

MIAMI-DADE EXPRESSWAY AUTHORITY

1. **Based on the information provided by the Applicant in the Question 21 response, SR 924 between the SR 826 to NW 57th Avenue/Red Road and W 4 Avenue has been considered a part of the traffic impact study area. The study also shows [Table 21-4, October 2007] that of the total 4,254 DRI external PM peak hour trips:**
 - **13 percent [or 359 trips eastbound and 164 trips westbound] were assigned to SR 924 between the SR 826 to NW 57th Avenue/Red Road and W 4 Avenue [Table 21.7].**

This comment has been acknowledged by the Applicant.

2. **The use of inappropriate Service Volumes in the ADA response was found during a spot check on MDX facilities. The ADA response shows that the DR! project trips do not reach the 5 percent threshold (project trips divided by the adopted maximum service volume) on the SR 924 segment included in the analysis in Table 21.7. If the correct service volume is used in the computation, the studied eastbound segment of SR 924 does reaches the 5% threshold while the segment on the opposite direction does not reach the threshold. Hence the segment of SR 924 from NW 57th Avenue/Red Road/ W 4 Avenue to NW 37th Avenue / Le Jeune Road/ Douglas Expressway should be also included in the analysis. The applicant should review all Service Volumes for all studied roadways in applicable Tables (i.e. 21-1, 21-6, 21-7, 21-8, etc.). The applicant should specify the background growth rate used in the development of future SR 924 traffic volumes.**

The Service Volume for the segment analyzed on SR 924 has been corrected to reflect that of a six lane freeway with interchange spacing greater than or equal to two miles apart. This roadway is projected to continue operating within the FIHS adopted level of service standard. A 0.6 percent annual growth rate was used for this facility.

3. **Page 21-18 states "Assigned pm peak hour Projects trips reflect at least 99% of the net new external trips obtained from the adjusted trip generation as described in sections above" but no support information was provided. Evidence that supports the abovementioned statement should be included in the ADA response.**

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

4. **At this stage of the DRI review process, we do not have additional comments about the traffic impacts on the MDX roadways as reported by the Applicant. However, if changes by the Applicant result in higher levels of traffic impacts on SR 924, MDX should be afforded an opportunity to review the traffic impact analysis. Any re-analysis resulting from Applicant actions should include the 5% threshold test for the additional SR 924 segment.**

Attached is a revised copy of the Beacon Countyline Question 21 (R), in which changes resulting from the comments made by all review agencies are incorporated

5. **Furthermore, we would encourage the Applicant to gather information from MDX about one future MDX projects in the early planning stages that are within the DRI traffic study area. These are also identified in the Question 21 response in Table**

21.3 This early planning study is referred to as MDX No. 92404 - Potential future westward extension of SR 924 to Okeechobee Road from its current terminus at I-75.

The applicant is aware of MDX's planning efforts to expand the facility to the west. For DRI purposes, the improvements are not committed and would not be included as part of the analysis. However, Table 21-3 has been revised to include this as a planned improvement.