



# ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING REPORT

**CENTRAL BROWARD  
EAST-WEST TRANSIT ANALYSIS  
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

FINANCIAL PROJECT ID NUMBER 411189-2-22-01

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
DISTRICT 4**



PREPARED BY:

**Carter#Burgess**

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:



**March 2005**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Study Area .....	2
1.2 STUDY Background.....	2
1.2.1 I-95/I-595 Master Plan .....	4
1.2.2 Broward County MPO 2025 LRTP .....	4
1.2.3 Tri-Rail Master Plan .....	4
1.3 Tier 2 Alignment Alternatives .....	5
1.3.1 Alignment 1 (I-595/SR 7/Broward Boulevard).....	5
1.3.2 Alignment 2 (I-595/SR 84/Andrews Avenue) .....	5
1.3.3 Alignment 3 (Sunrise Boulevard/University Drive/Broward Boulevard) .....	5
1.3.4 Alignment 4 (Sunrise Boulevard/SR 7/Broward Boulevard).....	5
1.3.5 Western and Eastern Termini .....	6
2. Screening Methods.....	12
2.1 Data Collection .....	12
2.2 Alignment Ranking Methodology .....	12
2.2.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	13
2.2.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	13
2.2.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	13
2.2.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	13
2.2.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	13
2.2.6 Community Services .....	13
2.2.7 Hazardous Materials .....	14
2.2.8 Wetlands.....	14
2.2.9 Noise.....	15
2.2.10 Historic and Archeological Resources .....	16
3. Alignment Ranking Results.....	16
3.1 Alignment 1 (I-595/SR 7/Broward Boulevard).....	16
3.1.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	16
3.1.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	16
3.1.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	17
3.1.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	17
3.1.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	17
3.1.6 Community Services .....	17
3.1.7 Hazardous Materials .....	19
3.1.8 Wetlands.....	19
3.1.9 Noise.....	22
3.1.10 Historic and Archeological Resources .....	23
3.2 Alignment 2 (I-595/SR 84/Andrews Avenue) .....	23
3.2.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	23
3.2.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	23
3.2.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	24
3.2.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....	24
3.2.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....	24
3.2.6 Community Services .....	24
3.2.7 Hazardous Materials .....	24
3.2.8 Wetlands.....	25
3.2.9 Noise.....	26
3.2.10 Historic and Archeological Resources .....	30
3.3 Alignment 3 (Sunrise Boulevard/University Drive/Broward Boulevard) .....	30

3.3.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....30

3.3.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....30

3.3.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....30

3.3.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....30

3.3.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....30

3.3.6 Community Services .....31

3.3.7 Hazardous Materials .....31

3.3.8 Wetlands .....35

3.3.9 Noise .....37

3.3.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources .....37

3.4 Alignment 4 (Sunrise Boulevard/SR 7/Broward Boulevard)..... 37

3.4.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....37

3.4.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....37

3.4.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations.....37

3.4.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations .....37

3.4.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations..... 38

3.4.6 Community Services .....38

3.4.7 Hazardous Materials .....38

3.4.8 Wetlands .....41

3.4.9 Noise .....43

3.4.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources .....44

3.5 Eastern Terminus ..... 44

3.5.1 Community Services .....44

3.5.2 Hazardous Materials .....44

3.5.3 Wetlands .....44

3.6 Western Terminus.....46

3.6.1 Wetlands .....46

4.0 CONCLUSIONS ..... 47

4.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations..... 47

4.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations ..... 47

4.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations..... 47

4.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations ..... 48

4.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations..... 48

4.6 Community Services ..... 48

4.7 Hazardous Materials ..... 49

4.8 Wetlands ..... 49

4.9 Noise ..... 50

APPENDIX A

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Study Area..... 3  
Figure 2: Tier 2 Alignment Alternatives..... 7  
Figure 3: Alignment 1 (I-595/SR 7/Broward Boulevard) ..... 8  
Figure 4: Alignment 2 (I-595/SR 84/Andrews Avenue)..... 9  
Figure 5: Alignment 3 (Sunrise Boulevard/University Drive/Broward Boulevard) ..... 10  
Figure 6: Alignment 4 (Sunrise Boulevard/SR 7/Broward Boulevard) ..... 11  
Figure 7: Community Services on Alignment 1..... 18  
Figure 8: Potential Hazardous Materials Sites along Alignment 1 ..... 20  
Figure 9: Wetlands along Alignment 1 ..... 21  
Figure 10: Community Services on Alignment 2 ..... 27  
Figure 11: Potential Hazardous Materials Site along Alignment 2..... 28  
Figure 12: Wetlands along Alignment 2..... 29  
Figure 13: Community Services on Alignment 3 ..... 33  
Figure 14: Potential Hazardous Materials Sites along Alignment 3..... 34  
Figure 15: Wetlands Along Alignment 3 ..... 36  
Figure 16: Community Services Along Alignment 4 ..... 39  
Figure 17: Potential Hazardous Materials Sites Along Alignment 4 ..... 40  
Figure 18: Wetlands Along Alignment 4 ..... 42  
Figure 19: Community Services within the Eastern Terminus ..... 45

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Alignment 1 Wetlands..... 22  
Table 2: Alignment 2 Wetlands..... 26  
Table 3: Alignment 3 Wetlands..... 35  
Table 4: Alignment 4 Wetlands..... 43  
Table 5: Eastern Terminus Wetlands ..... 46  
Table 6: Western Terminus Wetlands ..... 47  
Table 7: Number of Household Rankings..... 47  
Table 8: Number of Employees Rankings ..... 47  
Table 9: Percent of Minority Household Rankings ..... 48  
Table 10: Percent of Disabled Persons Rankings ..... 48  
Table 11: Percent Low-Income Household Rankings..... 48  
Table 12: Community Service Rankings ..... 49  
Table 13: Hazardous Materials Rankings..... 49  
Table 14: Wetlands Rankings..... 50  
Table 15: Noise Rankings ..... 50  
Table 16: Cumulative Evaluation Matrix ..... 51  
Table A-1: Historic Structure Inventory..... 52

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this Environmental Screening Report is to summarize the socio-economic conditions and the results of the preliminary evaluation of the environmental resources associated with the Tier 2 alignment alternatives of the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis. Several goals for the project were identified during the Tier 2 evaluation, including the minimization of potential for environmental impact, maximizing ridership, and maximizing service to minority and transit dependent populations. These goals were addressed by examining several different criteria. The environmental goal was addressed by examining several elements within an area that extends  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile from both sides of the centerline of each alignment. This wide study area provides an appropriate buffer, such that if a change is made to the alignment, any potentially significant environmental features will have been identified. However, for the purpose of environmental screening, it is assumed that transit construction will remain within the existing right of way to the greatest degree possible in order to minimize impacts. The ridership goal was addressed by determining the number of households and employees within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of the station areas along each alignment. Service to minority and transit dependent populations was measured based on three factors: the percentage of minority households, the percentage of persons with a disability, and the percentage of low-income households, all within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile of stations along each alignment.

The purpose of the environmental resources screening is to identify and assess any issues early in the Alternatives Analysis process. Existing environmental statutes and executive orders mandate the avoidance of parks, historic sites, wetlands and other natural features. These requirements must be continually reassessed as candidate alignments and potential station locations are refined. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines call for the inclusion of environmental considerations throughout the Alternatives Analysis process to the degree feasible. Many potential environmental concerns cannot be taken into account at the early stage of the development of alternatives. A detailed analysis that quantifies the impacts and the costs of avoidance or mitigation may be needed before the alignment is adjusted or other refinements are made to minimize adverse impacts. Such detailed analysis may not occur until preliminary engineering (PE) nevertheless, as the alternatives advance from the conceptual stage to the final detailed description in project planning, the relevant environmental issues should be considered in refining the alternatives at a level of detail commensurate with the detail of the alternatives. For socio-economic conditions, the purpose of this screening report is to evaluate each alignment to determine which offers the most benefits to the community.

The overall approach for the evaluations in the Central Broward East-West Transit Alternatives Analysis is to provide increasing detail and more quantitative analysis as the project progresses and the number of alternatives is reduced. The Tier 1 evaluation of alternatives was based on a "Good, Neutral, Poor" rating of each criterion. In most cases, this qualitative rating was based on quantitative data. In the Tier 2 evaluation the ranking of alternatives is based on a score developed by totaling the points under each measure. The environmental and socio-economic data collected for each of the four alignments was utilized to compute a score and ultimately rank each alignment. In addition to identifying the alignment with the least potential for impact to the natural and built environment, the focus of this phase of the alternatives analysis includes the preliminary identification of any "fatal flaw" issues that could affect the recommendation of a preferred alignment.

## **1.1 STUDY AREA**

The study area, illustrated in Figure 1, is located in Central Broward County, Florida. The general boundaries of the study area are Oakland Park Boulevard, the Weston/Sawgrass area, Griffin Road, and the Intracoastal Waterway. The term, corridor, in the context of this study refers to the area included within the above general boundaries. The alternatives under consideration are alignments, or routes, within that corridor.

The study area for the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis contains a diverse mix of land uses that are representative of the typical growth pattern experienced throughout Florida. Generally, the land development pattern of the study area is characterized by low to medium density residential uses and strip commercial development located along major arterials in the western portion (west of Florida's Turnpike), with higher residential densities and concentrations of commercial development occurring in and around the historic central cities. The densest concentration of both residents and nonresidential activities occurs in the eastern portion of the study area, or that portion east of Florida's Turnpike. The western portion of the study area is characterized by lower density (five dwelling units per acre or less) residential areas with smaller pockets of supporting nonresidential uses.

The population of Broward County in 1999 was estimated at 1,591,290. By contrast, the 1999 population of the study area was estimated at 445,998. Thus, approximately 28% of the County's population resided in the study area in 1999. The projected population for the study area in 2025 is approximately 527,932, yielding an estimated population growth rate of 18% from 1999 to 2025. The projected countywide population for 2025 is 2,008,577 (a 26% increase from 1999). These projections indicate that the percentage of Broward County's population living in the study area in 2025 will be approximately 26%, which is a slight decrease from 1999's estimated population.

Total employment in Broward County in 1999 was estimated at 626,434, with over 40% of the workforce employed in the service industry. The study area's employment for 1999 was approximately 207,487, representing over 33% of the County's total employment. Projections for 2025 suggest that countywide employment will reach 883,318 (a 41% growth rate), with the percentage of the workforce employed by the service industry nearing 60%. The projected growth rate for employment in the study area parallels the countywide growth. An anticipated 296,735 persons will be employed in the study area by 2025, representing 34% of the total county employment.

## **1.2 STUDY BACKGROUND**

High levels of travel and congestion on major east/west roadways characterize conditions of this area. Historically, the traditional travel patterns have been directional--eastbound in the morning and westbound in the afternoon--fueled by the residential communities in the west and employment centers in the east. In short, the mobility needs in the study area reflect the amount of travel between west and east Broward County; the congestion on main east/west arteries; lack of connectivity among important transportation facilities including Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport, Port Everglades, and Tri-Rail; and the amount of travel to significant destinations throughout the Central Broward area. The study has its origins in the I-95/I-595 Master Plan, the Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and Tri-Rail's 2020 Plan.

### 1.2.1 I-95/I-595 Master Plan

The I-95/I-595 Master Plan analyzed possible alternatives for meeting the transportation needs of the I-595 and I-95 corridors. This study took a first look at the feasibility of premium or high performance transit (bus rapid transit or light rail) in the I-595 corridor. In developing the I-95/I-595 Master Plan Locally Preferred Alternative, it was found that recommended highway improvements would not accommodate the 100-percent increase in corridor demand, and that highway performance transit would be needed to address future travel needs in the corridor. The I-95/I-595 Master Plan recommended an alternatives analysis to follow, if the elected leaders of Broward County wished to pursue its implementation. The MPO subsequently approved funding for an alternatives analysis, which is the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis.

### 1.2.2 Broward County MPO 2025 LRTP

The Broward County MPO has defined a countywide network of premium transit, and express and local bus services in its 2025 LRTP. The 2025 Transit Plan contained within the LRTP, recommends transit improvements within the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis study area. Proposed transit services within this study area include premium transit within the I-595 corridor and bus rapid transit along several major arterials.

The 2025 Cost Feasible Plan depicts the proposed transit elements of the 2025 LRTP. Key elements include improving the headways on over 40 routes. The headway improvements generally double the frequency of service (e.g. from 30 minutes to 15 minutes), with no listed route having a headway of over 30 minutes. There are several bus rapid transit (BRT) routes identified in the Cost Feasible Plan. The proposed BRT routes create a network of service on major east-west and north-south arterials and highways. East-west BRT routes are shown on Pines Boulevard, Sheridan Street, Sunrise Boulevard, Broward Boulevard, Oakland Park Boulevard, Commercial Boulevard, Atlantic Boulevard and Sample Road. Most of these routes extend from I-75 or the Sawgrass Expressway in the western part of the county to US 1 or SR A1A in the eastern part of Broward County. The north-south BRT routes are shown on Powerline Road, University Drive and SR 7. These routes generally extend the length of the county.

“High Performance Transit” (HPT) is shown on I-595 from 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue to US 1. A central circulator loop from the Tri-Rail station at Broward Boulevard through downtown Fort Lauderdale to the beaches is part of the HPT network. The Airport-Seaport People Mover is also shown as part of the HPT network. The HPT service shown in the 2025 Cost Feasible also includes the Transit Bridge service from I-595 south along SR 7 into Miami-Dade County.

### 1.2.3 Tri-Rail Master Plan

Tri-Rail’s 2020 Plan describes the strategies for developing expansion opportunities and infrastructure investments for the commuter rail system managed by the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority/Tri-Rail covering Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties. In relation to the Central Broward East-West Transit Analysis study area, the Tri-Rail plan identifies an expansion opportunity from Sawgrass Mills to Downtown Fort Lauderdale, with recommendations for development of light rail transit technology along an east-west arterial route, currently shown as Sunrise Boulevard-University Drive-Broward Boulevard.

### 1.3 TIER 2 ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES

The following four alignments were screened for environmental resources and socio-economic conditions under the Tier 2 phase of the study (Figure 2):

- Alignment 1 (I-595/SR 7/Broward Boulevard)
- Alignment 2 (I-595/SR 84/Andrews Avenue)
- Alignment 3 (Sunrise Boulevard/University Drive/Broward Boulevard)
- Alignment 4 (Sunrise Boulevard/SR 7/Broward Boulevard)

A description of each of the four study alignment alternatives follows.

#### 1.3.1 Alignment 1 (I-595/SR 7/Broward Boulevard)

Originating near Sawgrass Mills and the Office Depot Arena, this alignment runs south on 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-595. The alignment runs along the southern side of the right-of-way of I-595 to SR 7. Turning north on SR 7, the alignment runs to Broward Boulevard and then turns east and continues into Downtown Fort Lauderdale. At Andrews Avenue, the alignment turns south and runs to the proposed Intermodal Center at Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport, where it terminates (Figure 3).

#### 1.3.2 Alignment 2 (I-595/SR 84/Andrews Avenue)

Originating near Sawgrass Mills and the Office Depot Arena, this alignment runs south on 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-595. The alignment runs along the southern side of the right-of-way of I-595 until SR 7, where it crosses to the north and continues in a northeasterly direction along SR 84. At South Andrews Avenue, the alignment runs south to the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport and then north (along Andrews Avenue) to Broward Boulevard. The alignment turns west on Broward Boulevard and terminates at the Fort Lauderdale Tri-Rail station, just west of I-95 (Figure 4).

#### 1.3.3 Alignment 3 (Sunrise Boulevard/University Drive/Broward Boulevard)

Originating near Sawgrass Mills and the Office Depot Arena, the alignment runs south on 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Sunrise Boulevard, where it turns east. The alignment runs east on Sunrise Boulevard and connects to Broward Boulevard via a north-south connector. The possible north-south connectors for this alignment include Pine Island Road and University Drive. For purposes of the analysis, a connection along University Drive was considered as the north-south connector. Thus, the alignment turns south on University Drive to Broward Boulevard and then runs east on Broward Boulevard to Andrews Avenue, where it turns south again and terminates at the proposed Intermodal Center at the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood Airport (Figure 5).

#### 1.3.4 Alignment 4 (Sunrise Boulevard/SR 7/Broward Boulevard)

Originating near Sawgrass Mills and the Office Depot Arena, the alignment runs south on 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Sunrise Boulevard, where it turns east. The alignment runs east on Sunrise Boulevard and connects to Broward Boulevard via a north-south connector. The possible north-south connectors for this alignment include SR 7 and 31 Avenue. For purposes of the analysis, a connection along SR 7 was considered as the north-south connector. Thus, the alignment follows Sunrise Boulevard as it turns south and then back east, and then heads south on SR 7 to Broward Boulevard. From the SR 7/Broward Boulevard intersection, the alignment runs east along Broward Boulevard to

Andrews Avenue, where it turns south again and terminates at the proposed Intermodal Center at the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood Airport (Figure 6).

**1.3.5 Western and Eastern Termini**

As depicted in Figure 2 and described in the above text, each of the four alignments includes “shared” western and eastern termini. The western terminus common to all four alignments extends from Sunrise Boulevard to the project terminus near Sawgrass Mills Mall and Office Depot Arena. The eastern terminus common to all four alignments includes the west-east segment along Broward Boulevard from the Tri-Rail Station to Andrews Avenue, as well as the north-south segment along Andrews Avenue and US-1 from Broward Boulevard to the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport. For the purposes of the Tier 2 Analysis, the environmental screening concentrated specifically on the environmental features associated with the four unique alternatives depicted as Alignments 1 through 4 in Figure 2. Although the environmental resources associated with the western and eastern termini were examined, these areas were not considered when assigning a rating for each alignment.

## **2. SCREENING METHODS**

### *2.1 DATA COLLECTION*

This report presents the results of a preliminary environmental and socio-economic assessment of the project, and is based on review of existing information. The socio-economic data was collected from the 2000 US Census and the Metropolitan Planning Organization's 2025 Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) and analyzed by potential station area using Geographic Information Systems, or GIS. A radius of ½ mile from the center of each potential station area was utilized to account for any adjustments to the station location that may occur in the preliminary engineering phase of the project. For each of the candidate station areas the following information was collected from the US Census: the number of households, population, households at the poverty level, the number of disabled persons, and the minority (non-white) population. The MPO's TAZ data was used to determine the number of employees in each station area.

The following environmental resources (natural and built) were identified along each of the alignment alternatives: community services, wetlands, historic and archaeological resources, contamination, and noise. The resources identified were based on data obtained from Broward County, except for the historic and archaeological site information, which was obtained from the Division of Historical Resources Florida Master Site Files. The Broward County database was chosen due to the ready availability of the relevant environmental data. Maps were generated to depict wetlands, community services, potential hazardous materials sites, and historic sites located within ¼ mile on each side of the centerline of each alignment. In accordance with the protection standards of the Division of Historical Resources, the identified archaeological sites were not mapped. Each element mapped within the buffer was inventoried and evaluated for proximity to the alignment. Aerial photographs were reviewed; windshield surveys performed, and limited ground-truthing was conducted as needed to verify the data.

### *2.2 ALIGNMENT RANKING METHODOLOGY*

In the Tier 2 Evaluation, the ranking of alternatives is based on a score developed by totaling the points under each measure. Points range from "1" to "5", with "5" being the best or highest rating and "1", the worst or lowest rating. In most cases, the scoring for a measure is based on quantitative data. For those measures that have qualitative components, or those that combined qualitative and quantitative factors, a relative score or ranking was developed.

For socio-economic conditions, the ranking is based on the quantitative data contained in the 2000 US Census and the TAZ data files. For each of the measures, the alignments were ranked relative to each other. Based on the range of values for the data of a given measure, the midpoint of the range was calculated. The middle upper and lower bounds of the range that would receive a score of "3" was based on values that were five percent above and below the midpoint, respectively. The ranges for the other values were based on 10 per cent increments from the upper and lower bounds of the middle range. The values of measure that fell within the lowest range received a score of "1" and the values of a measure that fell within the highest range received a score of "5." Note that highest and lowest values are relative to each measure.

The following is a description of each of these measures.

**2.2.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

This criterion provides a quantitative assessment of the potential of the alternative to meet the travel and transportation needs of residents. Alternatives were scored based on the number of occupied households (utilizing 2000 US Census data) located within ½ mile radius of the proposed station locations for each alignment alternative.

**2.2.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

This criterion provides a quantitative assessment of the potential of the alternative to meet the travel and transportation needs of employees. Alternatives were scored based on the number of employees (using 1999 TAZ data) located within ½ mile radius of the proposed station locations for each alignment alternative.

**2.2.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

A quantitative assessment of the potential to provide transit service to, and conversely impact, minority (defined as non-white as reported to the 2000 US Census) populations. In this measure, the scores were developed based on a comparison of the percentage of minority households served by the alternative to the percentage of minority households within the corridor overall. The proportion of minority households within the study area is 28%.

**2.2.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

This measure is a quantitative assessment of the accessibility of the alternative to persons with a disability (as reported to the 2000 US Census). In this measure, the scores were developed based on a comparison of the percentage of persons with a disability served by the alternative to the percentage of persons with a disability within the corridor overall. Disabled persons represent 33% of the study area population.

**2.2.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

This measure is a quantitative assessment of the ability of the proposed alternative to meet the travel and transportation needs of low-income (defined as below the poverty line as reported to the 2000 US Census) households. In this measure, the scores were developed based on a comparison of the percentage of low-income households served by the alternative to the percentage of low-income households within the corridor overall. The proportion of low-income households in the study area is 12%.

For the environmental evaluation, the scoring is based on an inventory of environmental resources (the number of resources that are within a ¼ mile of the alignment), as well as other factors. Each of the four study alignments were assigned a ranking of 1-5 based on the number and location of wetlands and community services, as well as the potential for contamination sites to be an obstacle to corridor development. A ranking of “1” represents the highest number of resources, with a ranking of “5” representing the least number of resources. The rankings were based on methods designed to evaluate each parameter quantitatively. A description of these methods for each environmental element is provided below.

**2.2.6 Community Services**

Community services evaluated include five (5) major categories: colleges, hospitals, libraries, parks, and schools. The location of each alignment relative to colleges, hospitals, libraries, parks, and schools was evaluated. Of these, parks are found within

all four of the alignments' ½ mile buffer study limits. The total number of facilities located within each study corridor was determined, and each alignment was assigned a ranking (1-5), by category, based on this total. The alignment with the fewest number of services was given the highest ranking of five (5). A composite score was then calculated for each alignment based on the rankings assigned by category. The alignment with the highest composite score was given a score of 5. When two or more alignments have the same number of facilities in a category, an equal ranking was assigned to all of the "tied" alignments. If necessary, a 4(f) evaluation will be conducted during the PE phase of the project.

#### 2.2.7 Hazardous Materials

All of the alignments were evaluated for the presence of known hazardous materials sites. For this preliminary phase of the study, the evaluation was limited to information regarding only the locations of known sites, as mapped from the existing Broward County database. The degree of contamination associated with each site and the potentially affected area is unknown at this time. Therefore, the study alternatives were evaluated based only on the number of known hazardous materials sites associated with each alternative. This level of evaluation is intended to be used only as an indicator of potential areas of concern and to identify those sites that would require detailed review as the project progresses. Because hazardous materials present at these identified facilities could be naturally attenuated over time or may change direction of migration due to groundwater flow, detailed reviews for each site will be required during subsequent phases of the project development in order to yield accurate results.

The potential for hazardous materials sites to be an issue on one or more of the study alignments was evaluated based on the total number of potentially contaminated sites associated with each. At this stage, there is not enough information available to determine which, if any, of these potential sites actually may pose a threat to project development. Therefore, the ranking can be based only on the total number of sites with potential for concern. The study alignment with the greatest number of hazardous materials sites therefore has the highest possibility for contamination issues to be encountered, and was assigned a "1" ranking. Similarly, the alignment with the fewest number of potentially contaminated sites was assigned a "5" ranking.

#### 2.2.8 Wetlands

Wetland maps were prepared for each alignment by obtaining land use coverages from Broward County, and mapping all Florida Land Use Cover and Forms Classification System (FLUCFCS) codes within the "600" category, which includes wetlands. Wetlands are further categorized within the Broward County database under two categories: "wetlands" and "development wetlands". "Development wetlands" include created wetlands or areas that have been developed as mitigation wetlands or mitigation banks. "Wetlands" include all other designated wetland areas. Wetland types are described according to the FLUCFCS code obtained from the Broward County database source. The Broward County data source utilized does not provide a FLUCFCS code for Development Wetlands. Each wetland mapped has also been assigned an identification number. At this phase of the study, additional information regarding the quality, composition or relative value of these wetlands is not available, therefore it was assumed for the purposes of this evaluation that all are of comparable value.

Limited, preliminary ground-truthing performed for the alignments has revealed that some discrepancies exist between the type and size of "wetlands" indicated in the

Broward County database and what was actually observed in the field. It is understood that more detailed field surveys will need to be conducted during the PE phase of the project to more accurately determine any wetland impact that may be associated with the project alternatives. However, for the purpose of this environmental screening, the best available information was utilized to rank the study alignments.

The screening of wetlands was evaluated utilizing three (3) parameters:

- Location within the ½ mile alignment study area
- Wetland size
- Total number of wetlands within the ½ mile study area

The location of the wetland within the ½ mile study area was scored based on whether the wetland is located along the outer perimeter of the study area; located at some point in the middle; or located adjacent to the existing roadway. This parameter was evaluated based on the assumption that a wetland system immediately adjacent to the existing roadway has a greater potential for significant impacts and may be less avoidable than a wetland found elsewhere within the study area. Each wetland was scored based on location as follows: perimeter = 2, middle = 1 and adjacent = 0. Points were totaled for all wetlands located within each alignment study area and each study area was then ranked (1 – 5). The highest ranking (5) was given to the alignment with the highest total points (i.e. fewest number of wetlands in proximity to the existing roadway).

The size of each wetland occurring with the study areas was assessed based on the assumption that impacts to larger wetlands would be less desirable than impacts to smaller wetlands. Larger wetland systems may also be more difficult to avoid. Points were assigned to each wetland based on the following:

- 0 – 0.25 acres - 5 points
- 0.25 – 1.0 acres – 4 points
- 1.0 – 5.0 acres - 3 points
- 5.0 – 10.0 acres - 2 points
- Greater than 10.0 acres - 1 point

Points were totaled for all wetlands located within each alignment study area and each study area was then ranked (1 – 5). The highest ranking (5) was given to the alignment with the highest total points (i.e. lowest wetland acreage).

The total number of wetlands found on each alignment was evaluated based on the assumption that the greater the quantity of wetlands, the greater the possibility that one or more could be affected. Each study area was ranked based on the total number of wetlands associated with it. The alignment with the most wetlands was given a “1” ranking.

#### 2.2.9 Noise

The number of noise sensitive receptors within one-quarter mile of either side of the centerline of each alignment alternative was estimated. Following a review of aerial photography, land use maps, and other material, a visual review of each alignment alternative was conducted. Based on this review, the number of noise sensitive receptors was estimated within each alignment alternative.

Noise sensitive receptors inventoried include five (5) major categories: residential units, schools, parks, medical facilities and churches. The evaluation examined the total number of facilities located within the study area for each alignment as well as the location and potential to be affected by noise. Each alignment was assigned a ranking (1-5) based on this overall evaluation.

This level of review is intended to estimate the number and type of potential noise sensitive receptors that exist only within each alignment study area. Since field measurements were not taken and no prediction models were used, the information contained in this section should be considered preliminary. A more detailed assessment for the selected alternative would be required to determine the potential for impacts and the appropriate mitigation measures, if needed.

For this preliminary noise screening, the eastern terminus of the project is included within the discussion for each alignment. This is due primarily to the presence of the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport, and the impact this facility has on noise considerations. Other noise sensitive sites may exist within the study area that were not observed or identified based on the information available at this time. A more detailed level of noise impact analysis will be conducted for the selected alignment alternative in order to accurately identify potential noise impacts from the proposed project during the preliminary engineering phase of the study.

#### 2.2.10 Historic and Archeological Resources

Information obtained from the Division of Historical Resources Florida Master Site Files revealed that a total of 383 historic structures are found within ¼ mile on either side of the centerline of the alignments (see Appendix A). The majority of these structures is found in the Downtown Fort Lauderdale area, within the eastern terminus of the study area, and is therefore common to each of the four alignments. As the purpose of the alignment scoring process is to rank the alignments relative to each other, this criterion was omitted from the scoring process because each alignment has essentially an equal number of sites. A Cultural Resource Assessment Survey will be conducted during the PE phase of the project to determine any impacts that the project may have on these historic structures.

### **3. ALIGNMENT RANKING RESULTS**

This section of the report details the results of the environmental screening analysis by each alignment alternative.

#### *3.1 ALIGNMENT 1 (I-595/SR 7/BROWARD BOULEVARD)*

##### 3.1.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations

Based on the 2000 US Census, a total of 21,539 households are located within ½ mile of the potential station areas for Alignment 1. Compared to the other alignments for this measure, Alignment 1 scored a three (3).

##### 3.1.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations

Based on the 1999 TAZ data, a total of 56,850 employees were determined to be located within ½ mile of the proposed stations along this alignment. The score for this measure was three (3), when compared to the other alignment alternatives.

**3.1.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Of the 21,539 households within ½ mile radius of potential stations, 7,518, or 35 percent, were classified by the 2000 US Census as minority. The score for this alignment on this measure was five (5).

**3.1.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The total population of the station areas along Alignment 1, based on the 2000 US Census, is 56,512. The reported number of persons with a disability in this same area is 19,289, which represents 34 percent of the population in these station areas. This measure's score is a three (3) relative to the other alignments.

**3.1.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The percentage of low-income households within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations on Alignment 1 is 15 percent, which scores a five (5).

**3.1.6 Community Services**

Two community services are found within the Alignment 1 study area. These include parks, both city and county, and schools (Figure 7). There are four city parks and four county parks within the Alignment 1 study area. All four of the county parks (Pond Apple Slough, Sunview Park, Boulevard Gardens Park, and Delevoe Park) and two of the city parks (Seminole Park and Sunset School/Park) are located along the outer edges of the study area. The remaining two city parks (Plantation Acres South Park and Guthrie-Blake Park) are located adjacent to or in close proximity to the existing roadway. The relatively small size of these two parks should allow for guideway options to avoid these facilities.

All three of the schools (Fox Trail Elementary, Pine Ridge Alternative Center and Sunset School) found within the study corridor are located on the outer edges of the Alignment 1 study area.

The score for this alignment for parks and community services is four (4).

**3.1.7 Hazardous Materials**

A total of thirty-three individual sites have been located within ¼ mile of either side of the centerline of Alignment 1 (Figure 8), including one (1) Superfund site (Florida Petroleum Reprocessors). There is a consent decree with the US Environmental Protection Agency that allows transportation development within the area bounded by Peters Road, SR 7, Orange Drive and Florida's Turnpike, therefore, the existence of this site will not significantly impact the ability to locate a transit system in this area. Six different pollutant types: unknown, chlorinated, gasoline, mixed product, petroleum, and solvents have been identified, for a total of thirty-five potential contamination products within the thirty-three sites.

The unknown contaminant type could be any number of potential pollutants. It is associated with a Long John Silvers retail restaurant chain. This business may not be the original source of the contaminant. This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The chlorinated contaminant type is associated with dry cleaners. There are nine dry cleaners with the potential for contamination concerns located along this alignment. All of the sites are located adjacent to the existing roadway with the exception of one (Loral Cleaners, 1875 S University Drive, Davie, FL), which is off the main roadway but within the Alignment 1 study limits.

The gasoline pollutant type is usually associated with gas stations but may also be associated with private companies with their own fueling capacity. All ten of the identified potential gasoline locations for this alignment are associated with retail gas stations. All of these identified sites appear to be located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

There are two locations with the mixed product pollutant type identified. One of the sites is a gas station and the other is a dry cleaner (Fashion Cleaners Inc., 2427 W Broward Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) that also is listed with the chlorinated contaminant type. Both of these sites are located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

Twelve sites have been identified with the petroleum pollutant type. These include six gas stations, 1 marina, 1 car dealer, 1 restaurant, and 3 unidentified sites. The unidentified sites appear to be a roofing company, a truck rental company and 1 unknown site. All of the petroleum sites, with the exception of two, are located directly adjacent or within close proximity to the existing roadway. The two sites that are within the Alignment 1 study area but located off of the roadway are the roofing company (National Roofing Company, 2396 SW 66 Terrace, Davie, FL) and the marina (Lakewood Travel Park, 3055 Burriss Rd, Ft. Lauderdale, FL).

One site has been identified in the study area with the solvent pollutant type (Westgate French Cleaners, 117 SR 7 N, Plantation FL). This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

Relative to the other alignments, Alignment 1 received a score of 2 for hazardous materials sites.

**3.1.8 Wetlands**

There are a total of seven wetlands mapped on this corridor, ranging in size from 0.06 acres to 25.58 acres in size (Table 1 & Figure 9). These wetlands total 32.26 acres and

are comprised of four types: Melaleuca (FLUCFCS 4244), Mangrove Swamps (612), Freshwater Marshes (641), and Development Wetlands.

The most prominent wetland on the corridor (Freshwater Marsh No. 24) is associated with the Pond Apple Slough area. The major portion of this wetland lies outside the Alignment 1 study area.

The remaining six natural wetlands on this corridor are mapped either as Melaleuca or Freshwater Marshes and range in size from 0.06 to 4.40 acres and total 55.37 acres. All of these wetlands are located off of the existing roadway and avoidance of these systems appears to be feasible.

Five development wetlands by the project have been identified. These wetlands range in size from 4.40 to 27.77 acres. Two of the wetlands (identified as No's 14 & 16) are located near the edge of the study area. Three of the wetlands are grouped together with two natural wetlands systems (No's 37 & 38) and make one larger contiguous system that is adjacent to the existing roadway. Avoidance of all these systems appears to be possible with the appropriate design of the guideway.

**Table 1: Alignment 1 Wetlands**

Wetland ID #	Wetland Type	Acres	FLUCFCS
1	Wetland	0.07	4244
2	Wetland	0.06	4244
3	Wetland	0.18	4244
24	Wetland	25.58	641
37	Wetland	4.40	641
38	Wetland	0.34	641
41	Wetland	1.63	612
11	Development	4.40	-
12	Development	9.39	-
13	Development	27.77	-
14	Development	8.08	-
16	Development	5.73	-
<b>TOTAL</b>		87.63	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

The score for this alignment was three (3).

**3.1.9 Noise**

This alignment study area was estimated to have 7,700 residential units, 10 schools, 24 parks, 2 medical facilities, and 1 religious facility. This alignment received a score of one (1) relative to the others for noise.

The major noise sources within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment are traffic on I-595, SR 7, Broward Boulevard, Andrews Avenue, and aircraft from the Fort Lauderdale/ Hollywood International Airport. As a result, ambient noise levels from

existing sources may be high enough that the introduction of transit service, especially in close proximity to the major roadways, is unlikely to create a substantial noise impact.

Most of the potentially noise sensitive receivers are residential units, including a substantial number of mobile homes located along 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue and I-595. Along the SR 7 and Broward Boulevard portions of the corridor, residential units tend to be located behind commercial development, which would tend to provide noise protection from the existing traffic noise or transit service operating within the existing right-of-way. The one religious facility does not appear to have exterior areas of frequent use, which greatly reduces the potential for noise impacts since the interior areas are protected by the building envelope, which includes masonry walls and air conditioning.

Within the area closest to the airport, much of the land use is industrial or commercial in nature and not considered extremely noise sensitive. The two medical facilities within the corridor are located along Andrews Avenue and did not appear to have any outdoor areas of frequent human use that would make them especially sensitive to transit noise. The interior areas of these medical facilities are typically air conditioned and are sound proofed with insulated glass and solid exteriors that effectively reduce interior noise levels to well below known abatement criteria. In addition to residences within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment, other sensitive receptors include the Fox Trail Elementary School located adjacent to I-595, the North Fork Elementary School on the north side of Broward Boulevard, and the Faith Tabernacle United Pentacostal Church located on the corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Broward Boulevard. A significant portion of the I-595/SR 7 corridor is still undeveloped, commercial or industrial in nature. This is also true of a major portion of the western boundary of 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue as well as most of Broward Boulevard and Andrews Avenue. Commercial and industrial land uses are not particularly sensitive to transit or traffic noise, and therefore have a higher noise impact criterion.

#### 3.1.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources

Four historic structures were identified along Alignment 1. Two are unique to Alignment 1 and two are shared with other alignments. The two structures unique to this alignment are located (1) in the area bordered by Davie Boulevard, SW 16th Street, SW 31st Avenue, and SR 7, and (2) in the area bordered by Broward Boulevard, Peters Road, SR 7, and the Fort Lauderdale Country Club. The historic structure that is common to Alignment 2 was identified in the vicinity of an area bordered by I-595, Davie Road, and University Drive. The fourth historic structure is common to Alignments 3 and 4 and is located in the area bordered by Broward Boulevard, I-95, and Martin Luther King Avenue. Due to the insignificant difference between the alignments, scores were not given for these resources.

### **3.2 ALIGNMENT 2 (I-595/SR 84/ANDREWS AVENUE)**

#### 3.2.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations

A total of 17,480 households were determined to exist within ½ mile of proposed stations along Alignment 2. This number of households rated a score of one (1).

#### 3.2.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations

Based on the TAZ data, a total 54,700 employees were estimated for Alignment 2. The score for this measure was three (3).

**3.2.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Of the 17,480 households within ½ mile of proposed stations along this alignment, 4,553, or 26 percent, were reported by the 2000 US Census to be minority households. This alignment received a score of two (2) for this measure.

**3.2.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The population within ½ mile of proposed stations for this alignment, based on the 2000 US Census, was estimated to be 42,647. Of these, 33 percent (14,121 persons) were reported to be disabled. A score of three (3) was assigned to this alignment for this measure.

**3.2.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Fifteen (15) percent of the households within a ½ mile radius of proposed stations on Alignment 2 were reported as low-income households. A score of five (5) was assigned to this measure.

**3.2.6 Community Services**

Alignment 2 also includes only two community service types: parks and schools (Figure 10). There are four city parks and two county parks within the Alignment 2 study area. Two of the parks, Pond Apple Slough and Secret Woods Nature Center, are adjacent to the existing roadways and span the width of the study area and beyond. The third park, Plantation Acres South Park, is adjacent to the existing roadway, but the park does not span across the Alignment 2 study limits and could be avoided. The fourth park, Seminole Park, is located adjacent to the northern edge of the study area.

All three of the schools (Fox Trail Elementary, Whiddon-Rogers Education Center, and Seagull School) found along the corridor are located on the outer edges of the Alignment 2 study area and would likely not be impacted by guideway options.

The score for this alignment for parks and community services was five (5).

**3.2.7 Hazardous Materials**

A total of twenty-nine individual sites with the potential for contamination concerns have been identified within the study area for Alignment 2 (Figure 11) , including one (1) Superfund site (Florida Petroleum Reprocessors). There is a consent decree with the US Environmental Protection Agency that allows transportation development within the area bounded by Peters Road, SR 7, Orange Drive and Florida's Turnpike, therefore, the existence of this site will not significantly impact the ability to locate a transit system in this area.. Four different pollutant types: chlorinated, gasoline, mixed product, and petroleum, have been identified, for a total of thirty potential contamination products within the twenty-nine sites.

The chlorinated contaminant type is associated with dry cleaners. There are seven dry cleaners, with the potential for contamination concerns, located along this alignment. All of the sites are either adjacent to or in close proximity to the existing roadway.

The gasoline pollutant type is usually associated with gas stations but may also be associated with private companies with their own fueling capacity. All seven of the identified gasoline locations within the Alignment 2 study area are associated with retail

gas stations. All of the identified sites appear to be located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

Facilities with the potential pollutant type “mixed product” could be associated with a variety of industries. The mixed product pollutant type is a catchall that includes a wide variety of potential contaminants. There is only one location (Twin Mini Shop, 1531 SR 84, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) with the mixed product pollutant type identified, and it also has gasoline. This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The petroleum pollutant type may be associated with gas stations, auto repair facilities, and various other businesses with the need for petroleum products. There are eight gas stations, 1 marina, and 4 unidentified sites with this potential contaminant type listed. The unidentified sites appear to be a roofing company, 2 unknown sites, and one gas station. All of the petroleum sites, with the exception of two, are located directly adjacent or within close proximity to the existing roadway. The two sites that are within the study area but located off of the roadway are the roofing company (National Roofing Company, 2396 SW 66 Terrace, Davie, FL) and the marina (Lakewood Travel Park, 3055 Burris Rd, Ft. Lauderdale, FL).

The score for Alignment 2 regarding hazardous materials is two (2).

### 3.2.8 Wetlands

Five different FLUCFCS categories of natural wetlands have been mapped within the Alignment 2 study area: Melaleuca (4244), Wetland Hardwood Forests (610), Mixed Wetland Hardwoods (617), Cypress (621), and Freshwater Marshes (641) (Figure 12). There are a total of eighteen wetlands ranging in size from 0.06 acres to 32.39 acres in size and total 161.03 acres (Table 2). The majority of the wetlands (thirteen) are associated with the Pond Apple Slough area, with a combined area of 155.97 acres. Most of these wetlands are contiguous. All of the eighteen wetlands associated with Pond Apple Slough, with the exception of one (identified as No. 24), are forested. The exception is identified as a freshwater marsh of 25.58 acres in size. Due to the contiguous nature of most of these wetlands, all of the eighteen Pond Apple Slough wetlands are either located directly adjacent to or in close proximity to the existing roadway. Avoidance of the wetlands associated with Pond Apple Slough is highly recommended in order to minimize impacts to the natural environment, and facilitate permitting of the project.

The five remaining natural wetlands on this corridor are mapped as Melaleuca or Freshwater Marshes and range in size from 0.06 to 4.40 acres. All of these wetlands are located off of the existing roadway, and it is likely that avoidance of these areas may be accomplished during the design of the guideway.

The development wetlands are typically considered to be of lower quality when compared to natural wetlands of similar type due to the “man-made” nature of the systems. There are six development wetlands in the alignment study area, which could potentially be affected by the guideway option. These wetlands range in size from 4.40 to 27.77 acres and total 62.23 acres. Two of the wetlands (identified as No’s 14 & 16) are located near the edge of the study area. Three of the wetlands are grouped together with two natural wetlands systems (No’s 37 & 38) to form one larger contiguous system that is adjacent to the existing roadway. The remaining development wetland is also

located adjacent to the existing roadway. Avoidance of all these wetland areas is to be possible.

**Table 2: Alignment 2 Wetlands**

Wetland ID #	Wetland Type	Acres	FLUCFCS
1	Wetland	0.07	4244
2	Wetland	0.06	4244
3	Wetland	0.18	4244
24	Wetland	25.58	641
25	Wetland	3.55	6177
26	Wetland	32.39	6177
27	Wetland	2.16	6177
28	Wetland	5.04	6177
29	Wetland	16.18	6177
30	Wetland	3.99	6177
31	Wetland	19.23	621
32	Wetland	16.95	6177
33	Wetland	0.73	610
34	Wetland	3.04	617
35	Wetland	25.97	6177
36	Wetland	1.17	610
37	Wetland	4.40	641
38	Wetland	0.34	641
10	Development	6.86	-
11	Development	4.40	-
12	Development	9.39	-
13	Development	27.77	-
14	Development	8.08	-
16	Development	5.73	-
TOTAL		223.26	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

The score for Alignment 2 for wetlands is one (1).

**3.2.9 Noise**

Within this alignment study area, it was estimated that there are 4,000 residential units, 10 schools, 22 parks, and 2 medical facilities. This alignment received a score of five (5) for noise.

The major noise sources within the study area are traffic on I-595, SR84, Andrews Avenue, and aircraft from the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport. As a result, ambient noise levels from the existing sources may be high enough that the introduction of transit service, especially in close proximity to the major roadways is unlikely to create a substantial noise impact.

Most of the potentially noise sensitive receivers within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment are residential units, including a substantial number of mobile homes located along 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue and I-595. Within the area closest to the airport, much of the land use is industrial or commercial in nature and is not considered extremely noise sensitive. The two medical facilities within the corridor are located along Andrews Avenue and did not appear to have any outdoor areas of frequent human use that would make them especially sensitive to transit noise. The interior areas of these medical facilities are typically air conditioned and are sound proofed with insulated glass and solid exteriors that effectively reduce interior noise levels to well below known abatement criteria. Aside from the single and multi-family homes within the corridor, the receiver that appears to have the highest potential for adverse noise impacts is the Fox Trail Elementary School located adjacent to I-595. A significant portion of the I-595/SR84 corridor is still undeveloped, commercial or industrial in nature. This is also true of a major portion of the western boundary of 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**3.2.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources**

One unique historic structure was identified along Alignment 2. This structure is located in the block bordered by SW 20th Street to the north, SR 84 to the south, SW 15th Avenue to the east, and SW 19th Avenue to the west. A second historic structure that is common to Alignment 1 was identified in the vicinity of I-595, Davie Road, and University Drive. Due to the insignificant difference between the alignments, scores were not given for these resources.

**3.3 ALIGNMENT 3 (SUNRISE BOULEVARD/UNIVERSITY DRIVE/BROWARD BOULEVARD)**

**3.3.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

A total of 21,392 households were determined to exist within ½ mile radius of the proposed stations along this alignment. This number of households received a score of three (3).

**3.3.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The number of employees estimated to be within a ½ mile radius of proposed stations along Alignment 3 is 58,005. This measure received a score of three (3).

**3.3.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Of the 21,932 households in this area, 7,249, or 34 percent, were reported to be minority households by the 2000 US Census. A score of five (5) was assigned for this measure.

**3.3.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

A disabled population of 19,240 was reported within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations along Alignment 3. This population represents 36 percent of the total population. This alignment received a score of four (4) for this measure.

**3.3.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Fourteen (14) percent of the households within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations for Alignment 3 were reported as low-income households. A score of three (3) was assigned for this measure.

### 3.3.6 Community Services

The only community service facility found on Alignment 3 is parks (Figure 13). There are ten city parks and two county parks within the Alignment 3 study area. Both of the county parks (Boulevard Gardens Park and Delevoe Park) and four of the city parks (Plantation Acre Horse Arena, Nob Hill Elementary School/Park, Jacaranda Lakes Park, and Hoffman Park) are located along the outer edges of the study area, leaving ample opportunity to avoid these facilities. Three of the city parks (Veterans Park – Plantation, Marcano Estates Park, and Guthrie-Blake Park) are located within the study area but all are relatively small in size, and the guideway could be designed to avoid these facilities. Two city parks (Woodbury Park and Thrower Park) are located directly adjacent to the existing roadway but are very small and the guideway could be designed to avoid these facilities. One city park (Plantation Volunteer) is also located adjacent to the existing roadway but is larger in size and would limit guideway options if direct impacts were to be completely avoided. This park would be the facility most likely to be impacted on this alignment, through either direct or the indirect affects of increased activity. Such impacts may necessitate a 4(f) evaluation.

The score for this alignment for parks and community services was two (2).

### 3.3.7 Hazardous Materials

A total of twenty-nine individual sites with the potential for contamination concerns have been located within one-quarter mile of either side of the centerline of Alignment 3 (Figure 14). Eight different pollutant types: unknown, arsenic, chlorinated, gasoline, hydraulic oil, mixed product, petroleum, and solvents have been identified, for a total of thirty-one potential contamination products within the twenty-nine sites.

The unknown contaminant type could be any number of potential pollutants. It is associated with a dry cleaner (Dryclean USA, 7165 W Broward Boulevard, Plantation FL). This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The arsenic contaminant type is found at one site (Plantation Golf Club, 7050 W Broward Boulevard, Plantation, FL). This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The chlorinated contaminant type is associated with dry cleaners. There are nine dry cleaners with potential for contamination concerns, located within the Alignment 3 study area. All of the sites are either adjacent or in close proximity to the existing roadway.

Three sites have been identified with gasoline as the pollutant type. All three of these potentially contaminated sites are associated with retail gas stations. All of these appear to be located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The hydraulic oil pollutant type is usually associated with auto repair or heavy equipment operations. There is one location (Sears Roebuck – Auto Repair, 8000 W Broward Boulevard, Plantation, FL) identified with this contaminant type. This potentially contaminated site is located off of the existing roadway but within the limits of the alignment study area.

Five locations have been identified with the mixed product pollutant type. Four of the sites are gas stations, and the other is a dry cleaner (Fashion Cleaners Inc., 2427 W Broward Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) also listed with the chlorinated contaminant

type. All of these sites are located directly adjacent to or in close proximity to the existing roadway.

A total of ten sites have been identified with the petroleum pollutant type. These include nine gas stations and 1 unidentified site. The unidentified site appears to be a truck rental company. All of the petroleum sites, with the exception of one, are located directly adjacent to or within close proximity to the existing roadway. The one site that is within the study area but located off of the roadway is a gas station (Mobil, 2185 N University Drive, Sunrise, FL). One of the sites (Texaco Broward, 3690 W Broward Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) also has gasoline identified on site.

There is one site identified with the solvent pollutant type (Westgate French Cleaners, 117 SR 7 N, Plantation FL) on this alignment. This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

A score of one (1) was assigned to Alignment 3 for this measure.

**3.3.8 Wetlands**

The natural wetlands mapped within the Alignment 3 study area include Melaleuca (424 and 4244), and Mangrove Swamps (612) (Figure 15). Four wetlands have been identified, ranging in size from 0.28 acres to 1.63 acres in size (Table 3). The total combined area of the four wetlands is 4.25 acres. Three of the wetlands (No.'s 4 -6) are mapped as Melaleuca, while the remaining wetland (No. 41) is identified as a Mangrove Swamp. All of these wetlands are located off of the existing roadway and through appropriate design and engineering can be avoided.

There are sixteen development wetlands on this corridor, ranging in size from 0.01 to 28.88 acres and total 57.03 acres. Three of the wetlands (identified as No's 15, 27, & 28 on the Wetlands Maps) are located on the edge of the study area. The remaining thirteen wetlands are located in one area and appear to make one larger contiguous system that is adjacent to the existing roadway. Based on the location within the study corridor, complete avoidance of this grouping of development wetlands may not be feasible.

**Table 3: Alignment 3 Wetlands**

Wetland ID #	Wetland Type	Acres	FLUCFCS
4	Wetland	1.38	4244
5	Wetland	0.96	424
6	Wetland	0.28	424
41	Wetland	1.63	612
1	Development	0.86	-
2	Development	0.32	-
3	Development	0.21	-
15	Development	28.88	-
17	Development	1.07	-
18	Development	0.01	-
19	Development	5.99	-
20	Development	0.13	-
21	Development	0.05	-
22	Development	0.07	-
23	Development	1.99	-
24	Development	0.74	-
25	Development	13.17	-
26	Development	2.41	-
27	Development	0.04	-
28	Development	1.09	-
TOTAL		61.28	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

A score of four (4) was assigned to Alignment 3 for wetland resources.

**3.3.9 Noise**

Alignment 3 was estimated to have 6,700 residential units, 10 schools, 28 parks, 3 medical facilities, and 4 religious facilities within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment. This alignment was given a score of two (2) for noise.

The major noise sources within the corridor are traffic on Sunrise Boulevard, University Drive, Broward Boulevard, Andrews Avenue, and aircraft from the Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport. As a result ambient noise levels from existing sources may be high enough that the introduction of transit service, especially in close proximity to the major roadways, is unlikely to create a substantial noise impact.

Most of the noise sensitive receivers are residential units (single family homes, townhouses, and apartments) along Sunrise Boulevard, University Drive and Broward Boulevard west of SR 7 that abut these roadways. Additional noise sensitive receivers along Sunrise Boulevard include Veterans Park and a KinderCare school and playground. Along University Drive there is a Baptist Church with a day care center, St. Gregory Catholic Church and School, and Our Savior Lutheran Church and School. Along Broward Boulevard is the aforementioned North Fork Elementary School. The remainder of the corridor is dominated by commercial or industrial uses, which, as noted previously, are not identified as being typically noise sensitive.

**3.3.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources**

One historic structure that is common to Alignments 3 and 4 and is located in the area bordered by Broward Boulevard, I-95, and Martin Luther King Avenue, was identified. Due to the insignificant difference between the alignments, scores were not given for these resources.

**3.4 ALIGNMENT 4 (SUNRISE BOULEVARD/SR 7/BROWARD BOULEVARD)**

**3.4.1 Number of Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The total number of households reported to be within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations along Alignment 4 is 22,129. A score of four (4) was assigned for this measure.

**3.4.2 Number of Employees within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

The number of employees estimated to be within a ½ mile radius of proposed stations along this alignment is 54,413. This alignment received a score of three (3) for this measure.

**3.4.3 Percentage of Minority Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Of the 22,129 households within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations, 40 percent are reported to be minority households. This alignment scored a five (5) for this measure.

**3.4.4 Percentage of Disabled Persons within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Of the 56,752 people within a ½ mile of the proposed stations along Alignment 4, 37 percent, or 20,720, were reported to be disabled. A score of four (4) was assigned for this measure.

**3.4.5 Percentage of Low-Income Households within ½ Mile Radius of Proposed Stations**

Low-income households represent 15 percent of the households within a ½ mile radius of proposed stations along Alignment 4. This measure received a score of five (5).

**3.4.6 Community Services**

Three types of community services facilities occur on Alignment 4: hospital, parks, and schools (Figure 16).

Plantation General Hospital is located within the limits of the Alignment 4 study area, but is not adjacent to the existing roadway. Increased activity associated with the increased transit service and new facilities may indirectly affect this facility through increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic and will be considered during PE and preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

There are twelve city parks and two county parks within the study area of Alignment 4. Both of the county parks (Boulevard Gardens Park and Delevoe Park) and six of the city parks (Plantation Acre Horse Arena, Nob Hill Elementary School/Park, Jacaranda Lakes Park, Wolk Park & Pool, and Plantation Mini Parks No.'s 2 & 3) are located along the outer edges of the study area. Three of the city parks (Veterans Park – Plantation, Plantation Mini Park No. 1, and Guthrie-Blake Park) are located within the study area but all are relatively small in size. One city park (Plantation Business Park) is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway but is very small and could be avoided. Two city parks (Plantation Volunteer and Roy C. Salmon Stadium & PAL Field) are also located adjacent to the existing roadway but are larger in size.

Four schools (Plantation High, Plantation Middle, Plantation Elementary, and Peters Elementary) are located along this alignment. The two elementary schools are located along the outer edges of the study area. Both the middle and high schools are located within the Alignment 4 study area but are not directly adjacent to the existing roadway and although may be affected by guideway options, room for avoidance appears to be available.

A score of one (1) was assigned to this alignment for parks and community services.

**3.4.7 Hazardous Materials**

A total of thirty-seven individual sites with the potential for contamination concerns have been identified within one-quarter mile of either side of the centerline of Alignment 4 (Figure 17). Eight different pollutant types: arsenic, chlorinated, diesel, gasoline, mixed product, perc, petroleum, and solvents have been identified, for a total of forty potential contamination products within the thirty-seven sites.

The arsenic contaminant type is found at one site (Sears, 6801 W Sunrise Boulevard, Plantation, FL). This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The chlorinated contaminant type is associated with dry cleaners. There are ten dry cleaners with potential for contamination to be present, located along this alignment. All of the sites are either adjacent to or in close proximity to the existing roadway.

The diesel contaminant type is found at two sites. One site (Hebrew School, 6701 W Sunrise Boulevard, Plantation, FL) is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The other site (Mc Arthur Dairy, 1101 NW 40th Avenue, Lauderhill, FL) is located off the existing roadway at the edge of the Alignment 4 study area.

Three sites have been identified with gasoline as the pollutant. All three are associated with retail gas stations. All of these potential contamination sites appear to be located directly adjacent or within close proximity to the existing roadway.

There are seven locations with the mixed product type identified on this alignment. Four of these sites are gas stations, one is an auto repair facility, there is one dry cleaner, and the other site is the dairy identified above as having the diesel contaminant type. The dry cleaner (Fashion Cleaners Inc., 2427 W Broward Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) is also documented with a chlorinated pollutant type on site. All of these sites, with the exception of the dairy, are located directly adjacent or in close proximity to the existing roadway.

The perc pollutant type is generally associated with dry cleaners. There is one dry cleaner site identified with perc. This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

Fifteen potentially contaminated sites have been identified within the Alignment 4 study area with the petroleum pollutant type. These include thirteen gas stations, 1 auto repair facility and 1 unidentified site. The unidentified site appears to be a truck rental company. All of the petroleum sites, with the exception of two, are located directly adjacent to or within close proximity to the existing roadway. The two exceptions are within the study area but located off of the roadway. One of the sites (Texaco Broward, 3690 W Broward Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale, FL) also has gasoline identified on site.

There is one identified solvent site (Westgate French Cleaners, 117 SR 7 N, Plantation FL) on this study corridor. This site is located directly adjacent to the existing roadway.

The number of hazardous material sites along this alignment scored a five (5).

#### 3.4.8 Wetlands

The natural wetlands mapped within this corridor include Melaleuca (424 and 4244), and Mangrove Swamps (612) (Figure 18). There are a total of four natural wetlands, ranging in size from 0.28 acres to 1.63 acres in size, with a combined area of 4.25 acres (Table 4). Three of the wetlands (No.'s 4, 5 and 6) are mapped as Melaleuca (424 and 4244) while the remaining wetland (No. 41) is categorized as Mangrove Swamp. All of these wetlands are located off of the existing roadway, such that these areas would be avoided.

Fifteen development wetlands have been identified on this corridor. These wetlands range in size from 0.01 to 13.17 acres and total 28.15 acres. Two of the wetlands (identified as No's 27 & 28) are located on the edge of the study area. The remaining thirteen wetlands are located in one area and appear to make up one larger contiguous wetland system that is adjacent to the existing roadway. Based on the location within the study corridor, complete avoidance of this grouping of development wetlands may not be feasible.

**Table 4: Alignment 4 Wetlands**

Wetland ID #	Wetland Type	Acres	FLUCFCS
4	Wetland	1.38	4244
5	Wetland	0.96	424
6	Wetland	0.28	424
41	Wetland	1.63	612
1	Development	0.86	-
2	Development	0.32	-
3	Development	0.21	-
17	Development	1.07	-
18	Development	0.01	-
19	Development	5.99	-
20	Development	0.13	-
21	Development	0.05	-
22	Development	0.07	-
23	Development	1.99	-
24	Development	0.74	-
25	Development	13.17	-
26	Development	2.41	-
27	Development	0.04	-
28	Development	1.09	-
TOTAL		32.40	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

The score for wetlands along Alignment 4 was five (5).

**3.4.9 Noise**

This alternative was estimated to have 6,700 residential units, 14 schools, 30 parks, 4 medical facilities, and 4 religious facilities within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment. This alignment scored a two (2) for potential noise receptors.

The major noise sources within the corridor are traffic on Sunrise Boulevard, SR 7, Broward Boulevard, Andrews Avenue, and aircraft from the Fort Lauderdale/ Hollywood International Airport. As a result, ambient noise levels from existing sources may be high enough that the introduction of transit service, especially in close proximity to the major roadways, is unlikely to create a substantial noise impact.

Most of the noise sensitive receivers are residential units (single family homes, townhouses, and apartments) that abut Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard west of SR 7. Other noise sensitive receivers along Sunrise Boulevard include Veterans Park; a KinderCare school and playground; the Church of God of West Broward with it's Kiddie Academy, Child Care, and Preschool; the Perlman Jewish Center and Posnak Jewish Day School; the Blake School; the Plantation Middle School; and the Plantation High School. Along Broward Boulevard is the aforementioned North Fork Elementary School.

The remainder of the corridor is dominated by commercial or industrial uses, which, as noted previously, are not identified as being typically noise sensitive.

#### 3.4.10 Historic and Archaeological Resources

One historic structure that is common to Alignments 3 and 4 and is located in the area bordered by Broward Boulevard, I-95, and Martin Luther King Avenue, was identified. Due to the insignificant difference between the alignments, scores were not given for these resources.

### **3.5 EASTERN TERMINUS**

This segment of the alignments was separately screened for community services, hazardous materials and wetlands, since each of the alignment alternatives include this area. In order to try to distinguish between the alignments, it was determined that only the unique segments of each alignment should be compared. Therefore, this section provides information on the environmental resources found in the Eastern Terminus, but does not include scores, as this was not completed for this segment.

#### 3.5.1 Community Services

The eastern terminus, which is shared by all four alignments, supports four different community services which may be affected by the project: colleges, hospitals, libraries, parks and schools (Figure 19). There are three colleges, one library (main branch), one hospital, twelve city parks and four schools. The only facility that may be unavoidable is Esplanade Park (also known as Discovery Park). If guideway options are not limited to the existing right-of-way, a 4(f) evaluation would have to be conducted during the PE phase of the project.

#### 3.5.2 Hazardous Materials

The eastern terminus of the project has thirty-one hazardous material sites and one hazardous waste transfer site. Two of these sites have more than one listed hazardous material. The types of hazardous materials found in this area include: diesel, fuel oil, gasoline, jet fuel, mixed product, perc, petroleum, solvents, used oil and one unknown. The location of these hazardous materials sites range across the ½ mile corridor area.

Many of the sites located directly adjacent to the existing roadway are associated with gas stations but are not limited to these types of facilities. The southern portion of this terminus has many facilities, such as car rental companies and aircraft service facilities, associated with the airport.

#### 3.5.3 Wetlands

The eastern terminus supports sixteen natural wetlands ranging in size from 0.09 acres to 7.75 acres that total 18.80 acres (Figures 9, 12 and 15 & Table 5). There are six development wetlands with the eastern terminus sections ranging from 0.36 acres to 8.53 acres and total 23.19 acres. The eastern terminus also includes two bridge crossings of the New River. In the downtown area, concrete bulkheads line the river, and no natural shoreline remains. At Andrews Avenue, only the south side of the river has been seawalled, and the north shoreline is densely vegetated by mangroves.

**Table 5: Eastern Terminus Wetlands**

<b>Wetland ID #</b>	<b>Wetland Type</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>FLUCFCS</b>
8	Wetland	0.40	612
9	Wetland	0.47	612
10	Wetland	0.09	612
11	Wetland	0.51	612
12	Wetland	7.75	612
13	Wetland	0.23	612
14	Wetland	0.17	612
15	Wetland	0.11	612
16	Wetland	1.16	612
17	Wetland	0.12	612
18	Wetland	0.82	612
19	Wetland	0.67	612
20	Wetland	0.66	612
21	Wetland	0.28	612
22	Wetland	2.20	612
23	Wetland	3.16	641
4	Development	0.36	-
5	Development	4.65	-
6	Development	2.24	-
7	Development	8.53	-
8	Development	5.12	-
9	Development	2.29	-
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>41.99</b>	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

### 3.6 WESTERN TERMINUS

This segment, common to all four alignments, was screened separately for wetlands.

#### 3.6.1 Wetlands

The extreme western terminus of the project (NW 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Sunrise Boulevard north to the end of the project) is also identical for all four of the alignments. Wetlands mapped within this short segment of the project include three natural wetlands ranging in size from 0.24 acres to 11.70 acres and two development wetlands ranging in size from 29.95 acres to 43.90 acres (Table 6).

**Table 6: Western Terminus Wetlands**

Wetland ID #	Wetland Type	Acres	FLUCFCS
42	Wetland	0.76	641
43	Wetland	11.70	641
44	Wetland	0.24	641
29	Development	43.90	-
30	Development	29.95	-
TOTAL		86.55	

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

## 4.0 CONCLUSIONS

### 4.1 NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN ½ MILE RADIUS OF PROPOSED STATIONS

Alignment 4 scored the highest for the total number of households within a ½ mile radius of proposed stations. Alignments 1 and 3 tied with the second highest score, and Alignment 2 was the lowest scored alternative.

**Table 7: Number of Household Rankings**

Alignment	Number of Households	Score
1	21,539	3
2	17,480	1
3	21,392	3
4	22,129	4

Source: Carter & Burgess, Inc., 2004.

### 4.2 NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WITHIN ½ MILE RADIUS OF PROPOSED STATIONS

There was not a significant difference in the number of employees within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations along each alignment, so each alternative scored the same.

**Table 8: Number of Employees Rankings**

Alignment	Number of Employees	Score
1	56,850	3
2	54,700	3
3	58,005	3
4	54,413	3

Source: Carter & Burgess, Inc., 2004.

### 4.3 PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN ½ MILE RADIUS OF PROPOSED STATIONS

Alignments 1, 3 and 4 scored the same for this measure. Only Alignment 2 had a significantly lower percentage of minority households.

**Table 9: Percent of Minority Household Rankings**

<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Percent Minority Households</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	35%	5
<b>2</b>	26%	2
<b>3</b>	34%	5
<b>4</b>	40%	5

Source: Carter & Burgess, Inc., 2004.

**4.4 PERCENTAGE OF DISABLED PERSONS WITHIN ½ MILE RADIUS OF PROPOSED STATIONS**

Alignments 3 and 4 scored the same for this measure, with the higher percentages of disabled persons. Alignments 1 and 2 also scored the same with slightly lower percentages of disabled persons.

**Table 10: Percent of Disabled Persons Rankings**

<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Percent Disabled Persons</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	34%	3
<b>2</b>	33%	3
<b>3</b>	36%	4
<b>4</b>	37%	4

Source: Carter & Burgess, Inc., 2004.

**4.5 PERCENTAGE OF LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN ½ MILE RADIUS OF PROPOSED STATIONS**

There was not a significant difference in the percentage of low-income households within a ½ mile radius of the proposed stations along each alignment, so each alternative scored the same.

**Table 11: Percent Low-Income Household Rankings**

<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Percent Low-Income Households</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	15%	5
<b>2</b>	15%	5
<b>3</b>	14%	5
<b>4</b>	15%	5

Source: Carter & Burgess, Inc., 2004.

**4.6 COMMUNITY SERVICES**

The alignment with the fewest number of community services appears to be Alignment 2 (Table 12). However, a design that includes avoidance of major county parks (Pond Apple Slough and Secret Woods Nature Center) is a critical issue for this alignment. The next best alternative appears to be Alignment 1.

**Table 12: Community Service Rankings**

Alignment	Number for Each Service					Ranking for Each Service*					Composite Ranking	Final Ranking
	Schools	Colleges	Parks	Hospitals	Libraries	Schools	Colleges	Parks	Hospitals	Libraries		
1	7	9	24	1	1	3	5	4	5	5	22	4
2	7	3	22	1	1	3	5	5	5	5	23	5
3	4	3	28	1	1	5	5	2	5	5	22	4
4	8	3	30	2	1	2	5	1	4	5	17	1

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

\*Each service assigned a ranking of 1 – 5 with 5 being the best and assigned to the alignment with the fewest number of services.

#### 4.7 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The alignment with the fewest number of identified hazardous materials sites appears to be the Alignment 2 (Table 13). This alternative does not support as many commercial developments as the other alignment alternatives. It is possible that the hazardous materials sites identified along this alternative, although fewer in number, may actually yield a greater degree of contamination concern to the project, but this is not known at this time. Further and more detailed study of the individual sites identified for each alternative would need to be conducted in order to yield more accurate results regarding potential contamination concerns.

**Table 13: Hazardous Materials Rankings**

Alignment	Total Number of Hazardous Materials Sites	Ranking*
1	62	3
2	59	5
3	60	4
4	67	1

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

\* Ranking of 1 – 5 with 5 being the best and assigned to the alignment with the lowest number of hazardous materials sites.

#### 4.8 WETLANDS

Alignment 4 appears to be the alternative with the least likelihood for impacts to both natural and development wetlands, assuming designs are employed that minimize wetland impacts (Table 14). This alternative appears to have the fewest number of natural wetlands. Although this alignment appears to include a grouping of development wetlands near the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and Flamingo Road, ground-truthing revealed that these areas appear to actually consist of stormwater treatment areas, and are therefore of lesser wetland habitat value.

**Table 14: Wetlands Rankings**

Alignment	Points*				Total # of Wetlands**				Composite Ranking	Final Ranking***
	Wetlands	Development Wetlands	Total Points	Points Ranking	Wetlands	Development Wetlands	Total Number of Wetlands	Total Wetlands Ranking		
1	133	39	172	1	29	13	42	5	6	3
2	158	43	201	3	39	14	53	1	4	1
3	112	110	222	5	25	24	49	2	7	4
4	112	110	222	5	25	23	48	3	8	5

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

\* Points are obtained from 2 variables: location within corridor (perimeter, middle, or adjacent to existing roadway) and by wetland size. A ranking of 1-5 is assigned to each alignment with 5 being the best and assigned to the alignment with the highest points for wetlands.

\*\* Ranking of 1-5 is assigned to each alignment with 5 being the best and assigned to the alignment with the least number of wetlands.

\*\*\* A final ranking of 1-5 is assigned to each alignment with 5 being the best and assigned to the alignment with the highest composite (combination of points ranking and total wetlands ranking) ranking.

#### 4.9 NOISE

The alignment with the lowest estimate of noise sensitive receptors appears to be Alignment 2 (Table 15). This alternative is dominated by a mix of commercial, industrial and open space interspersed with residential areas. Only one school, Fox Trail Elementary, is within one-quarter mile of the centerline of the alignment. The existing traffic noise from the major roadways and the noise from aircraft at Fort Lauderdale/ Hollywood International Airport tend to dominate the noise environment within this alignment. Ambient noise levels from existing sources may be high enough that the introduction of transit service, especially in close proximity to major roadways, is unlikely to create a substantial noise impact.

**Table 15: Noise Rankings**

Alignment	Number of Residential Units	Number of Schools	Number of Parks	Number of Medical Facilities	Number of Religious Facilities	Ranking
1	7,700	10	35	2	1	4
2	4,000	10	22	2	0	5
3	6,700	10	28	3	4	3
4	6,700	14	30	4	4	2

Source: ESA, 2004.

Notes: The numbers contained in this table are estimates only and should not be considered as exact values.

A final alignment ranking for the environmental screening criteria (excluding the socio-economic conditions) is based on a calculation of all of the individual environmental criterion scores (Table 16). As this shows, Alignments 2 and 3 scored the highest, followed closely by Alignment 1. Alignment 4 falls well below the other three alignments in all categories, with the exception of the wetlands category.

The community services located along the routes for Alignments 2 and 3 appear to be easily avoided through proper placement of the guideway. If the proposed project route could not be

placed to avoid impacts to the parks located along either of these alignments, a 4 (f) Evaluation would likely be triggered.

The fewest number of hazardous materials sites are found on Alignments 2 and 3. At this time no detailed data has been collected for these sites that could point to whether or not potential contamination issues may be a concern in the development of either of these alignments. A more detailed assessment would be conducted during the PE phase of the project, and a Contamination Screening Evaluation Report will be prepared. However, no significant hazardous materials issues, such as superfund sites or unlined landfills, have been identified for any of the alignments.

The wetlands associated with Alignment 2 are the most sensitive of all of the alignments and should be avoided completely. This can be accomplished if the guideway is located within the existing right-of-way. The wetlands associated with Alignment 3 are infrequent and do not appear to be significant in size. There are some moderately sized “development wetlands” which have been mapped adjacent to the existing roadway. Avoidance of these areas is recommended to the greatest degree possible. The potential for wetland impacts will be further evaluated during the PE phase of the project, in which a Wetland Evaluation Report will be prepared.

Alignment 2 is ranked the highest ranked in relation to number of noise receptors, while Alignment 3 is ranked in the middle. The nature of development, primarily commercial, industrial, and undeveloped, along the existing roadways will probably mask any additional noise created by a transit service. A detailed noise study will be conducted during the PE phase of the project.

**Table 16: Cumulative Evaluation Matrix**

<b>Alignment</b>	<b>Community Services</b>	<b>Hazardous Material Sites</b>	<b>Wetlands</b>	<b>Noise</b>	<b>Composite Ranking</b>	<b>Final Ranking*</b>
1	4	3	3	4	14	3
2	5	5	1	5	16	5
3	4	4	5	3	16	5
4	1	1	4	2	8	1

Source: Quest Ecology, 2004.

**APPENDIX A**

**Table A-1: Historic Structure Inventory**

Block Location (N/S/E/W)	Number of Structures	Alignment			
		1	2	3	4
1. NW 4th St./Broward Blvd./Palm Ave./NW 15th Ave.	0	X	X	X	X
2. NW 4th St./NW 2nd St./NW 9th Ave./Palm Ave.	2	X	X	X	X
3. NW 4th St./NW 2nd St./NW 7th Ave./NW 9th Ave.	17	X	X	X	X
4. NW 4th St./NW 2nd St./N. Andrews Ave./NW 7th Ave.	7	X	X	X	X
5. NE 4th St./NE 2nd St./NE 3rd Ave./Andrews Ave.	5	X	X	X	X
6. NE 4th St./NE 2nd St./Federal Hwy./NE 3rd Ave.	7	X	X	X	X
7. NW 2nd St./Broward Blvd./NW 9th Ave./Palm Ave.	0	X	X	X	X
8. NW 2nd St./Broward Blvd./NW 7th Ave./NW 9th Ave.	0	X	X	X	X
9. NW 2nd St./Broward Blvd./Andrews Ave./NW 7th Ave.	9	X	X	X	X
10. NE 2nd St./Broward Blvd./NE 3rd Ave./Andrews Ave.	1	X	X	X	X
11. NE 2nd St./Broward Blvd./Federal Hwy./NE 3rd Ave.	5	X	X	X	X
12. Broward Blvd/Las Olas Blvd/Palm Ave./NW 15th Ave.	10	X	X	X	X
13. Broward Blvd/Himmarshee St./NW 7th Ave/Palm Ave	8	X	X	X	X
14. Broward Blvd/Himmarshee St./Andrews Ave/SW 7th Ave.	34	X	X	X	X
15. Broward Blvd/Himmarshee St./SE 3rd Ave/Andrews Ave.	2	X	X	X	X
16. Broward Blvd/Himmarshee St./Federal Hwy/SE 3rd Ave.	1	X	X	X	X
17. Himmarshee St./Las Olas Blvd/SW 4th Ave/Palm Ave.	40	X	X	X	X
18. Himmarshee St./SE 7th St./Andrews Ave/SW 4th Ave	73	X	X	X	X
19. Himmarshee St./Las Olas Blvd/SE 3rd Ave/Andrews Ave.	2	X	X	X	X
20. Himmarshee St./Las Olas Blvd/Federal Hwy/SE 3rd Ave.	3	X	X	X	X
21. SW 4th Ave./SE 7th St./SW 4th Ave./NW 7th Ave.	34	X	X	X	X
22. Las Olas Blvd/SE 7th St./SE 3rd Ave/Andrews Ave.	20	X	X	X	X
23. Las Olas Blvd/SE 7th St./Federal Hwy/SE 3rd Ave.	16	X	X	X	X
24. SW 7th St./Davie Blvd./SW 4th Ave./SW 7th Ave.	15	X	X	X	X
25. SW 7th St./Davie Blvd./Andrews Ave./SW 4th Ave.	13	X	X	X	X
26. SE 7th St./Davie Blvd./SE 3rd Ave./Andrews Ave.	21	X	X	X	X
27. SE 7th St./Davie Blvd./Federal Hwy/SE 3rd Ave.	2	X	X	X	X
28. Davie Blvd./SW 17th St./SW 4th Ave/1/4-mile radius	3	X	X	X	X
29. Davie Blvd./SW 17th St./Andrews Ave./SW 4th Ave.	3	X	X	X	X
30. Davie Blvd./SW 17th St./SE 3rd Ave./Andrews Ave.	7	X	X	X	X
31. Davie Blvd./SW 17th St./Federal Hwy/SE 3rd Ave.	8	X	X	X	X
32. SW 17th St./SW 19th St./SW 4th Ave./1/4-mile radius	0	X	X	X	X
33. SW 17th St./SR 84/Andrews Ave./SW 4th Ave.	6	X	X	X	X
34. SW 17th St./SR 84/Federal Hwy./Andrews Ave.	4	X	X	X	X
35. SW 17th St./Spangler Blvd./1/4-mile radius/Federal Hwy.	0	X	X	X	X
36. SW 20th St./SR 84/SW 15th Ave/SW 19th Ave.	1		X		
37. Davie Blvd./SW 16th St./SW 31st Ave./SR 7	1	X			
38. Broward Blvd./Peters Rd./SR 7/Ft. Lauderdale C.C.	1	X			
39. Broward Blvd./1/4-mile radius/I-95/Martin Luther King Ave	1	X		X	X
40. I-595/1/4-mile radius/Davie Rd./University Dr.	1	X	X		