

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – DISTRICT IV

General Comments

1. **Please include the approved Methodology Letter of Understanding in the submittal.**

The document requested has been included as Appendix 21-1 (R).

2. **Please include the latest Master Plan in the submittal.**

The latest master plan is included in Exhibit 21-4 (R).

3. **Please include more information regarding the expected subsequent analysis and requirements for the Turnpike Interchange Justification Report (TIJR) for the NW 170th Street interchange mentioned above. Please identify the parties responsible for the analysis and funding of the interchange. FDOT would like to review the TIJR's analysis of impacts to I-75. FDOT is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study for the I-75 corridor.**

An interchange at this location is subject to the Department's policies, procedures and guidelines for approval. Approval must be given by the FTE and have concurrence from FDOT District 6 and Central Office. In addition, the interchange must be included on local government adopted plans.

Existing Conditions

Page 21-4, Exhibit 21-2, *Annual Average Daily Traffic:*

4. **Please include count from the telemeter site number 87-0137, on Palmetto Expressway 2,600 feet west of NW 67th Avenue.**

Consistent with the Miami-Dade Concurrency Management Database, Exhibit 21-2 (R) shows the traffic count for station #576 between NW 138 Street and NW 67 Avenue. The link analysis however did reflect the count for station # 0137. Exhibit 21-2 (R) has been revised to reflect the count at this station.

Pages 21-6 and 21-7, Table 21-1, *Existing Traffic Conditions:*

5. **Please justify the directional service volume of 608 used for portions of NW 138th Street and W 68th Street/NW 122nd Street.**

The LOS D Service Volume for a lane undivided Non-State Roadway adjusted down by 20% because left turn lanes are not available at major intersections was used for these roads.

6. **Please correct the laneage for NW 107th Avenue between NW 162nd Street and NW 138th Street. Southbound from NW 162nd Street to NW 154th Street should be "NA" and southbound from NW 154th Street to NW 138th Street should be "ILU".**

The number of lanes column in Table 21-1 (R) has been revised to reflect the existing lane configuration, as requested.

- 7. Please explain "Existing Backlog Improvements" and clarify if they are identified in the first three years of the Transportation Improvement Programs. If they are not, please remove their inclusion.**

It was agreed during discussions with reviewing agencies that the improvements needed to eliminate backlogs will be discussed in the text, but will not be included in the analysis of future traffic conditions. Backlog assumptions affect proportionate share calculations and are intended to be part of that future discussion. Tables depicting roadway segment analysis have been revised to reflect this.

Page 21-11, Table 21-2, *Committed Roadway Improvements:*

- 8. Please check all roadways improvements against Transportation Improvement Programs provided in the Appendix 21-3 for consistency. For example, project on Okeechobee Road between east of W 12th Street and W 19th Street is "landscaping", not "add lanes & reconstruction".**

The improvement mentioned above has been completed. The remaining tasks are landscape and design. The analysis for this segment shows the number of lanes currently built. Table 21-2 (R) has been revised to reflect this.

Appendix 21-1, *Traffic Counts and Factors:*

- 9. Please include information from telemeter site 87-0137.**

Consistent with the Miami-Dade Concurrency Management Database, Exhibit 21-2 (R) shows the traffic count for station #576 between NW 138 Street and NW 67 Avenue. The link analysis however did reflect the count for station # 0137. Exhibit 21-2 (R) has been revised to reflect the count at this station.

- 10. It is unclear how the K and D factors are used in the traffic analyses. Please provide description how these factors are used and on what roadways they are being applied.**

Attachment 21-2 includes a description of the use of these factors and is located in **Question 21 - Transportation.**

Appendix 21-4, *Traffic Diversions Documentation:*

- 11. The highway network maps are illegible. Please provide legible plots for review.**

The maps have been re-printed into smaller sections to allow for better legibility.

- 12. Please show how the diverted-linked trip assignments get added back to the roadways leading to the project site. Diverted-lined trips are counted as new trips where they travel on roadway segments required to reach to the project site where they previously did not travel.**

Appendix 21-6 (R) has been revised to include the assignment of pass-by and diverted linked trips, as requested.

Trip Generation

Page 21-14, Table 21-4, *Trip Generation and Internalization:*

- 13. Please remove all internalized trips except for those between Retail and Office land uses.**

Table 21-4 (R) provided in the ADA is based on the ITE internalization guidelines. It was agreed during discussions with the reviewer that internalization between the warehouse and retail components would be eliminated. Table 21-4 has been revised to reflect this. The resulting data has been transferred into the official ITE internalization matrix form and is provided as Attachment 21-3.

- 14. The additional "out" vehicle trip adjusted for trucks seems to be calculated incorrectly.**

A difference of 1 vehicle was found for the outbound warehouse volume due to rounding. Table 21-4 (R) was revised.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Pages 21-22 and 21-23, Table 21-7, *Project Traffic Assignment:*

- 15. The peak-hour directional service volumes used for the project significant test should be the service volumes of the existing plus committed laneage, not the "improved to reduce or eliminate backlog" laneage.**

It was agreed during discussions with reviewing agencies that the improvements needed to eliminate backlogs will be discussed in the text, but will not be included in the analysis of future traffic conditions. Backlog assumptions affect proportionate share calculations and are intended to be part of that future discussion. Tables depicting roadway segment analysis have been revised to reflect this.

- 16. The percent project traffic consumption should be calculated for each direction. For example, NB I-75 between Miramar Parkway and HEFT should show a 5.3% (491/9340) usage of the service volume, hence this segment is significant. Please revise.**

Table 21-7 (R) has been revised to show one-way and two-way consumption.

Appendix 21-10, *Model Outputs:*

- 17. The model output plots depicting the project traffic are unclear. Please provide a map showing project traffic percentages along all major roadways. Please clearly show the percent distribution from the project site; the percent assigned to external roads should add up to 100 percent. In addition, please track all project trip percentages until they are less than 5 percent of the adopted service volumes.**

A map showing the project assignment has been included as Attachment 21-4.

Appendix 21-12, *Project Consumption Calculations:*

18. Please ensure that the service volume threshold reflects the existing plus committed laneage, and revise the "percent consumption" column for each direction separately.

Service Volumes used reflect the existing plus committed lane configuration. Directional consumption has also been added to the table, as requested.

Future Traffic Analyses

Pages 21-19 and 21-20, Table 21-6, *Future Traffic Conditions without Project:*

19. It is unclear how the year 2018 volumes were calculated. For example: using the 1.4% annual growth rate for Palmetto Expressway: $8,135 \times (1+0.014)^{11}$ years = 9,479 not 8,307. Please justify or revise accordingly.

As agreed in the methodology, half of the background growth rate was applied to 2007 volumes to estimate 2018 background growth. Committed development traffic was then accounted for separately.

Appendix 21-9, *Committed Developments Documentation:*

20. Please show how the committed trips were used in calculating the total traffic.

A table has been prepared and is included as Attachment 21-2 to show each component of the traffic forecasts developed for future (2018) traffic conditions and is located in **Question 21 - Transportation.**

Intersection Analyses

Page 21-26, Table 21-9, *Intersection and Ramp Analysis Results:*

21. Please revise this table to include all intersection and ramp analyses as a number of new intersections are likely to be added to the impacted intersection list.

Table 21-9 (R) has been revised as requested.

22. Please correct the intersection name for NW 162nd Street and NW 97th Avenue intersection.

The name of the intersection has been changed as requested.

23. Please ensure that all pass-by and diverted trips are added back to the driveways, roadway segments, intersections, and ramps leading to the project site.

Appendix 21-6 (R) has been revised to include the assignment of pass-by and diverted linked trips, as requested.

Appendix 21-2, *Intersection Analysis Worksheets*:

24. It is unclear how the 2018 turning movement volumes were determined. Please include all documentation (growth calculations, TM Tools, Turns output sheet, etc.) to support the future background volumes.

Documentation regarding the development of turning movements is provided in Attachment 21-5.

25. It is unclear how the total traffic (2018 background plus project traffic) was calculated. Please include figures and/or tables showing the projected turning movement counts, project traffic percentages, committed traffic from other developments, applicable pass-by/diverting traffic, and total traffic calculations.

Documentation regarding the development of turning movements is provided in Attachment 21-5.

26. Please use a corridor-wide or a system-wide peak hour factor (PHF) for all intersection analysis. The applicant has used a PHF of 1.0 at the intersection of NW 122nd Street and NW 97th Avenue, which is highly unlikely.

The PHFs have been reviewed and adjusted as requested.

27. The proposed signal re-timing at several intersections seem to be unrealistic. It should be noted that a minimum cycle length should be used, and a combination of various second cycle lengths proposed will not provide the best progression along a corridor (e.g. along NW 170th Street) and should be avoided.

Cycle lengths have been reviewed and changed as requested.

Mitigation

28. Based on the *Florida House Bill (HB) 7203 – Comprehensive Planning* and *HB 985 – Transportation*, the applicant is not responsible for mitigating existing deficiencies (backlog), but the applicant is responsible for mitigating any additional impacts created by background and project traffic. For instance, if a backlogged roadway is currently operating at a volume-to-service-capacity ratio (v/sc) of 1.10 under existing conditions, and a proposed project's traffic with background traffic causes the backlogged roadway to operate at 1.20 v/sc, then the applicant is responsible for mitigation measures that will bring v/sc back to 1.10 v/sc. Likewise, if an intersection approach is operating at backlogged LOS E with 60.0 seconds of delay, then it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that intersection approach is at least operating at LOS E with 60.0 seconds of delay in the buildout year. It is also important to note the service volumes should be for the existing plus committed laneage configurations. The Department recommends that the applicant meet with all review agencies through the Planning Council to reach a consensus on the proportionate-share calculation on the backlog facilities.

It was agreed during discussions with reviewing agencies that the improvements needed to eliminate backlogs will be discussed in the text, but will not be included in the analysis

of future traffic conditions. Backlog assumptions affect proportionate share calculations and are intended to be part of that future discussion. Tables depicting roadway segment analysis have been revised to reflect this.

29. Please provide a revised list of roadway with transportation deficiencies and their associated mitigation.

Question 21 has been revised to reflect all improvements needed in the study area based on the revised analyses.

30. Please note that all roadways and intersections should be mitigated back to existing conditions (if they are identified as backlogged facilities) or the adopted level-of-service.

It was agreed during discussions with reviewing agencies that the improvements needed to eliminate backlogs will be discussed in the text, but will not be included in the analysis of future traffic conditions. Backlog assumptions affect proportionate share calculations and are intended to be part of that future discussion. Tables depicting roadway segment analysis have been revised to reflect this.