - During the I-95 master plan/HOV commuter study that mode was considered, but it was dropped due to its low speed.

Mr. Everett-Lee briefly reviewed the typical sections. He pointed out that the typical sections depict an LRT (light rail transit) vehicle in the curb lane of the each typical section (with the exception of I-595) and that the BRT (bus rapid transit) technology would operate in the same way. He also pointed out that for modeling and cost estimating purposes, it was assumed that both BRT and LRT vehicles would share a lane with general purpose traffic. There would be no dedicated lane for transit. Ms. Schaufele inquired if it would be possible to close a travel lane during peak hours to accommodate transit. There was discussion about this issue, which concluded that closing the lane to traffic would cause level of service problems since the peak hours are when vehicles are using the lane as well. Mr. Robinson asked what sharing a lane with vehicular traffic would do to the average travel speed, frequency and ridership. Mr. Everett-Lee responded that this situation would result in slower speeds and longer travel times, negatively impacting ridership.

There was a discussion of the FTA Region IV position that for a BRT project to be eligible for funding, it would have to have a dedicated lane, at a minimum, for some "significant" portion of its alignment. Given that condition, as currently defined, only the BRT alternatives on I-595 are likely to be eligible for New Starts funding. Mr. Zelaya expressed concern regarding the need to clarify FTA's definition of BRT before continuing with the study. After some discussion, Ms. Caicedo-Maddison suggested that the definition of BRT be coordinated with the Transit Bridge project. Mr. Weidner commented that the need for an exclusive lane is circumstantial and would need to be evaluated based on the conditions in the area.

Mr. Everett-Lee clarified that both tracks would be located between the main lines of I-595 and the frontage roads for the proposed I-595 alignments. This impacts the cost calculations as it is assumed that at least 50 percent of a system along I-595 would be elevated to accommodate exit ramps and existing overpasses. Mr. Schmidt pointed out that the County is currently working to widen Sunrise Boulevard between Hiatus and Pine Island, and therefore, the typical section will have to show this additional paving. At this point Mr. Lampley raised the issues of

bike lanes, noise abatement structures and sidewalks. It was agreed that these items should be accounted for in the engineering typical sections. Mr. Yesbeck clarified that the typical sections presented were provided to show the location of the proposed transit system and not to be engineering typical sections.

Mr. Everett-Lee then provided an overview of the station prototypes, pointing out that the BRT and LRT stations on arterial streets are essentially identical with curb-running stations. The only difference between the two is the length of the canopy. Mr. Weidner asked how pedestrians would be able to access the stations on opposite sides of the street. Mr. Everett-Lee responded that the stations would be located at major intersections, allowing pedestrians to cross at signalized intersections, and that the stations would be located on the far side of the intersection. This issue will be more closely considered during the engineering phase of the project. Mr. Robinson asked when joint development of station areas would be considered during the project. Mr. Yesbeck stated that this would occur during the engineering and design phase of the project. Mr. Schmidt commented that right-of-way preservation for bus bays should be considered. Mr. Everett-Lee said that Broward County Transit would be consulted about the issue of bus bays but that, in his opinion, queue-jumping lanes would better serve any bus service since bus bays often make it difficult for the buses to reenter traffic once stopped.

Mr. Kissinger then addressed the station prototypes. He emphasized that these are preliminary designs and that, obviously, the station designs would have to specific to their respective locations and that CPTED principles would be followed. He discussed the need to make the stations, regardless of technology, contribute to sense of place and that the stations can be a catalyst to economic development and re-development. Mr. Aispuro commented that the BRT stations should be designed to also serve light rail transit, in order to plan for future service. There was discussion that it was too soon in the project to be reviewing station prototypes, but Mr. Seeburger clarified that they have been provided to spur discussion about important elements, not to determine their exact design. Mr. O'Reilly expressed concern about the need to look at right-of-way availability and potential acquisition. Mr. Yesbeck responded that this issue would be addressed during the next phase of the analysis. Mr. Everett-Lee pointed out that the cost estimates include a large contingency factor to account for right-of-way. Other issues raised regarding station design included: joint development possibilities, parking garages and pedestrian accessibility, and a graphic that depicts interface with Tri-Rail and Transit Bridge stations. Mr. Everett-Lee asked for input about station location and which stations should have park and ride facilities. Mr. Weidner responded that all the stations along the proposed I-595 alignments should have park and ride facilities.

Ms. Perez presented a brief overview of the major destinations and connections to other transit systems within the study area. Mr. Weidner commented on the connection between the Sunrise-Broward alignments and the Transit Bridge and the absence of the north-south proposed bus rapid transit routes shown on the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Anderton requested that Port Everglades be included on the map as part of the Airport to Seaport Peoplemover.

Ms. Quigley noted that because the alignments are within existing rights-of-way potential for negative impacts to natural environmental resources is minimal for all alternatives. Potential impacts to community resources are addressed through several of the evaluation criteria (those under the Environmental Justice category and the economic development/TOD criterion.

Mr. Yesbeck discussed the project's transportation demand modeling issues, explaining that new ridership projections were not available due to FTA's concerns with SERPM. One of these

concerns is the limited set of transit mode choices. The model currently does not have a transit mode choice that resembles the operating characteristics and speeds of the proposed BRT and LRT technologies. For the project's modeling efforts, an approach will be developed (that will also have to be approved by FTA) to address this mode choice issue. Mr. Robinson asked if a significant change in the projected ridership ranges was anticipated based on these adjustments to the model. Mr. Yesbeck responded that the service frequency would be reduced, as would average travel speed, both of which would affect ridership projections.

Carter & Burgess staff presented the evaluation criteria. Mr. Yesbeck pointed out that the qualitative assessment of the alternatives (rankings and scores) was based on quantitative analysis. He indicated to the steering committee that in both the qualitative evaluations and the quantitative data was provided in their packets distributed prior to the meeting.

Ms. Perez presented the evaluation criteria for mobility, connectivity to major destinations and system connectivity. There was considerable discussion of connectivity issues, particularly regarding the Transit Bridge project. Some members of the steering committee pointed out that the Sunrise-Broward alignment alternatives should receive a score equal to the I-595 alignment alternatives, because it would be logical, and inevitable that a connection would be made between transit service on Sunrise-Broward and the Transit-Bridge project. It was pointed out, that as currently defined, the Transit Bridge project will have a northern terminus near Riverland Road, just north of I-the 595/SR7 interchange. During this discussion, it was also pointed that the station location on the alignment alternatives should the consistent with the "super stations" identified in the Broward County MPO's long-range transportation plan.

Ms. Quigley presented the commuter service and local service evaluation criteria. There was significant discussion regarding how the commuter service criterion differs from the mobility criteria. Mr. Seeburger explained that these criteria were designed to try to distinguish between alignments that might better serve commuters versus local trips.

Ms. Perez discussed the evaluation criteria concerning households, employees, and environmental justice issues. There was some general discussion about how the evaluation criteria utilized in this analysis relate to FTA's criteria.

There was considerable discussion of the economic development/TOD evaluation. A particular issue was the assumption that existing zoning and, in turn, allowable densities would be in place through the horizon year of the project (2025). Mr. Everett-Lee requested input from the Steering Committee regarding the location of stations and other assumptions that could be made regarding economic development potential. Ms. Schaufele suggested that the County's Director of Urban Planning and Redevelopment, Cynthia Chambers, be added to the Steering Committee to address these types of issues.

Mr. Everett-Lee raised financing and funding issues related to the County's ability to fund capital and operating costs for any proposed transit system resulting from this analysis. Ms. Schaufele indicated that the County did not currently have additional funding sources available.

REPORTED BY: Joe Yesbeck

Carter Burgess

Steering Committee Meeting Report

PROJECT: Central Broward Transit Alt. Analysis

PROJECT NO.: 411189 2 2201

PRESENT: Scott Seeburger, FDOT
Nancy Ziegler, FDOT
John Krane, FDOT
Paul Lampley, FDOT
Ann Broadwell, FDOT
Lloyd Robinson, FDOT
Gus Schmidt, FDOT
Giselle Whittington, FDOT
Jeff Weidner, FDOT
Daphne Georgiadis, FDOT
Mario Aispuro, Broward County MPO
David Anderton, Port Everglades
Stephen Wilson, Broward County Aviation
Mike Ronskavitz, Broward County Transit
Kent Rice, Florida's Turnpike
Mike Williams, South Florida RTA/Tri-Rail
John Zegeer, Kittelson & Associates
Joe Yesbeck, Carter & Burgess
Reed Everett-Lee, Carter & Burgess
Jill Quigley, Carter & Burgess
Angela Perez, Carter & Burgess
Paul Kissinger, EDSA

DATE: 02/02/04

The purpose of this meeting was to review the results of the Tier 2 analysis with the steering committee and receive their comments on the recommended alternative.

Scott Seeburger, FDOT Project Manager, began the meeting with introductions and updated the committee on the events related to the project since the prior meeting. Joe Yesbeck, Carter & Burgess Project Manager, gave an overview of the Tier 2 analysis and the project objective, which is to identify a Locally Preferred Alternative, develop a financing strategy and create an implementation plan. Reed Everett-Lee reviewed the evaluation results, beginning with a discussion of the evaluation goals. In addition to the measures addressed in the evaluation criteria, Mr. Everett-Lee discussed additional considerations for each of the alignments.

Gus Schmidt noted that the western most point of all the alignments is the Sawgrass Mills area and asked if this is where a transfer from I-75 would occur. Mr. Everett-Lee responded affirmatively and noted that park and ride facilities would be provided at this station. Mr. Yesbeck relayed his conversations with representatives from the City of Sunrise, resulting in the City's support for the alignments as currently depicted. Mr. Seeburger suggested that an I-595/I-75 station might be possible and that this is a critical issue for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

Mr. Everett-Lee continued with an overview of the evaluation criteria. There were several questions about the projected ridership and cost estimates. Mr. Everett-Lee responded to these inquiries. Mr. Yesbeck noted that for determining right-of-way costs an average cost of land in Broward County was used and multiplied by 2.5 to account for business damages and acquisition costs.

Kent Rice asked if the capital costs include noise mitigation. Mr. Everett-Lee responded that this should be covered by the contingency and discussed the Federal Transit Administration's criteria for noise abatement. Mr. Seeburger indicated that the noise impacts will be addressed in the I-595 PD&E.

Paul Lampley asked if a station at the Turnpike was considered. Mr. Yesbeck answered that this was considered but that there is very little right-of-way available.

Mr. Yesbeck discussed the total scores for each of the alignments and noted the small difference between the I-595/SR 7 and Sunrise/Broward alignments. This led to a discussion of the recommendation to propose the I-595/SR 7 alignment for the New Starts application and a Sunrise/Broward alignment for the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Jill Quigley presented the methodology for determining the economic development potential of each station area. Mr. Robinson inquired as to whether the methodology was static or was based on what could occur once the system was in place. There was general discussion about this issue.

Mike Williams suggested that there was not enough of an argument presented for I-595/SR 7 as the New Starts alignment and that the committee should assist in the development of a compelling argument for this alignment. There was general discussion about this point and the FTA process. Mr. Yesbeck stated that other statistics that will help to explain the I-595/SR 7 alignment will be presented at future workshops.

Mr. Everett-Lee addressed the upcoming financial workshop and stated that the financial strategy will have to address Broward County in general, not just the proposed New Starts alignment. Mr. Seeburger summarized previous conversations with elected officials and suggested that it is time to start considering a sales tax that covers transportation and other quality of life issues, such as parks and libraries.

There was discussion about identifying the sponsoring agency. Mr. Robinson recommended that the MPO decide who the operating agency should be. Mr. Everett-Lee stated that this would be addressed during the upcoming financial workshop.

It was suggested that the scoring matrix be simplified before presentation to the public to assist in communicating that the I-595/SR 7 alignment was the recommended alternative.

REPORTED BY: Jill Quigley

Steering Committee Meeting Report

PROJECT: Central Broward Transit Alt. Analysis **PROJECT NO.:** 411189 2 2201

PRESENT: Scott Seeburger, FDOT **DATE:** 03/07/05
Nancy Ziegler, FDOT
John Krane, FDOT
Paul Lampley, FDOT
Howard Webb, FDOT
Jeff Weidner, FDOT
Gus Schmidt, FDOT
Gerry O'Reilly, FDOT
Steven Braun, FDOT
Daphne Georgiadis, FDOT
Enrique Zelaya, Broward County MPO
David Anderton, Port Everglades
Jonathan Roberson, South Florida RTA/Tri-Rail
Joe Yesbeck, Carter & Burgess
Reed Everett-Lee, Carter & Burgess
Jill Quigley, Carter & Burgess

The purpose of this meeting was to review the results of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) evaluation and to discuss the potential for a dedicated revenue source for transit.

The meeting began with self-introductions. Mr. Scott Seeburger, FDOT Project Manager, updated the Committee on the project and reviewed information on the need for transit to be competitive with the automobile, the decisions needed from the MPO, other considerations for the Central Broward East-West Transit project, the alternatives evaluated (No Build, Baseline/TSM, and Build), and the technology options.

Mr. Joseph Yesbeck, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, Inc., presented the remainder of the project information, including guideway configurations, projected ridership, projected capital and operating costs, cost effectiveness, funding options, needed decisions, the recommended (LPA), implementation strategies, and additional considerations if light rail is desired.

Significant discussion centered on the following issues:

- The capacity of bus rapid transit (BRT) compared to light rail transit (LRT)
- Construction of guideway for BRT that can be converted for LRT use in the future
- Options resulting from the I-595 PD&E study (particularly the need for both roadway and transit improvements in this corridor and right-of-way issues)
- Guideway configuration along Broward Boulevard (width of aerial supports & guideway and consistency with HOV Connector)
- How capital cost information for each segment is displayed
- Projected ridership (how it compares to other LRT systems, modeling assumptions & impacts of land use)
- State's policy for transit spending and potential for receiving state funding if federal funds are not provided for project
- Desire for LRT in Broward County (how this affects potential for federal funding and impact on development)

Mr. Seeburger concluded the meeting with an open-ended discussion about what FDOT and the transit agencies in Broward County can or should do to assist in the development of a package of information for a dedicated revenue source, if such is pursued.

REPORTED BY: Jill Quigley
