



# University Drive Mobility Improvements Planning Study

## Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

### Meeting #7 Agenda

July 23, 2014 | 2:00 PM - 3:30 PM

Broward County Transit

Broward County Government Center West

1 N. University Drive, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Hearing Room (GC- West),  
Plantation, FL 33324

#### Action Items/Decisions for this PAC Meeting:

- Determine which alternatives to move forward to the Committees and Board
- Select a locally preferred alternative for recommendation

#### Agenda Items:

1. Refresher on 9 Alternatives
2. Public outreach conducted
3. Input we received from:
  - a. TCC/CIR
  - b. Elected official debriefings
  - c. Public
4. Alternatives to move forward based on feedback
5. Recommended locally preferred alternative



# University Drive Mobility Improvements Planning Study

## Summary of Input Received on Alternatives

### July 16, 2014

Below is a table summarizing the input received on the nine alternatives (Silver through Violet) during the end of May, June, and early July 2014 time period. The table also includes the study team’s recommended actions to take for each comment. This information should be reviewed by the PAC members prior to meeting on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. The actions agreed to at the July PAC meeting will be move forward into the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative study phase.

**Table 1. Feedback Received on the Series of Alternatives Developed for the U-Drive Study**

Comments	Recommended Action
<b>PAC Feedback</b>	
Multiple municipalities concerned over the traffic impacts to removing right-turn lanes.	Removal of right-turn lanes will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in the next phase of implementation; the technical analysis that illustrates the benefits and impacts should be shared with each municipality prior to implementation.
BCT had questions on the operating costs and fleet size.	Follow-up meeting was held with BCT; BCT provided updates to the operating costs prior to presenting to the TCC and CIR.
Municipalities were generally supportive of landscape buffers if low-maintenance materials are used but stated that prior to implementation, this should be coordinated with the municipal engineering/public works staff.	Prior to implementation, this should be coordinated with the municipal engineering/public works staff.
<b>TCC Feedback</b>	
On-time performance target for BCT was requested.	BCT is constantly working on this. This should be addressed outside the U-Drive project among the different agencies/partners.
Removing right-turn lanes is not safer for bicyclists.	Removal of right-turn lanes modifies the location of potential conflict between autos and bicyclists. Research statistics on this treatment will be referenced if they exist.
<b>CIR Feedback</b>	
Colored asphalt was requested for the sidewalk and bicycle projects.	This should be addressed at a further stage in the study (i.e., during design/construction).

Comments	Recommended Action
<b>MPO Board Feedback (based on debriefs only)</b>	
Universal concern with the traffic impacts related to the Red and Magenta alternatives (i.e., Business Access and Transit Only lane scenarios).	Remove the Red and Magenta Alternatives from consideration for the Locally Preferred Alternative.
Universal concern with the Violet Alternative (widening University Drive from 6 to 8 lanes) due to the property impacts and costs.	Remove the Violet Alternative from consideration for the Locally Preferred Alternative.
Side streets for biking were recommended.	The project has assessed bike and sidewalk network within a ¼ mile and ½ mile respectively.
Education is needed to make a big impact.	Safety education should be conducted outside the scope of the U-Drive project. With whom should we coordinate this with?
Countdown pedestrian signal heads should be included in the signal upgrades (Can the total wait and walk time be provided? This would require signs that accommodate 3 digits)	Countdown heads will be included in the project list.
Report back to City Managers on study recommendations/findings.	Information will be shared with City Managers via the PAC members.
Enforcement and education are needed to make a big impact on the pedestrian safety problem.	Education and enforcement should be conducted on a region-wide basis and is not within the scope of the U-Drive project. This issue will be shared with the Broward MPO and the County.
Requested “arms” be placed on the front of the BCT buses similar to what school buses have to help with safety.	This recommendation/idea will be shared with BCT.
Walking bridges over the canals in the southern end were requested.	There is interest from Miramar/Pembroke Pines in seeking grants for foot bridges across the canal based on the U-Drive study findings.
Transit routes from Parkland directly to FAU, FLL Airport, and Port Everglades were desired.	These travel markets were not within the U-Drive study travel market findings. However, these transit routes may be explored further outside the scope of the U-Drive study.
MDT’s NW 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue enhanced bus project information was requested by Miramar.	This information was sent to Miramar.
A request was made that a summary is prepared for each city that summarizes the improvements specific to that city.	Brief summaries will be prepared for each City along the corridor.
Multiple municipalities concerned over the traffic impacts to removing right-turn lanes.	Removal of right-turn lanes will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in the next phase of implementation; the technical analysis that illustrates the benefits and impacts should be shared with each municipality prior to

Comments	Recommended Action
	implementation.
Support for Complete Streets (bike and pedestrian-related design elements).	Keep these elements as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative (both short- and long-term improvements).
Include barriers to pedestrians crossing in the median.	FDOT District 4 Traffic Operations Unit is currently conducting a Roadway Safety Audit (RSA) or similar research to understand the feasibility of this.
Question raised regarding signal pre-emption for emergency vehicles and whether or not the recovery time can be reduced through technology/software options.	This item will be shared with BCTED and the Miramar PAC member will be followed up with stating that the item was shared with the agency.
Question raised regarding whether there is a loss time associated with Transit Signal Priority, similar to signal pre-emption.	Follow-up with the Miramar PAC member that TSP does not take the system out of coordination.
The widening of University Drive may only be supported to Wiles Road (rather than to the Sawgrass Expressway); coordinate this with Paul Carpenter.	Follow-up with Paul Carpenter; continue to report what is on the adopted TIP.
Opposition to on-street bike lanes; include a buffer of at least 2-3 feet between the bike lane and auto travel lane.	This is consistent with the Yellow Alternative and all the subsequent Alternatives.
Support for pedestrian scale lighting. The City of Plantation has a maintenance agreement with FDOT so that they maintain the lights.	Request a copy from Scott and/or the City of Plantation.
What is the breakeven of the age of the pedestrian deaths in the Dangerous by Design report?	Research this and share the information with Commissioner Vignola and Paul Carpenter.
<b>Public Feedback</b>	
As of early July (and nearly 400 survey responses), Alternative Green ranked highest, with Alternatives Blue and Yellow ranked second highest.	Feedback does not conflict with the Committees and Board feedback. No action needed.
Car travel time was highest priority, with pedestrian and bicycle safety second highest, and transit travel time third highest.	No action needed.
General comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve auto travel times</li> <li>• Better design for bikers and pedestrians</li> <li>• More shade trees</li> <li>• Promote public transit solutions</li> <li>• Add bus bays that do not impede auto traffic</li> <li>• Existing and planned land uses do not support robust transit investment</li> </ul>	Feedback is consistent with projects included in the series of alternatives aside from few comments received on transit modes that were screened out in Tier 1 due to cost (versus the benefit/demand). All public comments are important and will be documented in the final report.

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Put buildings closer to the street and provide for safe mid-block pedestrian crossing</li><li>• Coordinate traffic signals</li><li>• Encourage community shuttles to destinations along the corridor</li><li>• You are doing great work to improve the quality of life</li><li>• Provide shelters at bus stops</li><li>• Provide underground transit from the Tri-Rail terminal in Palm Beach County to the West Dade Metro Terminal</li></ul>	