



## Technical Memorandum II: DOCUMENTING IMPROVED MOBILITY TECHNIQUES ON SIS AND TRIP FACILITIES

FDOT Contract Number: BD549, RPWO #36

November 2007

Center for Urban Transportation Research  
University of South Florida

Photography Courtesy FDOT  
and Design Farm

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the State of Florida Department of Transportation, or the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Prepared in cooperation with the State of Florida Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation.

## Acknowledgements

### **FDOT Project Staff**

Martin Guttenplan, Systems Planning Office

Doug McLeod, Systems Planning Office

### **CUTR Project Staff**

Karen E. Seggerman, AICP

Kristine M. Williams, AICP

Pei-Sung Lin, Ph. D., P.E., PTOE

Huaguo Zhou, Ph. D., P.E.

Monique Ellis, Graduate Assistant

Rebecca Bosco, Program Assistant

### **Technical Committee**

Martin Berger, Broward County

Lois Bush, FDOT

Amy Datz, FDOT

Mike Escalante, NCFRPC

Waddah Farah, FDOT

Lea Gabbay, FDOT

Amy Goddeau, FDOT

Shi-Chiang Li, FDOT

Jason McGlashon, HDR

Fred Milch, ECFRPC

Kelly Parker, FDOT

Carlos Roa, Miami-Dade County

Gus Schmidt, FDOT

Ruth Steiner, University of Florida

Ben Walker, FDOT

Jon Weiss, FDOT



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	iii
List of Tables .....	v
List of Acronyms .....	vi
About This Guide .....	1
I. Growth Management and Site Impact Processes .....	3
A. Transportation Concurrency .....	3
B. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review .....	4
C. Developments of Regional Impact .....	5
D. Sub-DRI Development and DRI Exemptions .....	7
E. Level of Service Variance .....	7
Attachment I-A - Performing a State of the System Review .....	9
Attachment I-B - Comprehensive Plan Review Process and Schedule .....	13
II. Strategies for Mitigating Transportation Impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP Facilities .....	15
A. Providing Concurrence for Mitigation Plans .....	15
B. Opportunities to Develop Mitigation Plans .....	15
C. Measuring Mitigation .....	18
D. A Menu of Mitigation Options .....	23
E. Funding Mitigation .....	32
Attachment II-A - SR 26 Conceptual Corridor Management Plan Summary .....	34
III. Build and Maintain Relationships .....	36
Attachment III-A - Hosting a Multimodal Solutions Peer Exchange Meeting .....	38
Appendix I - Impact of Multimodal Strategies on Automobile Traffic .....	42

## List of Tables

Table II-1 Palm Beach County point system methodology .....	20
Table II-2 TDM strategies in land development .....	26

## List of Acronyms

<b>AADT</b> annual average daily traffic	<b>MMTD</b> multimodal transportation district
<b>ADA (DRI)</b> application for development approval	<b>MPO</b> metropolitan planning organization
<b>ADA</b> Americans with Disabilities Act	<b>MSV</b> maximum service volume
<b>BRT</b> bus rapid transit	<b>NCHRP</b> National Cooperative Highway Research Program
<b>CIE</b> capital improvement element	<b>NOPC</b> notice of proposed changes (DRI)
<b>CMP</b> congestion management process	<b>ORC</b> Objections, Recommendations, and Comments Report (Comprehensive Plan)
<b>CMS</b> concurrency management system	<b>PTO</b> Public Transit Office
<b>CORSIM</b> traffic simulation model application	<b>PUD</b> planned unit development
<b>CPA</b> comprehensive plan amendment	<b>QLOS</b> quality/level of service
<b>CRALLS</b> constrained roadway at a lower level of service (Palm Beach County)	<b>ROW</b> right of way
<b>CUTR</b> Center for Urban Transportation Research	<b>RPC</b> regional planning council
<b>DCA</b> Department of Community Affairs	<b>SAC</b> suburban activity center
<b>DO</b> development order	<b>SIS</b> Strategic Intermodal System
<b>DRI</b> development of regional impact	<b>TAZ</b> traffic analysis zone
<b>DU</b> dwelling unit	<b>TCEA</b> transportation concurrency exception area
<b>ECFRPC</b> East Central Florida Regional Planning Council	<b>TCMA</b> transportation concurrency management area
<b>EE</b> external-external trips (through trips)	<b>TCRP</b> Transit Cooperative Research Program
<b>FDOT</b> Florida Department of Transportation	<b>TDM</b> transportation demand management
<b>FHWA</b> Federal Highway Administration	<b>TDP</b> transit development plan
<b>FIHS</b> Florida Intrastate Highway System	<b>TIP</b> transportation improvement program
<b>FLUM</b> future land use map	<b>TND</b> traditional neighborhood development
<b>FSUTMS</b> Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure	<b>TOD</b> transit oriented development
<b>ITE</b> Institute of Transportation Engineers	<b>TRIP</b> Transportation Regional Incentive Program
<b>ITS</b> intelligent transportation systems	<b>UGMFP</b> Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (Portland, Oregon)
<b>LGCP</b> local government comprehensive plan	<b>VMT</b> vehicle miles traveled
<b>LOS</b> level of service	<b>VTR</b> vehicle trip rate
<b>LRTP</b> long range transportation plan	<b>WSDOT</b> Washington State Department of Transportation
<b>M&amp;M</b> modeling and monitoring (DRI)	

## About This Guide

The desire to maintain mobility on Florida's transportation system is universal; however, deciding who or what entity is ultimately responsible remains elusive. One thing is clear – all agencies involved with development approval or transportation service provision must work together. This guide includes tools, resources, and guidance to enable transportation partners to respond effectively to growth management issues, to become more proactive, and to maximize use of limited transportation funds. These transportation partners may include among others local governments, metropolitan planning organizations (MPO), regional planning councils (RPC), and the Florida Departments of Transportation (FDOT) and Community Affairs (DCA). It also offers examples of what may be considered acceptable mitigation of transportation impacts to transportation facilities that are part of the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) or Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS), or are funded through the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP). Throughout this guide, items noted as a "Resource" are available for download.

### Resources:

1	<i>Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide</i>
2	<i>Working with Transportation Concurrency Management Systems</i>
3	<i>Guidelines and Questions for Transportation Monitoring and Modeling Studies</i>
4	<i>Guidelines and Performance Measures to Incorporate Transit and Other Multimodal Strategies into the Development of Regional Impact Review Process</i>
5	<i>Level of Service (LOS) Variance Request for Interstate 4 and US Highway 27</i>
6	<i>Transportation Proportionate Share Agreement</i>
7	<i>Working with Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas</i>
8	<i>A Guide for the Creation and Evaluation of Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas</i>
9	<i>Multimodal Transportation Districts and Areawide Quality of Service Handbook</i>
10	<i>Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts</i>
11	<i>Okeechobee Boulevard CRALLS Point System</i>
12	<i>Incorporating TDM into the Land Development Process</i>
13	<i>Guide for Analysis of Corridor Management Policies</i>
14	<i>Corridor Preservation Best Practices for Local Governments</i>
15	<i>Access Management Model Plan Amendment</i>
16	<i>Access Management Model Ordinance</i>
17	<i>Managing Corridor Development</i>
18	<i>Accomplishing Alternative Access on Major Transportation Corridors</i>
19	<i>Second Edition of the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual (TCQSM)</i>
20	<i>Land Developer Participation in Providing for Bus Transit Facilities/Operations</i>
21	<i>Comprehensive Transportation Review Methodology (CTR)</i>
22	<i>Working with Proportionate Fair Share</i>
23	<i>Model Ordinance for Proportionate Fair-Share Mitigation of Development Impacts on Transportation Corridors</i>
24	<i>Alternative Funding Strategies for Improving Transportation Facilities: A Review of Public Private Partnerships and Regulatory Methods</i>
25	<i>From Handshake to Compact: Guidance to Foster Collaborative, Multimodal Decision-Making</i>
26	<i>Impact of Employer-Based Programs on Transit System Ridership and Transportation System Performance</i>

DOCUMENTING IMPROVED MOBILITY TECHNIQUES ON SIS AND TRIP FACILITIES: A GUIDE TO MITIGATION  
ABOUT THIS GUIDE



## I. Growth Management and Site Impact Processes

FDOT staff review a variety of transportation or traffic impact analyses addressing the impact of the proposed development on the State Highway System. Transportation impact analyses may address concurrency, comprehensive plan amendments, developments of regional impact (DRIs), or sub-DRI developments. In most cases, the transportation impact review process and methodology is driven by local governments with little uniformity across the state or even at the District level.

This section includes recommended practices to augment existing review processes for transportation concurrency, comprehensive plan amendments, developments of regional impact (DRI), DRI exemptions, sub-DRI development, and level of service variances.

### A. Transportation Concurrency

It is the responsibility of local government to meet statutory requirements for concurrency; however, all transportation partners can benefit from an understanding of and participation in local government concurrency management systems (CMS). The following steps are recommended for transportation planners regardless of jurisdiction.

1. ***Understand the basics of concurrency management systems.*** Although each local government concurrency management system may work a little differently, the basic concepts of such systems are similar. *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide* ([Resource 1](#)),<sup>1</sup> presents practical guidance regarding local government concurrency management systems including an overview of the concurrency review process and considerations for establishing level of service standards, applying concurrency alternatives (i.e., transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEAs), etc.), developing a concurrency management system, and evaluating the transportation impacts of comprehensive plan amendments. It also offers a detailed look at the process for implementing transportation concurrency and the mechanics of a concurrency tracking system. The guide includes a sample transportation impact methodology for reviewing comprehensive plan amendments and projects with impacts that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

Polk County has a county-wide concurrency management system that also tracks major roadways within municipalities. This is accomplished through interlocal agreements.

To encourage coordination, FDOT has provided District personnel with the guide, *Working with Transportation Concurrency Management Systems* ([Resource 2](#)),<sup>2</sup> to assist local governments as they implement transportation concurrency management systems. The guide presents a general overview of concurrency, CMS uses, and requirements to establish a CMS.

2. ***Become familiar with local government concurrency management systems in the area.*** Because each CMS is different, it is important to become familiar with each system. A familiarity of each CMS within a geographic area will enable practitioners to use the systems as a tool for transportation planning purposes. Generally, each local government has one or more staff assigned to managing the transportation CMS who will be able to explain the details of the system and serve as a regular contact. Local CMSs should identify when proposed projects will impact the State Highway System.

3. ***Establish an annual (or more frequent) “State of the System Review” for SIS, FIHS and TRIP facilities.*** Transportation professionals are encouraged to compare the current level of

<sup>1</sup> *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide*. Florida Department of Community Affairs, September 2007.

<sup>2</sup> *Working with Transportation Concurrency Management Systems (CMS)*, Florida Department of Transportation, 2006.

service (LOS) as determined by the FDOT with the LOS established in the local government CMS for specific roadways. Any differences in the level of service or maximum service volume used for the analysis should be carefully reviewed by both parties. The ultimate goal of this review is to achieve a consensus on existing LOS and future LOS of these facilities based on existing traffic, anticipated traffic growth, and trips approved by local government. Guidance for performing a “State of the System Review” is found in Attachment I-A.

All Districts annually estimate the level of service for each of their state roads. This information is used as a guide when reviewing transportation impact analyses. Generally, a review begins with a sketch planning analysis performed using the FDOT Generalized Tables to screen for deficiencies. A more detailed analysis may be required on facilities where anticipated traffic volumes (background plus development traffic) exceed a percent of the maximum service volume (e.g., 85 percent) for the adopted LOS standard as established in the Generalized Tables.

## **B. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review**

Amendments to local government comprehensive plans, particularly the future land use map, typically involve an increase in the density or intensity of use. It is important to gauge the impacts of those proposed land use changes on the transportation system as well. This is not for the purpose of concurrency review, per se, rather, analyzing these impacts provides the local government with advance warning of the need to increase transportation system capacity or reduce demand on the system to accommodate future land use changes as well as to comply with Florida growth management law.

When a transportation need resulting from a proposed future land use map change is identified, corresponding capacity improvements or other mitigation strategies must be included in the transportation element and the capital improvements element during the same amendment cycle. This will ensure that the necessary transportation facilities or services will be available when development authorized by the amendment is ultimately permitted. Planned transportation system improvements can also form the basis for proportionate fair-share mitigation (per Section 163.3180(16) F.S.).

Local governments or their consultants send proposed comprehensive plan amendments directly to DCA, FDOT, and other review agencies. Proposed amendments usually contain a broad transportation analysis of impacts to the transportation system. DCA establishes the schedule for review via an email to review agencies. FDOT staff analyze the potential for impacts to SIS, FIHS, or TRIP-funded facilities that may result from the proposed change in land use category.

Local governments often submit numerous future land use map amendments in a given amendment cycle. Although each applicant may be required to prepare a transportation impact analysis of the proposed land use change, the cumulative impacts of all amendments in a cycle are typically not analyzed. Failure to analyze cumulative impacts can result in inadequate planning for future transportation system needs and improvements. It is, therefore, a good idea for each local government to consider the cumulative impacts of proposed comprehensive plan amendments. Such an approach is outlined in *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide* ([Resource 1](#)).

A standardized comprehensive plan review process and schedule among a local government, FDOT, and DCA may enhance communication and coordination of CPA review as well as mitigation of impacts. An approach to such a review process is outlined in Attachment I-B. During this process, all parties should ensure that improvements required to accommodate proposed future land use map (FLUM) changes are identified in the local government transportation or traffic circulation element and the capital improvement element. These elements should also accurately reflect any improvements found in the MPOs long range transportation plan (LRTP) transportation improvement program (TIP), and Transit Development Plan (TDP).

### C. Developments of Regional Impact

A development of regional impact (DRI) is subject to a review process during which the regional planning council, the state, and other affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on the impacts of a proposed development. The primary purpose of the DRI review process is to provide the opportunity for multiple agencies to participate in identifying and addressing development impacts that cross jurisdictional boundaries, including impacts to the regional transportation system.

FDOT's role in the DRI review process is primarily to review the impact of a proposed development upon the State Highway System, particularly the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). Reviews are conducted by the FDOT in accordance with FDOT's Site Impact Handbook (1997). FDOT's role in the DRI review process includes:

- participation in the DRI traffic impact methodology meeting between the applicant and reviewing agencies;
- review of applications for development approval (ADA) and notices of proposed changes (NOPC) along with concurrent proposed amendments to the local government comprehensive plan (LGCP); and
- provision of comments and recommendations to the RPC.

The applicable regional planning council (RPC) is charged with coordinating the review process. Rule 29, F.A.C. outlines general RPC practices and procedures for the DRI review process; however, some RPCs have adopted additional administrative procedures. Among other issues, procedures address the process of DRI review and monitoring, fees, number of copies to be submitted, and procedures for the pre-application conference. Local governments and FDOT Districts should work with regional planning councils to establish uniform method(s) for determining mitigation requirements for impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities. This document is intended to aid in this process.

Participation in the pre-application conference and traffic impact methodology meeting is essential so that all parties may reach agreement on methodology details. Per the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC), at a minimum the following must be addressed at this meeting:

- study area roadways and intersections to be analyzed;
- minimum acceptable LOS;
- service volumes to be used;
- improvements to be assumed as constructed in the future analysis year;
- trip generation methodology;
- significance levels; and
- use of modeling or any revisions to an adopted FSUTMS<sup>3</sup> model.

The wording of development order conditions varies among RPCs producing dramatically different results. In some cases, conditions require very little from the developer; however, in other cases, conditions net essential funding for mitigation of the DRI's impact on the transportation system. Mitigation dollars required through development order conditions from multi-use DRIs in FDOT District 2 which includes the Jacksonville metropolitan area ranged from \$280 to \$1,518 per new daily

---

<sup>3</sup> Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure. A new modeling engine has been adopted for FSUTMS, known as Cube Voyager. The new program is a Windows-based and more user-friendly than the DOS-based operating system of FSUTMS.

trip (from 2002 to 2006). This has netted millions of dollars toward capacity improvements in the District. The mitigation may be in the form of land, money, or construction of the necessary improvement. Cash payments for mitigation are usually processed by the local government. Funds appropriated for mitigation of impacts to the state highway system are coordinated between the local government and FDOT.

In *Guidelines and Questions for Transportation Monitoring and Modeling Studies* ([Resource 3](#)),<sup>4</sup> the ECFRPC advocates the modeling and monitoring (M & M) schedule as a method of ensuring the traffic impacts to any regional roadway affected by a development of regional impact (DRI) do not fall below its adopted level of service. Although not required for the DRI review process, it may be included in a development order to satisfy a minimum condition to show that adequate provisions are made for public transportation facilities and maintenance of LOS at the end of each project phase or phase subset (Rule 9J-2.045(7)(a), F.A.C.). Currently, only District 5 is known to incorporate the M & M schedule into their DRI review process.

An M & M schedule must identify the actions or measures necessary to mitigate significant and adverse impacts to the transportation system in order to proceed to the next phase of a project's development. It must also identify the amount of development that will adversely impact the roadway, as well as when the impacts are scheduled to be mitigated subsequent to each phase or phase subset of a project. If roadway improvements together with timing of such improvements are not identified in the M & M schedule, building permits will be withheld for that project phase or subset until written approval is obtained and compliance with any needed roadway improvements can be demonstrated.

A study period consisting of the next stage of development, and traffic study for the existing peak hour LOS and projection of the next phase's LOS for all impacted roadways listed on the M & M schedule help exhibit compliance with the development order. The study must include estimated traffic for all background developments and the project during the next study period, as well as the end-of-study-period LOS for the impacted roadways. The project traffic is to include all existing project developments, permitted project developments, and project developments anticipated to receive building permits during the next study period.

Regardless of the jurisdiction, DRI proposals and subsequent development orders rely mainly on roadway improvements as mitigation for transportation impacts and include little in the way of providing multimodal solutions. *Guidelines and Performance Measures to Incorporate Transit and Other Multimodal Strategies into the Development of Regional Impact Review Process* (Resource 4)<sup>5</sup> encourages FDOT's collaboration with transit agencies and regional planning councils (RPC) in their review of developments of regional impact, and, specifically, the inclusion of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The guidelines offer practices for incorporating transit into the DRI review process including information to share with the applicant early in the process, additional multimodal-related submittal requirements, sample sufficiency comments, sample development order conditions, and review checklists. Transportation partners can use these guidelines to focus transportation impact mitigation strategies on alternative modes of transportation in DRIs and other development.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Guidelines and Questions for Transportation Monitoring and Modeling Studies*. East Central Florida Regional Planning Council. 2000.

<sup>5</sup> *Guidelines and Performance Measures to Incorporate Transit and Other Multimodal Strategies into the Development of Regional Impact Review Process*, Center for Urban Transportation Research/USF, Florida Department of Transportation, pending 2007.

#### **D. Sub-DRI Development and DRI Exemptions**

Many of the trips that impact SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities are approved by local governments outside of review processes that include FDOT. This may include trips that are generated by sub-DRI development, that is, any size of development below DRI review thresholds,<sup>6</sup> and developments considered to be exempt from DRI review per relevant Florida statutes or DRI exemptions. Communication and coordination between FDOT District staff and local government is key to mitigating impacts of these types of development. Districts should request notification regarding major development proposals that will impact a state highway and local governments should regularly share development information with FDOT.

Often, FDOT only becomes aware of sub-DRI development when a developer requests an access permit. In some Districts, access permitting personnel alert the District site impact coordinator when they believe a project seeking an access permit will have a significant, and adverse, impact on the State Highway System. Traffic studies for access permitting focus on the safety and operation of the transportation system near the proposed development, not on issues of major long term improvements to the transportation system away from the development site. Hopefully, at the time of access permitting, the local government has already dealt with the issues of concurrency and long term improvements to handle the expected traffic from this development. At the access permitting phase, it is too late to start the process of growth management concurrency evaluation. It is the responsibility of the local government with land use jurisdiction to ensure an applicant complies with concurrency requirements before the permitting phase.

Regular development review meetings between local governments and FDOT create the opportunity to coordinate on technical issues, to identify impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities, and to develop mitigation strategies for facilities at or near deficiency. These mitigation strategies can then be used as a basis for proportionate fair-share mitigation. In addition, review of comprehensive plan amendments and their potential for adverse impacts to the transportation system should also be addressed with local government as these amendments are likely to become sub-DRI development.

The 2005 growth management legislation established new statutory exemptions from the DRI requirements. These DRI exemptions include proposed developments that lie within designated urban service boundary areas, rural land stewardship areas, or urban infill and redevelopment areas and where the local government having jurisdiction has entered into a binding agreement regarding the mitigation of impacts on state and regional transportation facilities with adjacent jurisdictions and FDOT, and adopted a proportionate fair-share mitigation program.

The *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide* ([Resource 1](#)) includes a recommended practice for assessing and mitigating transportation impacts of DRI's that have been exempted from the standard DRI review. It also has an agency coordination procedure. The procedure is offered in recognition of the need for a formal process in which local governments could both inform and coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions and FDOT regarding the transportation impacts of a proposed development, particularly a DRI exemption, at or near another jurisdiction's border.

#### **E. Level of Service Variance**

In a limited number of cases, it may be appropriate for FDOT to consider granting a variance to Rule 14-94, F.A.C. which establishes LOS standards for SIS, SIS connectors, or TRIP-funded facilities in accordance with Section 120.542, Florida Statutes. A level of service variance is considered only as a

---

<sup>6</sup> Information regarding DRI thresholds according to county is available at <http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/dcp/procedures/index.cfm>

temporary mechanism to allow a designated facility to fall below the LOS standard for an established time period while the jurisdiction implements long term plans to remedy a LOS deficiency.

Early coordination with the appropriate District is essential to a successful variance request. District staff will explain the process and offer acceptable examples of a LOS variance. *Level of Service (LOS) Variance Request for Interstate 4 and US Highway 27* ([Resource 5](#)) is provided as one excellent example of a LOS variance request. Such variance requests from jurisdictions responsible for concurrency will be considered in conjunction with long-term concurrency management systems where designated facilities will meet required LOS standards over time.

Prior to filing a variance request, the applicant should work closely with the District to develop suitable mitigation plans and strategies. If the Department determines that a request for variance should be granted, it will issue an “Order Granting Petition for Variance.” Level of service variance requests containing acceptable justification for level of service deficiencies and appropriate mitigation may be eligible for expedited review procedures.



## Attachment I-A - Performing a State of the System Review

### Purpose

It is in the interest of local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and FDOT to support mobility and avoid congestion as well as to recognize that transportation facilities and impacts on those facilities do not end at jurisdictional boundaries. Agencies must look beyond road widening improvements (e.g., examine bicycle, pedestrian, transit, transportation demand management, and traffic operations improvements) to accomplish mobility, particularly where needs outstrip funding or where such improvements are seen as adversely impacting community character.

This optional System Review is an example procedure for comparing the current level of service as determined by FDOT with the LOS as determined by the local government concurrency management system (CMS) on facilities that are on SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities. Implementation of a System Review may be limited by District resources; however, the proactive effort may increase coordination efforts to minimize impacts to these facilities. In addition, although the first System Review may be challenging, future System Reviews would be facilitated by greater District and local government staff familiarity with the process and data requirements. Consensus on existing LOS and future LOS based on anticipated traffic growth, approved development trips, and adopted LOS standards forms the basis for achieving and maintaining mobility on SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities.

### Step 1: Set meeting date

- A. It is recommended that FDOT District staff initiate a meeting with all local governments that SIS, FIHS, or TRIP-funded facilities pass through or near. A representative from the area transit agency, MPO, commuter assistance program, and bicycle/pedestrian program should also be invited, where facilities pass through or near urban planning boundaries. For convenience, this may include several local governments at once and may be particularly beneficial where LOS standards are inconsistent on facilities that cross jurisdictional boundaries (Guidelines for addressing this issue can be found in *Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide (Resource 1)*).
- B. Establish a date, time, and location for the meeting that is convenient for all participants.
- C. FDOT should prepare a list of applicable SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities to be discussed during the meeting.

### Step 2: Prepare information for meeting

- A. Each participating local government should prepare for the meeting by assembling applicable automobile and multimodal information for each road segment (SIS, SIS connectors, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities) from their CMS including:
  - (1) Facility name – the name of the road;
  - (2) From/To – the limits of the segment;
  - (3) Area type – urban, transitioning, or rural;
  - (4) Functional classification – according to FHWA Functional Classification Guidelines;
  - (5) LOS standard and maximum service volume (MSV) – the adopted LOS standard for that segment of road and maximum service volume;
  - (6) FDOT LOS standard and MSV – the LOS standard per the FDOT 2002 Q/LOS Handbook and 2007 LOS Issue Papers (2002 Q/LOS Handbook Addendum); maximum service volume (as updated on [www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/sm/los/los\\_sw2.htm](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/sm/los/los_sw2.htm));

- (7) Jurisdiction – the local government establishing the LOS standard for the segment;
- (8) In average annual daily traffic (AADT) and p.m. peak hour traffic
  - (a) Existing traffic volume;
  - (b) Projected traffic growth;
  - (c) Approved traffic volume;
- (9) Current level of service; and
- (10) Planned improvements (per financially feasible capital improvements element FDOT working MPO TIP and associated MSVs;
  - (a) Planned service enhancements (per Transit Development Plan), and
  - (b) Corridor-specific management plans and regulations (i.e., service road ordinances, transit-oriented development plans/regulations, right-of-way preservation requirements, street network and connectivity regulations, inter-parcel cross access requirements).

### Step 3: Meeting format

- A. FDOT and local governments should then meet to perform the following for the identified facilities addressing LOS for all modes:
- (1) Verify existing traffic volumes and projected traffic growth;
  - (2) Verify approved development trips - in particular, examine volumes and multimodal services on facilities that cross jurisdictional boundaries to ensure they make sense based on permitting conditions;
  - (3) Verify maximum service volumes, particularly where local governments may have adopted service volumes other than those in FDOT's Generalized Tables (Note: Where local governments have adopted their own LOS standard and accompanying MSV on state roads; it is important for FDOT District staff to be aware of this situation and provide technical assistance if appropriate.);
  - (4) Identify all transportation facilities where existing traffic volume plus projected traffic growth plus approved traffic exceeds 85 percent of the MSV associated with the adopted LOS standard for daily or peak hour traffic;
  - (5) Estimate the year when additional capacity will be needed;
  - (6) Review improvement projects, transit service, transportation demand management, pedestrian and bicycle enhancements scheduled in the capital improvement element (CIE) to determine if additional capacity is programmed (may be roadway capacity or other multimodal improvement);
  - (7) Identify opportunities to better coordinate mobility improvements with planned development on the corridors (i.e., transit service enhancements with transit-oriented development (TOD) locations, avoiding development within planned ROW, etc.);
  - (8) Develop a mobility plan designed to accommodate future traffic on the impacted corridors based on solutions other than adding lanes to existing roads, particularly if no improvement projects are programmed on deficient facilities.

### Step 4: Adopt and implement mobility plan

- A. Each local government should incorporate the necessary policies to implement the mobility plan into their comprehensive plan, land development regulations, and concurrency management system (CMS) as appropriate.



- B. All parties responsible for implementing the mobility plan(s) should enter into an interlocal agreement to solidify their support of the plan and to identify their relative roles and responsibilities for implementing the plan.
- C. Adopt a schedule of short range and long range improvements and actions as part of the mobility plan.



## Attachment I-B - Comprehensive Plan Review Process and Schedule

Local governments, DCA, and FDOT would benefit from establishing a standard comprehensive plan amendment (CPA) review process and schedule to ensure impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities are adequately addressed through planning efforts. Notably this process encourages involving FDOT at an earlier stage to allow transportation concerns to be addressed prior to CPA transmittal. Below is a step-by-step process to achieve these goals:

### Step 1. Identify CPA cycle dates

Local governments, FDOT, and DCA should mutually obtain and maintain a schedule of key dates for the two annual CPA cycles for each local government.

### Step 2. CPA pre-application

Local governments may consider hosting a pre-application meeting for CPAs that may impact SIS, FIHS, or TRIP-funded facilities. In particular, such meetings will be useful in addressing complex issues regarding large-scale future land use map (FLUM) amendments, transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEAs), transportation concurrency management areas (TCMAs), and multimodal transportation districts (MMTDs). Invitees should include representatives from the local government initiating the plan amendment, metropolitan planning organization (MPO), FDOT, and the regional planning council (RPC).

Palm Beach County holds a comprehensive plan pre-application meeting for applicants. Review agencies such as FDOT are invited to attend.

### Step 2a. Methodology

*Transportation Concurrency: Best Practices Guide* ([Resource 1](#)), includes a methodology for analyzing the traffic impact of comprehensive plan amendments. A recommended approach for addressing the cumulative impacts of CPAs is also included. Local governments may allow applicants to conduct a transportation impact analysis by subarea and/or corridor to identify cumulative impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities. A cumulative analysis is best accomplished by aggregating or grouping proposed comprehensive plan amendments into specific geographic areas. These geographic areas may be sub-area, neighborhood, sector, or other planning areas, impact fee districts, transportation corridors, or specific traffic analysis zones.

### Step 3. Initial CPA Review (optional)

Local governments may offer FDOT early review of the plan amendment agenda documentation package prepared by local staff for presentation before the designated local planning agency. This effort affords the local government an opportunity to address transportation system concerns early in the comprehensive plan amendment process. FDOT District staff will assess proposed CPAs for impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities. Plan amendments of concern may include those located in close proximity to designated SIS facilities or other strategic transportation corridors and those in areas where transportation infrastructure is operating near or below adopted LOS with no supporting transportation facilities improvements programmed in the capital improvements element (CIE). FDOT will notify the local government of any concerns prior to the public hearing for transmittal of the plan amendments. This will give local government staff the opportunity to re-evaluate the transportation impact of proposed CPAs. In addition, District staff may appear at the public hearing (at the District Secretary's discretion) to place on record concerns the Department may have relating to a pending plan amendment.

#### Step 4. Final CPA Review

A copy of CPAs approved by the local government along with supporting documentation transmitted to DCA for review should also be sent directly by the local government to the FDOT District representative responsible for amendment reviews. DCA will determine the completeness of the plan amendment within 5 working days of receipt and notify the District if the package is complete. It is the responsibility of the local government to certify to DCA that copies of additional submissions have been sent to the FDOT District.

Within 10 days after receipt of amendment package, District staff will notify DCA which amendments they intend to submit review comments on and a list of preliminary concerns relating to the amendments. Plan amendments noted in the Initial Review should be included at a minimum unless changes were made to the proposed CPA that eliminate the concerns. DCA may request that the District perform a review on any amendment not included on the District's list. DCA will notify local government of its intention to conduct a review of the amendments listed by the District per §163.3184 (6) (b) F.S.

Within 30 days after receipt of an amendment package District staff will forward written comments to DCA regarding the respective plan amendment for potential inclusion into the subsequent Objections, Recommendations, and Comments ORC Report issued by DCA to the local government. Office of Policy Planning staff within FDOT Central Office as well as the applicable DCA reviewer should be contacted for any review containing a recommendation for "Objection" to facilitate communication and coordination.

FDOT staff review and comments should address the following:

1. Identify whether there is sufficient information to evaluate the impact of the proposed land use change on SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities such as a transportation impact analysis. If not, request that an appropriate transportation impact analysis to be submitted for review
2. Identify flaws in the transportation impact analysis and recommend corrective action;
3. Identify the location of the proposed future land use amendment in proximity to the nearest SIS, FIHS, or TRIP-funded facility;
4. Verify the trip generation estimate of both the existing and future land use as well as the difference which is used for analysis;
5. Verify the adopted LOS standard (per Rule 19-94, F.A.C.) and the current level of service. Note where local government is using an incorrect LOS standard for SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities;
6. If new trips will impact a deficient or near-capacity facility, ensure corresponding transportation system capacity improvement is in transportation and capital improvement elements (financially feasible);
7. If development (such as transit oriented development (TOD) or traditional neighborhood development (TND)) intends to rely on transit or other multimodal strategies, verify that adequate plans and programs are in place to support transit, transportation demand management, etc;
8. Include positive comments regarding the use of multimodal strategies, including,
  - recognize the transportation system benefits of TOD or TND; or
  - note the importance of access management.

## II. Strategies for Mitigating Transportation Impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP Facilities

The 2005 growth management legislation increased the role of FDOT in the review of the transportation impacts of proposed developments on the SIS, the FIHS, and TRIP-funded roadways. In particular, the legislation required FDOT to concur with mitigation plans for those impacts as proposed by local governments. Local governments proposing new or applying existing transportation concurrency alternatives, transportation concurrency exception areas (TCEA), transportation concurrency management areas (TCMA), or multimodal transportation districts (MMTD), must consult with FDOT and DCA to assess potential impacts on SIS facilities. If impacts cause the facility to fall below the level of service required by Rule 14-94, F.A.C., plans must be cooperatively developed to mitigate those impacts.

The long term goal to maintain or improve mobility as measured by LOS on affected facilities is no small challenge. It requires application of a variety of techniques and strategies and, perhaps most importantly, increased and continuing intergovernmental collaboration. Level of service measures may move away from auto LOS as the primary measure for concurrency in favor of multimodal measures. Likewise mitigation strategies should include corridor management plans, supporting street network improvements, transportation demand management (TDM), increased transit service enhancements, and land use measures such as transit-oriented development (TOD), in addition to traditional roadway capacity improvements.

This section defines “concurrence,” discusses opportunities to develop mitigation plans, and provides a “menu of options” regarding mitigation strategies for transportation impacts. Such strategies will require the collaboration of transportation partners to develop and apply them.

### A. Providing Concurrence for Mitigation Plans

The word “concur” commonly means to agree or work together. FDOT, local governments, and other transportation partners must work together to develop effective mitigation plans for impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities and improve mobility. An appropriate mechanism to document agreement of such a plan is an interlocal agreement or memorandum of agreement. At a minimum, the agreement should identify the parties involved (e.g., FDOT, local government, developers), and responsibilities of all parties. To streamline approval of mitigation plans, an “umbrella” agreement may be developed and adopted by FDOT and specific local governments with individual addendums made for each mitigation plan. An example of this approach by District 3 and Walton County is included in *Transportation Proportionate Share Agreement* ([Resource 6](#)).

### B. Opportunities to Develop Mitigation Plans

Section 163.3180, F.S., offers alternatives to strict adherence to transportation concurrency stating, “A local government may grant an exception from the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities if the proposed development is otherwise consistent with the adopted local government comprehensive plan and is a project that promotes public transportation or is located within an area designated in the comprehensive plan for: 1. urban infill development, 2. urban redevelopment, downtown revitalization, or 3. urban infill and redevelopment unders.163.2715.”

Alternative transportation concurrency areas include the transportation concurrency exception area (TCEA), the transportation concurrency management area (TCMA), the multimodal transportation district (MMTD), and the long-term concurrency management system (long-term CMS). These alternative approaches may be used to mitigate transportation impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities while accomplishing local planning objectives such as encouraging urban infill and redevelopment, emphasizing use of alternative modes of transportation, or addressing constrained

facilities and concurrency deficiencies. Use of these mechanisms requires a comprehensive plan amendment and the approval of DCA, as well as concurrence from the FDOT if the facility is governed by Rule 14-94, F.A.C. Transportation partners should take full advantage of these established alternatives and apply them when appropriate.

#### Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas (TCEAs)

The transportation concurrency exception area is the most widely used of available alternatives. It allows local governments to reduce barriers to infill and redevelopment, and the incentive for urban sprawl, by allowing development to proceed notwithstanding a failure to meet transportation concurrency. There must be a community commitment to pursue alternative modes of transportation and urban forms that will reduce single occupant vehicle trips.

The 2005 growth management legislation requires local government comprehensive plans to support and fund mobility strategies that promote the purpose of the concurrency exception. These strategies must address urban design, land use mix, and network connectivity within the TCEA. Local governments must justify the size of the TCEA. In addition, the legislation requires them to consult with FDOT and DCA prior to the designation of TCEAs to assess any impact the proposed TCEA may have on the SIS, as well as to develop plans in cooperation with FDOT to mitigate any impact. FDOT has provided a copy of *Working with Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas* ([Resource 7](#))<sup>7</sup> to District staff. The document provides guidance on how to review and coordinate with local governments as they establish and maintain a TCEA. DCA, in conjunction with the University of Florida, conducted a review of existing TCEAs in Florida with respect to the requirements of the 2005 growth management legislation. Model evaluation criteria for TCEAs were developed and applied in three pilot communities to test their effectiveness. Study results are published in *A Guide for the Creation and Evaluation of Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas* ([Resource 8](#)).

#### (1) Transportation Concurrency Management Areas (TCMA)

The second alternative, a transportation concurrency management area, is also designed to promote infill development and redevelopment. A TCMA “must be a compact geographic area with an existing network of roads where multiple, viable alternative travel paths or modes are available for common trips” (Section 163.3180(7), F.S.). The TCMA allows an LOS standard to be applied areawide rather than on individual road segments. The areawide LOS is determined by averaging the LOS on similar facilities within the designated area serving common origins and destinations. This alternative approach to strict concurrency should be used with an abundance of caution only where it is truly viable for trips to use alternative facilities.

A TCMA must be designated within the local government’s comprehensive plan using data and analysis that support using an areawide LOS standard. The comprehensive plan must detail how urban infill development or redevelopment will be promoted and how mobility will be accomplished.

#### (2) Multi-Modal Transportation Districts

A multimodal transportation district is an area where primary priority is placed on “assuring a safe, comfortable, and attractive pedestrian environment, with convenient interconnection to transit.”<sup>8</sup> Communities must incorporate design features that reduce vehicular usage while supporting an integrated multimodal transportation system. Common elements include the presence of mixed-use activity centers, connectivity of streets and land uses, transit-friendly design features, and accessibility to alternative modes of transportation.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas (TCEAs)*, Florida Department of Transportation, September 2006.

<sup>8</sup> *Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts*, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2005.

The *Multimodal Transportation Districts and Areawide Quality of Service Handbook* ([Resource 9](#))<sup>9</sup> guides users regarding the designation and planning of MMTDs in accordance with Florida's growth management legislation. The Areawide QOS Handbook allows MMTD designation in a downtown or urban core area, regional activity center, or traditional town or village in accordance with certain criteria. In these areas, planning efforts would focus on enhancing multimodal elements, guiding redevelopment, and encouraging appropriate infill. An MMTD could also be applied to a new or emerging area, where adopted plans and regulations would need to ensure the internal and external connectivity, a mix of uses, densities, and urban design features necessary to support alternative modes of transportation. The Multimodal Transportation Checklist in the QOS Handbook includes the minimum indicators for designation.

*Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts* ([Resource 10](#))<sup>10</sup> was prepared as a companion to the QOS Handbook. Multimodal transportation districts (MMTDs) are to be carried out through local comprehensive plans, land development regulations, and capital improvements programs. This report provides model comprehensive plan amendments and model regulations for multimodal transportation districts to assist local governments in Florida.

### (3) Long-term Concurrency Management Systems

Many local governments have existing transportation concurrency deficiencies that require special attention and longer time frames to overcome. In such cases, local governments may adopt a long-term transportation concurrency management system with a planning period of up to 10 years (Rule 9J-5.0055(4), F.A.C). This allows local governments time to prioritize and fund projects to reduce the backlog of transportation projects. For severe backlogs and under specific conditions a local government may request approval from the DCA for a planning period of up to 15 years.

To implement a long-term transportation concurrency management system, the local government comprehensive plan must designate in the comprehensive plan specific areas where significant backlogs presently exist. These areas must be delineated on an adopted comprehensive plan map and be consistent with other elements of the plan. The system must establish improvement priorities and be financially feasible based on currently available revenue sources to ensure that existing deficiencies are corrected within the planning period.

A long-term schedule of capital improvements must also be adopted that identifies improvements needed to correct existing deficiencies and accommodate new development. The schedule must indicate project commencement and completion dates and may be relied on as a basis for evaluating concurrency and issuing development permits. A plan amendment is required to eliminate, defer, or delay construction of any facility or service identified in the schedule and needed to maintain the adopted level of service standard.

As part of a long-term concurrency management system, a local government may adopt policies to establish interim level of service (LOS) standards on certain facilities for the purpose of issuing development orders or permits. The interim LOS standards noted in the inset for Capital Circle NW in Tallahassee are one example of how this might be accomplished. In this case, LOS E is established for Capital Circle NW until widening is complete. A schedule may be established that shows when incremental improvements to the LOS standards are expected. Additionally, a plan should be developed to monitor the progress

---

<sup>9</sup> *Multimodal Transportation Districts and Areawide Quality of Service Handbook*, Florida Department of Transportation, 2004.

<sup>10</sup> *Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts*, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2005.



of scheduled improvements. If the improvements are not made as scheduled, an amendment must be made to the comprehensive plan to establish a default LOS standard by which to issue development orders or permits.

(4) All Other Facility Locations

Significant lane miles of the SIS lay outside of concurrency alternative areas. Current review processes usually only require FDOT review of proposed developments of regional impact even though substantial impacts to the SIS may be the result of sub-DRI developments or DRI exemptions. It is imperative for FDOT, local governments, and other transportation partners to coordinate all development review to accurately assess and mitigate transportation impacts to facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System.

### C. Measuring Mitigation

Although it may not be difficult to determine if mitigation is needed, it is difficult to determine if mitigation is adequate. Traditional traffic modeling may not show system relief due to the tendency of the transportation models to draw traffic to facilities with the most capacity. In addition, merely offering alternative modes to transportation system users does not result in immediate change in travel behavior and measuring that mode change is even more difficult. Jurisdictions that have chosen to promote alternative modes of transportation as mitigation for system impacts often do so based on planning objectives rather than a one-to-one trade-off of trips.

The relationship between land use measures and transportation outcomes is complex and still not well understood. Studies are sometimes contradictory and use a variety of measures and approaches, making it difficult to generalize findings to a specific strategy or feature. This is particularly true for the micro-strategies such as sidewalks, parking lot connectivity, and bicycle racks. A number of studies indicate that there are transportation system benefits to providing multimodal facilities and to urban forms such as transit-oriented or traditional neighborhood development particularly in advancing alternative modes of transportation.<sup>11</sup> This benefit is not always easy to quantify, however, as it varies considerably based on a range of variables, such as the size of the developed area, the compatibility of the land use mix, the degree of connectivity in the built environment, location of the development, socioeconomic characteristics of the affected population, and the density or intensity of uses. Highlights of some resources and publications relevant to the impact of various multimodal strategies on automobile traffic summarized are discussed in Appendix I.

Although the specific relationship between trip making and land use strategies or site design features varies by the context, some conclusions can be drawn. These are as follows:

**Tallahassee /Leon County  
Level of service Standards**

The peak hour roadway level of service for Tallahassee and Leon County is established as follows:

*Outside the Urban Service Area:*  
Interstate, Limited Access Parkways: B  
Principal Arterials: C  
Minor Arterials: C  
Major and Minor Collectors: C  
Local Streets: D

*Inside the Urban Service Area:*  
Interstate, Limited Access Parkways: C  
Principal Arterials: D\*\*  
*Except Capital Circle NW from I-10 to SR 20*  
Capital Circle NW from I-10 to SR 20: E  
Minor Arterials: D / E\*  
Major and Minor Collectors: D / E\*  
Local Streets: D

\* For Minor Arterials, and Major and Minor Collectors located inside the Urban Service Area and south of U.S. 90, the Level of Service shall be "D" for purposes of establishing priorities for programming transportation improvements, and "E" for meeting concurrency requirements, to support the Southern Strategy. Roads north of U.S. 90 shall be LOS D for both programming improvement and concurrency purposes.  
\*\* The Level of Service for Monroe Street from Gaines Street to Tennessee Street shall be "E."  
*Source:* Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan. Policy 1.4.1 [T], Revised Effective 7/25/03.

<sup>11</sup> *Impact Fee Credits for Livable Communities Improvements. Technical Memorandum #1, Literature Review and Alternative Approaches.* Center for Urban Transportation Research. January 2005



- providing a mix of uses can increase internal capture and reinforce alternative modes, but these impacts are highly dependent on context and other factors, such as land use compatibility and network connectivity;
- connectivity of local street and bicycle/pedestrian networks does reduce local trips on arterials and increases bicycle and pedestrian travel; and
- improving pedestrian and bicycle facility level of service attracts more users.

Given such variation in existing study findings, most communities do not have specific data to support their multimodal reductions or credits. Instead, observation, and the fact that research to date indicates a trend toward multimodal benefits, becomes the basis for discretionary decisions regarding reductions in trip generation or vehicle miles traveled for various actions.

A point system based on multimodal improvements made by the developer is a method sometimes used to decrease required trip generation. The Palm Beach County, Florida Unified Development Code contains a point system used to implement planning objectives called the *Okeechobee Boulevard CRALLS Point System* ([Resource 11](#)). CRALLS is an acronym for “constrained roadway at a lower level of service.” This designation is intended for use on facilities where additional roadway travel lanes would be detrimental to the existing community fabric. The Okeechobee Boulevard CRALLS Point System was adopted as a method “to provide a means for approving new land development/redevelopment projects that will have significant traffic impacts on Okeechobee Boulevard, but will provide acceptable mitigation for those impacts.”<sup>12</sup> The point system seeks to accomplish the following:

- reduction of single occupant vehicle trips by encouraging ridesharing, diversion to alternative travel modes, and telecommuting;
- reduction of peak hour vehicle trips by shifting these trips to other time periods;
- reduction of land use densities and intensities for proposed development/redevelopment; and
- increase in land use densities for proposed development/redevelopment only in cases where land use mix maximizes internal trip capture and promotes feasibility of mass transit modes.

The general procedure includes application requirements, condition monitoring, and requirements for later changes to mitigation. Each strategy includes qualifying criteria, implementation timeframes, monitoring and enforcement provisions, and credit factors. Each strategy has a different calculation to determine the amount of credit applicable. See the inset (Page 21) for an example. Credit factors for each strategy used are added up to meet the minimum points needed to fulfill mitigation as determined by Table II-1. The strategies include:

- mixed use development around transit corridors;
- mixed use development around transit centers;
- feeder transit service to rail stations or multi-modal transit centers; new commuter bus service; local bus/shuttle service; employee transit passes;
- parking management;
- ridesharing programs;
- telecommuting programs;
- bicycle parking facilities;
- provide access between developments;

---

<sup>12</sup> Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code. Article 12 - Traffic Performance Standards. 01/07 Supplement No. 3 (Effective December 1, 2006)

DOCUMENTING IMPROVED MOBILITY TECHNIQUES ON SIS AND TRIP FACILITIES: A GUIDE TO MITIGATION STRATEGIES FOR MITIGATING TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS TO SIS, SIHS, AND TRIP-FUNDED FACILITIES

- provide access to more than one road;
- low generation traffic sensitive uses;
- intersection modifications;
- grade separated interchange improvement;
- compressed work week/non-peak hour work hours; and
- additional mitigation fee payment.

Table II-1 Palm Beach County point system methodology

CRALLS Facilities Assigned Trips (Net 2-way peak hour trips)	Weighting Factor	Minimum Points Needed to Fulfill Mitigation (divide assigned trips by 10)
1-100	5	<=10
101-200	10	11-20
201-200	20	21-40
401-800	40	41-80
801-1000 <sup>1</sup>	80	81-100

Note: <sup>1</sup>Net 2-way peak hour trips in excess of this number shall be categorized and assigned weighting factors in a proportionate manner to the above table.

Source: Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code. Article 12 – Traffic Performance Standards. 01/07 Supplement No. 3 (Effective December 1, 2006)

**SAMPLE CRALLS POINT MITIGATION STRATEGY**

**Strategy 13. Compressed Work Week/Non-Peak Hour Work Hours**

**1. Strategy**

A work site policy implementing a work schedule for full-time (i.e. working at least 35 hours per week) employees for a less than 5-day work week by extending hours of work during the remaining work days, with start and end work times that fall outside the normal AM (7 to 9 AM) and PM (4 to 6 PM) peak hours.

**2. Qualifying Criteria**

- a. 20 percent or more of on-site employees must be working the compressed work week schedule.
- b. Either the start or end work time or both must fall outside the normal AM and PM peak hours of on-street traffic.
- c. The work schedules for the affected on-site employees need to be documented on an annual basis.
- d. Projects must include an on-site coordinator to assist participants in the program, as well as to facilitate program performance tracking and reporting.]
- e. Project must develop a formal policy and contract between employees and managers that shall identify which job categories are eligible for the compressed work week/non-peak work hours option.
- f. Project must be an employer of 20 or more people.
- g. For those employees qualifying for credit under the non-peak hour work hours' part of Strategy 13, Compressed Work Week/Non-Peak Work Hours, no credit shall be received for Strategy 5, Ridesharing Programs.

**3. Implementation Timeframe**

One year from date of issuance of the first CO for the Project.

**4. Monitoring and Enforcement**

a. By April 1 of each year, starting April 1 after the first full year after initiating the program, the owner, developer, or their agent, must supply a report to the County Engineer identifying the number of employees from the development participating in the program and the total number of employees employed during the reporting period, and the work schedules of each participant. This Monitoring Report shall also include a copy of the compressed work week policy and copies of each of the signed compressed work week contracts entered during the reporting period. The County Engineer shall analyze the data for compliance with the Development Order. If the program fails to meet the plan's specified criteria within one year of Project Buildout, the owner, developer, or agent shall undertake remedial action, or institute an alternate mitigation strategy.

b. Two years following initiation of the strategy, the project's developer, owner, or agent as appropriate, may request alteration or substitution of the strategy pursuant Art. 12.P.3.F, Time Limits.

**5. Credit Factor**

Credit factor shall be calculated in accordance with Strategy 13 Credit Factor Calculation, below:

$$\text{Credit Factor} = E \times (D + H/(5-D)) \\ 50 \times (\text{square root of } S)$$

E = number of on-site based employees that participate in program

D = number of weekdays per week that the employees do not have to drive to work due to their participation in program

H = number of peak hours per week on workdays during which participating employees will not drive to work

S = size of project in 1,000 sf

---

Source: Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code. Article 12 – Traffic Performance Standards. 01/07 Supplement No. 3 (Effective December 1, 2006)



#### D. A Menu of Mitigation Options

An effective way for determining the appropriate mitigation of transportation is through the preparation of a series of acceptable mitigation actions. These actions could be based on a corridor management plan, a subarea plan, planning policy objectives, or some combination. This section introduces a menu of options that may be incorporated into a mobility plan. The plan must be structured carefully to demonstrate how each technique works together in a clearly demonstrated pattern to accomplish the desired mobility goal. Such plans must address land use as well as the transportation system and modes. FDOT District 4 is applying a combination of options to SR 710 (see inset).

##### A ROAD MAP FOR SR-710

Development pressure in Palm Beach County and Martin County has been extending westward. The existing and proposed development in the area totals more than 25,000 residential units and approximately 6,000,000 square feet of non-residential land use that, when combined, exert a great deal of pressure on the area roadway system. SR-710, a SIS facility with a rural area LOS standard, faces the brunt of the impact. The three-mile segment running from Blue Heron Boulevard to Northlake Boulevard in the vicinity of Florida's Turnpike is Palm Beach County's main concern. The County contends that even without the proposed developments, the segment will soon be deficient. Additional development approvals will accelerate deficiency on this segment (and other portions of SR-710).

In January 2007, FDOT District 4 coordinated a meeting with representatives of Palm Beach County, Martin County, DCA, FDOT Central Office, and the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC), to begin laying out a long-term solution for the SR-710 corridor. A *road map* was proposed to resolve LOS issues in both counties was developed that separated SR-710 into two segments. The proposed road map included:

1. Segment One (SR-710 within the Indiantown area, Fox Brown Road to SR-76, in Martin County). Martin County should investigate whether or not this portion of SR-710 can be designated as a Transportation Concurrence Exception Area as defined by Chapter 163.3180(5) F.S.
2. Segment Two (SR-710 from SR-76 in Martin County to Haverhill Road in Palm Beach County). Each county should prepare a Temporary LOS Variance Petition and develop a Long-Term Transportation Concurrence Management System for SR-710.
3. A series of demand traffic modeling/project traffic workshops were also proposed to reach agreement on future traffic volume, the ultimate cross-section, associated funding of mitigation strategies; and timing of construction for various segments of SR-710.

The proposal envisions finalizing the traffic modeling effort for traffic projections by late 2007. This will be followed by completion of the ultimate cross-section, and then the funding agreement in the Spring of 2008. As of November 2007, both counties have officially committed to participate in the proposed road map and workshops are ongoing.

All approaches call for the use of a variety of options that work together to provide overall mobility and travel choices. The following “menu” of options may be combined in various ways and therefore be “tailored” to each individual community or sub-area.

- (1) *Transportation systems management* – Application of transportation system management techniques may improve the operation of existing highway facilities by maximizing their capacity. These techniques include improved signage, adding a median, installing turn-lanes, managing driveway spacing, encouraging carpooling as well as large-scale projects such as traffic signal systems, centralized traffic operation centers, converting intersections to freeway style interchanges, and sophisticated intelligent transportation system, or ITS strategies, like installing video cameras along the interstate.

Some areas pool developer contributions for the purpose of establishing intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements. Intelligent transportation systems include a wide range of tools for managing traffic as well as for providing services for travelers including commercial vehicle operations, advanced public transportation systems, advanced traffic management systems, advanced traveler information systems, advanced crash avoidance systems, automatic vehicle location, machine vision, and electronic toll and traffic management systems. One of the major benefits of ITS is the maximization of the network's performance by the reallocation of travel demand or improving the reliability of transportation system through information, communication, integration and management. For example, providing traffic congestion information allows drivers to select less congested routes, diverse departure times, or a different mode of travel. Collectively, these driver choices contribute to decreasing traffic congestion.

A traffic management center or traffic operations center monitors roadway conditions through the use of closed circuit television monitoring cameras or various detectors. These centers collect information that identifies the cause of traffic congestion at specific locations. Transportation professionals can then find efficient and effective solutions to isolated instances of traffic congestion. Such solutions may include adaptive signal control which optimizes traffic signal timing plans and coordinates traffic signal control increasing the efficiency intersections and, ultimately, arterial capacity.

- (2) *Congestion management process (CMP) can form the basis for developer mitigation* – All MPOs are required by federal law to maintain a congestion management process (CMP). This process first identifies and then addresses congestion issues using travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. The CMP identifies problems that can be addressed relatively quickly using lower-cost management and operational approaches. The CMP can also be used to identify congestion problems and reduction strategies that are relatively large in scale and cost. Transportation partners may work with the MPO through the CMP to develop solutions to traffic congestion impacting SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities.
- (3) *Transportation demand management (TDM)* – Transportation demand management may be the most underused element of an effective mobility plan. TDM consists of strategies that foster increased efficiency of the transportation system by influencing travel behavior by mode, time of day, frequency, trip length, regulation, route or cost. TDM discourages drive-alone travel through better management of existing transportation infrastructure, services and resources. TDM strategies include, for example, public transit services, carpooling and vanpooling, compressed work weeks, telecommuting, limited parking, and provision of bike and locker facilities by employers. Detailed information about TDM strategies and existing programs can be found at the National TDM and Telework Clearinghouse (<http://www.nctr.usf.edu/clearinghouse/>).

Transportation partners unfamiliar with local government land development processes will find guidance on proactive measures that can be used to influence the incorporation of TDM into the land development process in *Incorporating TDM into the Land Development Process* (Resource 12)<sup>13</sup> National Center for Transit Research at CUTR, August 2005. The report documents efforts to secure TDM strategies as part of development approvals, summarizes the long range planning groundwork that frames the land development process, includes several case study examples from Florida and other states and identifies institutional barriers to the use of TDM as part of the land development process.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Incorporating TDM into the Land Development Process*, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, August 2005.

Transportation partners interested in using TDM in land development must get involved long before development proposals are submitted. This requires participation in review and updates of the MPO long range transportation plan and transportation improvement program as well as local government comprehensive plans. Further, it involves appraising how well the local government land development regulations implement the intent of the comprehensive plan and reviewing traffic analysis methodology and underlying assumptions. These activities will begin the integration of TDM principles and strategies into the land use and transportation planning process resulting in physical infrastructure and regulatory tools to support TDM as land development proceeds.

Table II-2, TDM strategies in land development (Page 25), is an excerpt from the report. It indicates which TDM strategies may be used to influence specific travel behavior, during which land development process they must be addressed, and potential implementing partners.

DOCUMENTING IMPROVED MOBILITY TECHNIQUES ON SIS AND TRIP FACILITIES: A GUIDE TO MITIGATION  
STRATEGIES FOR MITIGATING TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS TO SIS, SIHS, AND TRIP-FUNDED FACILITIES

Table II-2 TDM strategies in land development

MEANS OF INFLUENCING TRAVEL BEHAVIOR	TDM STRATEGY (EXAMPLES)	SUPPORTING ACTION (LAND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS)	POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING PARTICIPANTS
<b>Trip length.</b> Reduce quantity of vehicle miles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit oriented development</li> <li>Proximate commuting by allowing employees to relocate job to the branch office nearest their homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clustering related land uses and providing an inter-connected circulation system (comprehensive plans and land development regulations)</li> <li>Providing incentives to employers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land developer</li> <li>Municipal land devt regulator</li> <li>Economic devt organization</li> <li>Realtors</li> <li>Employer</li> <li>Commuter assistance program</li> <li>Transp management assoc</li> </ul>
<b>Mode.</b> Increase efficiency of system to carry more people in the same number of vehicles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing land in support of alternative modes, such as transit oriented development</li> <li>Limiting parking supply</li> <li>Offering alternative modes, such as transit, vanpooling, carpooling, bicycling, walking</li> <li>Carsharing</li> <li>Road pricing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locating land development to take advantage of existing underutilized transportation services such as transit routes</li> <li>Providing on-site amenities, such as lockers, showers, bicycle parking and preferential carpool parking (land development regulations)</li> <li>Providing support services such as marketing, ridematching and guaranteed ride home</li> <li>Providing transportation services and physical transportation facilities off-site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land developer</li> <li>Property manager</li> <li>Municipal land devt regulator</li> <li>Realtors</li> <li>Economic development organizations</li> <li>Transit agency</li> <li>State DOT</li> <li>Municipal public works dept</li> <li>Municipal parks &amp; rec dept</li> <li>Employer</li> <li>Commuter assistance program</li> <li>Transp management assoc</li> <li>Private enterprise</li> </ul>
<b>Route.</b> Bypass congestion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit oriented development</li> <li>Providing route alternatives</li> <li>High occupancy vehicle lanes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing a grid system, street connectivity, and destinations within easy walking distance (comprehensive plans and land development regulations)</li> <li>Implementing Advanced Traveler Information Systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land developer</li> <li>Municipal land development regulator</li> <li>Realtor</li> <li>Economic development organization</li> <li>State DOT</li> <li>Municipal public works department</li> <li>Highway patrol</li> </ul>
<b>Regulation.</b> Mandate specific traffic management actions or outcomes by local ordinance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State growth management provisions</li> <li>Concurrency</li> <li>Trip reduction ordinances</li> <li>Zoning ordinances</li> <li>Subdivision ordinances</li> <li>Parking ordinances</li> <li>HOV lanes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carried out primarily by land developers, property managers, employers, neighborhood associations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State land planning agency</li> <li>State DOT</li> <li>Municipal land development regulator</li> <li>Municipal public works department</li> <li>Municipal parking department</li> <li>Highway patrol</li> </ul>
<b>Cost.</b> Establish incentives and disincentives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking pricing</li> <li>Transit subsidies</li> <li>Parking cash-out</li> <li>High occupancy toll lanes</li> <li>Commuter tax benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tax benefit program assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property manager</li> <li>Municipal parking department</li> <li>State DOT</li> <li>Employers</li> <li>Commuter assistance programs</li> <li>Transp management assoc</li> </ul>
<b>Frequency.</b> Reduce number of trips over given time period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing on-site amenities</li> <li>Compressed work week</li> <li>Telework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing physical facilities, such as employee cafeteria, fitness center, bank</li> <li>Providing technical support to employers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land developer</li> <li>Property manager</li> <li>Employer</li> <li>Commuter assistance program</li> <li>Transportation management association</li> </ul>
<b>Time of day/day of week.</b> Move trips to less congested periods or avoid vehicle trip completely.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compressed work week</li> <li>Staggered work hours</li> <li>Telework</li> <li>Flex time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unbundling parking from employment site leases</li> <li>Providing technical support to employers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property manager</li> <li>Commuter assistance program</li> <li>Transportation management association</li> <li>Employer</li> </ul>



(4) *Develop a new parallel reliever roadway or add capacity to an existing parallel roadway.*

Parallel roads run in the same direction within reasonable proximity to one another and serve common destinations. A parallel road may be another arterial or collector road near a facility at or near capacity. Evaluation of travel demand may reveal that a parallel road may relieve the traffic congestion on the main roadway. Developing a new parallel reliever is likely to be complex and costly, particularly in terms of right of way. Designation of an existing road as a parallel reliever is a more feasible solution. This may require improving access to the reliever particularly from the main facility or connection of several existing parallel roads to create one continuous road. In addition, improvements to a designated reliever such as turn lanes, medians, signal timing, or additional lanes may be necessary to maximize traffic flow.

In some cases, parallel roads may be service roads. Service roads generally provide alternative access to commercial tracts along a major roadway. They are often referred to as frontage roads or reverse frontage roads (aka “backage” roads). Reverse frontage roads provide access behind the commercial uses facing the main road. Providing buildable sites between the service road and the major road right-of-way, creates a safer condition than frontage roads by allowing greater separation of the service road connection from the major arterial intersection. It also increases the ability to integrate corridor development with local street networks. Frontage roads parallel an arterial roadway or freeway between the roadway right-of-way and the front building setback line. Frontage roads can work well for light office or single family residential developments, where they begin and end between major road intersections. However, continuous frontage roads can lead to crashes and operational problems due to unfamiliar movements and where they connect too close to a major roadway intersection.

Opportunities to partner with the state transportation agency or MPO can increase the ability of smaller communities to create service roads on state highways. In addition, similar mechanisms may be used to relieve congestion on major roadways including corridor access management plans and street network connectivity both of which are discussed below.

(5) *Corridor access management plans* – One technique that may be used to maximize mobility on an existing corridor is the development of a corridor management plan that addresses land use, access management, street networks, and right-of-way needs along a major roadway. A corridor management plan should include defined improvement projects and may be part of long term concurrency management system.

The corridor evaluated for the plan should extend beyond the road right-of-way into the adjacent neighborhoods. The purpose of this physical planning effort is to evaluate roadway design and access characteristics, and propose changes that maintain reasonable access to property, while improving the safety and operation of the main highway. Such changes may involve:

- medians or median opening closures;
- signal location and spacing;
- auxiliary lanes;
- right-of-way needs and requirements;
- site access and circulation design;
- land use and activity center concepts;
- improvements to the supporting roadway network;
- improvements involving access for other transportation modes (e.g. bus pullouts, transitions for special use transit lanes or bus rapid transit, pedestrian crossing treatments); and
- bicycle lanes and shared use paths.

Corridor management plans typically include a map and report establishing the desired location, spacing and design of median openings, signals and (driveway or street) connections. They should also include concepts for expanding the street network that runs parallel to and connects to the highway. Some corridor management plans are detailed maps with binding agreements that specifically indicate future property access on a parcel-by-parcel basis. Most, however, are conceptual and serve as a guide for access decisions during development review or access permitting. Improvement projects identified through this process should become eligible for funding by proposed development along the corridor.

Because the corridor management plan affects the state highway and the surrounding community, it requires both state and local government approval. Official adoption by each implementing agency is necessary to establish the corridor management plan as a legal standard that can be enforced in development review and permitting. The plans are typically implemented through a combination of regulations, interagency or public/private agreements, design standards, and road improvement projects. These tools can be supplemented with binding agreements on site access, where such agreements can be legally applied or negotiated with individual property owners.

The *Guide for Analysis of Corridor Management Policies* ([Resource 13](#)) provides detailed guidance for conducting a corridor management policy analysis including steps in evaluating local government policies and practices, methods for identifying implementation needs, and a framework for recommending policy changes, including examples and resources for further information. A review of local government policies affecting a corridor along with appropriate adjustments is key to a successful corridor management plan and should be an integral part of plan development. *SR 26 Conceptual Corridor Management Plan*,<sup>14</sup> is an example application of the techniques outlined in the guide and is summarized in Attachment II-A.

Right of way preservation is essential to corridor management plans that involve capacity and street network improvements. Right-of-way preservation is the coordinated application of measures to obtain control of or protect the right-of-way for a planned transportation facility. In Florida law, right-of-way preservation is addressed in the context of corridor management, which is defined as the “coordination of the planning of designated future transportation corridors with land use planning within and adjacent to the corridor...” (Section 163.3164(30), F.S.).

*Corridor Preservation Best Practices for Local Governments* ([Resource 14](#))<sup>15</sup> addresses the right-of-way preservation aspects of a corridor management plan. A variety of tools are available to preserve right-of-way and mitigate hardship on property owners, the main argument against right of way preservation. These tools include density credits, regulatory controls, options to purchase, interim use agreements, land banking, and purchase of development rights. The most effective approach is a systematic program for preserving right-of-way and managing access that uses the full range of governmental powers and tools to their maximum advantage.

Model access management plan amendments ([Resource 15](#)) and access management ordinance language ([Resource 16](#)) address corridor preservation. In addition, *Managing Corridor Development: A Municipal Handbook* ([Resource 17](#))<sup>16</sup> documents success stories in implementing comprehensive corridor management and identifies best practices that can be applied by FDOT, MPOs, and local governments throughout the state. The emphasis is on policy, regulatory, and funding strategies for

---

<sup>14</sup> *SR 26 Conceptual Corridor Management Plan*, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2007.

<sup>15</sup> K. Williams and R. Frey, *Corridor Preservation Best Practices for Local Governments*, Prepared for Hillsborough County, FL, Center for Urban Transportation Research, 2003.

<sup>16</sup> Williams, K., and M. Marshall, *Managing Corridor Development: A Municipal Handbook*, Center for Urban Transportation Research, 1996.

comprehensive corridor management that can be directly applied by communities alone, or in coordination with state transportation agencies and MPOs. The study also addresses policy issues in comprehensive corridor management and recommends changes in current practice that will assist the FDOT, MPOs and local governments in managing access to the SIS and other important state highways. This document includes excellent examples of effective corridor management practices that are transferable to similar situations.

(6) *Street network connectivity* – Enhancing street network connectivity can be applied as a technique to provide highway system users alternatives to major roadway, particularly for short trips. Local and collector street networks are often underdeveloped and major highways such as SIS facilities are used as the only means of access to and from many developments. Transportation partners seeking to remedy congestion through urban areas should explore the possibility of improving adjacent street networks. Fragmented street systems increase the number and length of automobile trips and also impede emergency access. A connected road network advances the following mobility objectives:

- fewer vehicle miles traveled;
- decreased congestion;
- alternative routes for short, local trips;
- improved accessibility of developed areas;
- facilitation of walking, bicycling, and use of transit;
- reduced demand on major thoroughfares;
- more environmentally sensitive layout of streets and lots;
- interconnected neighborhoods foster a sense of community;
- safer school bus routes; and
- safer walking and bicycling routes to schools.<sup>17</sup>

Although challenging, transportation partners should seek ways to connect existing fragmented systems as well as to prevent new fragments. *Accomplishing Alternative Access on Major Transportation Corridors* ([Resource 18](#))<sup>18</sup> discusses the basics of street connectivity and offers some sample code language. In addition, the planning and regulatory model for multimodal transportation districts discussed later in the report, *Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts* ([Resource 10](#)), contains land development regulation policies for improving street networks and connectivity. Another document that explores street connectivity and different approaches communities are using in detail, *Planning for Street Connectivity, Getting from Here to There*,<sup>19</sup> is available through the American Planning Association Planning Advisory Service ([www.planning.org](http://www.planning.org)).

(7) *Bicycle/pedestrian network connectivity* – To foster the use of alternative transportation modes, connectivity for bicycle and pedestrian movement should be an integral part of any mobility plan. Although often considered the realm of local government alone, transportation partners should be prepared to share technical expertise in this area. Ample bicycle and pedestrian

---

<sup>17</sup> Safe Routes to School – The Role in Multimodal Planning.  
[www.dot.state.fl.us/research-center/Completed\\_Proj/Summary\\_PL/FDOT\\_BD545\\_32\\_rpt.pdf](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/research-center/Completed_Proj/Summary_PL/FDOT_BD545_32_rpt.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Kristine Williams and Karen Seggerman, *Accomplishing Alternative Access on Major Transportation Corridors, Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> National Conference on Transportation Planning for Small and Medium-Sized Communities*, Transportation Research Board, Colorado Springs, CO Sept 2004. (Best Paper)

<sup>19</sup> *Planning for Street Connectivity: Getting from Here to There*, S. Handy, R. Paterson, and K. Butler. PAS Report 515, American Planning Association 2003.

connections within and between residential areas and supporting community facilities and services, such as shopping areas, employment centers, transit stops, neighborhood parks, and schools may lessen short-range automobile trips.

A bicycle and pedestrian network comprised of a system of interconnected and direct routes can be measured by a connectivity index. Instructions on how to perform this measure are found in *Multimodal Transportation Districts and Areawide Quality of Service Handbook* ([Resource 9](#)). Missing links or gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network should be identified and eliminated where appropriate through the development process. Missing links may include locations between cul-de-sacs, through walls or fences, mid-block where block length exceeds 660 feet, or where bicycle pedestrian routes would otherwise be “excessively” circuitous. Highest priority for improvements should be given to locations with high concentrations of pedestrian activity and where connections are needed to ensure easy access between transportation modes, with particular attention to bicycle and pedestrian access to schools, transit stops and regional greenway or trail systems. Model comprehensive plan amendment and land development regulation language can be found in *Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts* ([Resource 10](#)).

- (8) *Transit* – Many transportation partners may want to include transit in their mobility plan; however, transit is perhaps the most difficult of the multimodal solutions to implement due mainly to continuing operational costs of the system. In addition, most transit agencies focus their transit development plans (TDP) on current revenues and do not have enough resources to devote staff time to development review or system expansion. Transportation partners would benefit from including transit agency representatives in any mobility plan discussion and work with them on strategic planning for their system. A wealth of information regarding transit is available on the National Center for Transit Research website (<http://www.nctr.usf.edu/>).

The *Second Edition of the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual* (TCQSM) ([Resource 19](#)), published by the Transportation Research Board in 2003, provides guidance to agencies that are establishing a new transit system, or evaluating or upgrading their current systems. The TCQSM recommends evaluating the transit systems by use of “Quality of Service” (QOS) measures using qualitative and quantitative performance measures.

*Land Developer Participation in Providing for Bus Transit Facilities/Operations* ([Resource 20](#))<sup>20</sup> documents various regulatory and non-regulatory strategies that Florida’s local governments and transit agencies can use to generate public transportation funding through the involvement of private developers. Local and national case studies highlight application of these strategies. Suggestions are designed for use within the framework of local government comprehensive plans, land development codes, and transit development plans, and therefore call for increased coordination and cooperation between local governments and transit agencies.

One transit option that is gaining momentum is bus rapid transit (BRT). According to the National Bus Rapid Transit Institute website ([www.nbrti.org](http://www.nbrti.org)), “Bus Rapid Transit is an innovative, high-capacity, lower-cost public transit solution that can achieve the performance and benefits of more expensive rail modes. This integrated system uses buses or specialized vehicles on roadways or dedicated lanes to quickly and efficiently transport passengers to their destinations, while offering the flexibility to meet a variety of local conditions. BRT system

---

<sup>20</sup> *Land Developer Participation in Providing for Bus Transit Facilities/Operations*. National Center for Transit Research, Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2002.

elements can easily be customized to community needs and incorporate state-of-the-art, low-cost technologies that attract more passengers and ultimately help reduce overall traffic congestion.”

When considering light rail as an option, transportation partners should seriously consider BRT as a lower-cost alternative. Extensive information regarding the application of BRT is available at the website above.

- (9) *Land use* – Land use is as important to mobility planning as the transportation system. Because local governments have control over land use decisions, this element is often left out of discussions regarding mobility plans. Transportation partners should not overlook this important element. Many studies address the transportation/land use connection. *Model Regulations and Plan Amendments for Multimodal Transportation Districts* ([Resource 10](#)) establishes that land use within a multimodal transportation district must be of sufficient size to support uses and transportation alternatives, contain a variety of land uses, including both employment and residential, and include land uses promoting pedestrian, bicycle and transit use.

Transit-oriented development is often defined as higher-density mixed-use development within walking distance - or a half mile - of transit stations. We use a performance-based definition, and believe that projects should also:

- Increase “location efficiency” so people can walk and bike and take transit
- Boost transit ridership and minimize traffic
- Provide a rich mix of housing, shopping and transportation choices
- Generate revenue for the public and private sectors and provide value for both new and existing residents
- Create a sense of place

Source: Center for Transit-Oriented Development

One approach increasing in popularity, transit-oriented development or TOD, is typically defined as compact development within easy walking distance of transit stations (typically a half mile) that contains a mix of uses such as housing, jobs, shops, restaurants and entertainment. Such development focuses on transit- and pedestrian-friendly site design, limited parking, mixed land uses, and increased housing density.

The Center for Transit Oriented Development<sup>21</sup> applies a performance-based definition to such development (see inset). Transportation partners seeking to make transit and other multimodal solutions a large part of mobility plans to mitigate impacts to SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities should investigate the benefits of this approach as well as its drawbacks. FDOT is preparing training for its staff regarding TODs.<sup>22</sup> Due to its growing popularity, there are many websites where additional information is available such as [www.transitorienteddevelopment.org](http://www.transitorienteddevelopment.org), the American Planning Association ([www.planning.org](http://www.planning.org)), the Congress for the New Urbanism ([www.cnu.org](http://www.cnu.org)), Smart Growth

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/tod>

<sup>22</sup> FDOT’s Public Transit Office (PTO) prepared and delivered a pilot classroom-style training to educate comprehensive plan reviewers (including DCA personnel and others) on how to recognize effective transit-oriented developments (TODs) in the context of local government comprehensive plans. PTO, along with a consultant, researched and developed the comprehensive plan TOD training course; prepared, delivered, and solicited feedback on the training and draft training material from the target audience; made appropriate modifications; and developed guidance for delivery of the training material. Discussion with course participants also assisted in determining primary criteria for codifying standards of TOD. Major themes of the training include the three Ds of TODs (density, diversity, and design), the importance of identifying TODs as special incentive districts on the FLUM, and identification of primary TOD characteristics.



America ([www.smartgrowthamerica.org](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org)), and the Transportation Surface Policy Project ([www.transact.org](http://www.transact.org)).

- (10) *Enhancing Development Review* – It can be challenging to incorporate multimodal analysis in the development review process. Collectively, transportation partners ask more of applicants and, as a result, get more from them regarding the status of multimodal systems and those system needs. One approach that may be used is discussed below.
- (a) *Include multimodal analyses in traffic impact analysis.* The City of Rockville, Maryland moved away from mitigation measures related primarily to providing additional roadway capacity through physical improvements and is encouraging mitigation for alternative modes (e.g., ridesharing programs, shuttles to transit stations, installation of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, etc.). Rockville applicants for developments may be obligated to contribute toward the improvement of offsite transportation and safety facilities to help address identified safety hazards for all modes. The City enacted a *Comprehensive Transportation Review Methodology* (CTR) ([Resource 21](#)) in September 2004 to evaluate the impacts of new development on the transportation system and to determine mitigation for alternative modes and assign corresponding trip credits.

## E. Funding Mitigation

Transportation needs continue to grow while funding from traditional sources continues to shrink. Cooperation among transportation partners is essential to maximize use of limited transportation funds. Available state transportation funds should be leveraged with local and private funding sources. A few options for consideration include:

- (1) *Proportionate fair-share mitigation.* The 2005 amendments to Florida’s growth management legislation directed local governments to enact concurrency management ordinances by December 1, 2006 that allow for “proportionate share” contributions from developers toward concurrency requirements. The intent of the proportionate fair-share option is to provide applicants for development an opportunity to proceed under certain conditions, notwithstanding the failure of transportation concurrency, by contributing their share of the cost of improving the impacted transportation facility.

*Working with Proportionate Fair Share* ([Resource 22](#))<sup>23</sup> was developed to offer FDOT staff a detailed overview of how proportionate fair-share works and should be applied according to its intended design. The guide describes the concept of proportionate fair-share (in contrast to proportionate share; which applies specifically to DRIs), how it is calculated; its implementation at the District level for FDOT facilities; which plans, roadway types, and phases can benefit from proportionate fair-share contributions; and key proportionate fair-share agreement components.

The *Model Ordinance for Proportionate Fair-Share Mitigation of Development Impacts on Transportation Corridors* ([Resource 23](#))<sup>24</sup> is a model ordinance that presents a series of options that are intended as a framework for proportionate fair-share programs. The ordinance language sets forth the proportionate fair-share mitigation options in a manner consistent with and as required by Section 163.3180(16), Florida Statutes, and has been crafted to tie to existing local government concurrency management systems. Because conditions vary

---

<sup>23</sup> *Working with Proportionate Fair-Share*. Florida Department of Transportation, December 2006.

<sup>24</sup> *Model Ordinance for Proportionate Fair-Share Mitigation of Development Impacts on Transportation Corridors*. Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2007.

throughout the state, it is not the intent that a local government would adopt the ordinance verbatim as it does not address all issues that may arise within a particular context. Rather, the model ordinance is a technical assistance tool that local governments will need to adapt to their situation. The model ordinance contains some options that a local government may consider depending upon their needs. Local governments should obtain professional planning and legal assistance when adapting this model regulatory language to fit local needs.

- (2) *Alternative Funding Sources. Alternative Funding Strategies for Improving Transportation Facilities: A Review of Public Private Partnerships and Regulatory Methods* ([Resource 24](#))<sup>25</sup> examines public and private partnerships, such as transportation corporations, alternative financing methods, such as tax increment financing, and methods for raising revenue, such as traffic impact fee ordinances or transportation improvement districts. The report also examines regulatory methods, such as fair share mitigation and concurrency or adequate public facilities ordinances, for more systematically requiring developer contributions toward needed transportation facilities through the development review process.

Any effort to promote cost sharing for transportation improvements should strive to achieve consistency and equity of outcome – equity to prospective developers, as well as equity of contributions across the many agencies and jurisdictions responsible for maintaining transportation facilities. It should also attempt to reduce administrative burdens and provide some certainty of outcome. A potential shortcoming of fair share programs is a reliance on site traffic impact studies, which are costly to administer and may be manipulated with unpredictable outcomes. Contributions achieved primarily through negotiation tend to be the least predictable and equitable.

- (3) *Transportation Concurrency Backlog Areas.* The 2007 growth management legislation established a new option called transportation concurrency backlog areas. The legislation allows local governments to create, through an inter-local agreement, a transportation concurrency backlog area for the purpose of funding the construction and maintenance of transportation improvements to resolve backlog and deficiency issues. The governing board of the county or municipality would comprise the authority's membership. Their task would be to develop and implement a plan that eliminates all backlogs within its jurisdiction. The plan must identify all roads designated as failing to meet concurrency requirements and include a schedule for financing and construction to eliminate the backlog within 10 years of plan adoption. The plan is not subject to the twice-per-year limitation on comprehensive plan amendments.

One method to fund the plan's implementation is a local concurrency backlog trust fund. Each authority may earmark and place in a trust fund tax increment funds equal to 25 percent of the difference between the ad valorem taxes collected in a given year and the ad valorem taxes which would have been collected using the same rate in effect when the authority is created. Upon adoption of the transportation concurrency backlog plan, all backlogs within the jurisdiction are deemed financially feasible for purposes of calculating transportation concurrency. The authority is dissolved upon completion of all backlogs.

---

<sup>25</sup> *Alternative Funding Strategies for Improving Transportation Facilities: A Review of Public Private Partnerships and Regulatory Methods.* Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2007.

## Attachment II-A - SR 26 Conceptual Corridor Management Plan Summary

A study of access management and street network needs along SR 26 in Alachua and Gilchrist Counties culminated in a conceptual access management plan that could form the basis for a mitigation agreement for this failing SIS corridor. Recommendations to address the observed access management issues form the basis of a conceptual corridor access management plan for SR 26. These recommendations are summarized below.

1. Plan and map parallel roadway and cross street networks along SR 26 to provide a clear framework for implementing alternative access along the corridor.
  - Each jurisdiction should add segments of the parallel roadway system to the capital improvements element of its comprehensive plan and require developer participation in implementing the system through fair share agreements as a condition of development approval for SR 26 concurrency mitigation.
  - Consider establishing a long term concurrency management system plan for accomplishing this supporting network on selected segments of SR 26.
  - Consider establishing a corridor management overlay ordinance for segments of SR 26 to aid in implementing parallel roadways and interparcel cross access in selected areas.
2. Establish a local government thoroughfare plan and adopt or update right-of-way preservation requirements to advance development of arterial and collector streets throughout the community:
  - Adopt a future traffic circulation map in the comprehensive plan that identifies the network of planned arterials and collectors to be preserved and assigns future right-of-way needs for each mapped street.
  - Enact policies and regulations that clearly restrict building in the right-of-way of a mapped transportation facility without a variance, and that clarify that ROW dedication will be roughly proportionate to development impacts.
  - Address right-of-way preservation in the development review process and provide for measures to mitigate hardship on property owners and preserve property rights, such as on-site density transfers, cluster options, and modifying alignments.
3. Enforce local street network and connectivity standards to help reduce reliance on SR 26 for short local trips:
  - Strongly enforce existing standards that require subdivisions to continue and connect to existing local and collector street networks.
  - Require developments to connect through to side streets at appropriate locations.
  - Require internal roads for residential subdivisions and consider allowing some variation in local street design to accommodate variety of cross section types, unpaved shared access drives for rural residential areas, and “skinny” streets where desired to maintain small town residential character.
4. Promote and enforce activity center development for commercial areas along SR 26 and increase the depth of commercially zoned areas where necessary to avoid commercial strip development:



- For large commercial developments require the provision and/or continuation of local and collector streets and provide street connections with surrounding residential areas so residents may access the center without traveling on SR 26;
  - Require shopping centers and mixed-use developments to provide a unified access and circulation plan and require any outparcels to obtain access from the unified access and circulation system.
  - Clarify in regulations that properties under the same ownership or those consolidated for development will be treated as one property for the purposes of access management and will not receive the maximum potential number of access points for that frontage indicated under minimum access spacing standards.
5. Strengthen and update local land division and access regulations to address access management on SR 26 and help reinforce development alternative access roads:
    - Establish that existing lots unable to meet the access spacing standards for SR 26 must obtain access from platted side streets, parallel streets, service roads, joint and cross access, or the provision of easements.
    - Establish minimum access spacing standards for locally-maintained thoroughfares and use these to guide corner clearance,<sup>26</sup> as well. Maintain adequate corner clearance at crossroad intersections with SR 26.
  6. Enact the necessary coordination measures with FDOT District 2 access permitting staff to ensure that conditions are placed in the access permit requiring properties to remove nonconforming access points and/or obtain alternative access in areas where parallel roads, service roads, and side street networks are planned. Provide FDOT access permitting staff with an opportunity to coordinate in review of proposed plats and development applications along the SR 26 corridor to prevent access problems.
  7. Consider establishing a corridor management team made up of representatives of each local government and FDOT District 2 to facilitate coordination in implementing alternative access along the SR 26 corridor and to address requests for deviation from SR 26 access spacing requirements and local alternative access plans.
    - In addition, FDOT District 2 should consider designating a regional access permit coordinator to participate in this process.

Assessing current land development and access management practices and developing conceptual corridor management plans are beneficial for several reasons. These activities can provide FDOT, as well as local governments, strategies for identifying and overcoming barriers to effective corridor access management in the land development process. In addition, the resulting plans can help to strengthen state and local coordination in access and development permitting. The result is a corridor management plan that, as defined in Florida planning law, promotes the “coordination of the planning of designated future transportation corridors with land-use planning within and adjacent to the corridor...” (Chapter 163.3164(30), F.S.).

---

<sup>26</sup> Corner clearance is focused on separation of access points from roadway intersections.

### III. Build and Maintain Relationships

Building and maintaining relationships among government agencies and other transportation partners is essential to achieving mobility goals. These relationships are mutually beneficial to all stakeholders. Such cooperation enables participants to meet statutory requirements such as providing mobility on the SIS and providing adequate transportation facilities concurrent with the impacts of development. A genuine partnership that includes regular communication creates an environment where local governments, FDOT, and other transportation partners can work strategically to meet mobility needs.

Establishing these relationships does not happen over night, but instead requires consistent interaction. It is important to just reach out and begin. The following approaches are mechanisms for coordination and collaboration.

- (1) ***Initiate and maintain contact with transportation partners.*** Staff representatives of local governments, FDOT Districts, MPOs, transit agencies, and other agencies should obtain and maintain the contact information of transportation partners responsible for growth management transportation issues. Include the names, position titles, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses. Information regarding changes in personnel should be shared as soon as possible.

FDOT District 7 Growth Management and Access Management teams meet with Hillsborough County on a weekly basis to discuss development applications that may affect traffic conditions on the State Highway System. The FDOT DRI Coordinator also participates in these Transportation Review Committee meetings.
- (2) ***Collaborate on multimodal strategies.*** FDOT, local government representatives, and other transportation partners should meet regularly to discuss land development issues and mitigation strategies. Such a meeting may be initiated by any of the parties. The frequency of this meeting will be dictated by development pressures, potential for impact on SIS, FIHS, and TRIP-funded facilities, and the relative complexity of the mobility issues. To guide collaboration efforts, participants may refer to the handbook *From Handshake to Compact: Guidance to Foster Collaborative, Multimodal Decision-Making* ([Resource 25](#)).<sup>27</sup> This resource is a handbook with practical advice on establishing and maintaining collaborative relationships for multimodal decision making.

**Collaboration:** A purposeful process of working together to plan, to create, and to solve problems and/or manage activities.
- (3) ***Host (or co-host) an annual Multimodal Transportation Peer Exchange for the region.*** This regional event is a forum where peer-level representatives from each District, regional planning councils, metropolitan planning organizations, local governments, transit agencies, and developers can swap ideas, share best practices, and discuss challenges. Lack of transportation funding and ever-increasing travel demand have lead local governments to realize that they cannot build their way out of congestion. Local governments and transportation agencies must work together to find multimodal solutions to transportation challenges. A peer exchange meeting offers a forum for highlighting transportation accomplishments, discussing challenges, and developing solutions. It should be emphasized to all participants that the peer exchange is not intended to compare jurisdictions efforts with one another or to minimize any of a jurisdiction's activities. The procedure for hosting a multimodal solutions peer exchange is provided in Attachment III-A.

---

<sup>27</sup> Practitioner's Handbook. *From Handshake to Compact: Guidance to Foster Collaborative, Multimodal Decision Making*. TCRP Report 106/NCHRP Report 536, TRB, 2005.

#### Coordination Strategies for FDOT

*Designate* a point person in each district office who will serve as the growth management liaison to local governments and other transportation partners with regard to monitoring level of service per Rule 14-94 F.A.C. Furnish each transportation partner with contact information for that individual and updates as to personnel changes so that the appropriate agency representative can be contacted.

*Request and review* any locally adopted ordinances, plans, or concurrency management systems for potential conflicts or inconsistencies with those of the State so that local policies or requirements may be cross-referenced when appropriate.

*Request* notification of any and all proposed development, plats, or redevelopment applications near or adjacent to a state highway.

*Engage* in discussions and early, shared review of applications with the local government and developer.

*Solicit* feedback from the local government on relevant circumstances surrounding the proposed development.

*Participate* in meetings, teleconferences, or other consistent methods of coordination.

### Attachment III-A - Hosting a Multimodal Solutions Peer Exchange Meeting

#### Purpose

A peer exchange meeting offers a forum for highlighting transportation accomplishments, discussing challenges, and developing solutions. It should be emphasized to all participants that the peer exchange is not intended to compare jurisdictions efforts with one another or to minimize any of a jurisdiction's activities.

#### Step 1: Preparing for a peer exchange meeting

- A. Identify co-hosts – Identify local governments or other agencies interested in co-hosting the event. The regional planning council (RPC) might be a natural fit for this role.
- B. Secure one or more professional facilitators to assist with the event.
- C. Begin planning 6-12 months prior to meeting date.
- D. Plan for a one-day event; however may be extended if organizers deem appropriate
- E. Choose an event date.
  - (1) Preferred dates may be when FDOT/local governments are in middle of their fiscal year so the results of this effort may be incorporated into the upcoming fiscal year budget.
  - (2) Avoid days when city/county commissions are meeting to maximize participation.
- F. Establish participant fee (registration fee) to cover cost of meals, etc. (Note: State funds cannot be used for providing food.) Identify an agency that can collect these fees and make necessary payments or arrange for ordering of food and individual payment on-site.
- G. Prepare list of invitees. The size of this meeting will depend largely on the size of the area being targeted. Ideally, this is a group of a 24 to 48 people that can identify areas of concern with the transportation system and work to develop multimodal solutions. Participants should include those with some decision-making power as well as those charged with implementing decisions. Suggested invitees are listed below and should include anyone who could bring efforts to a halt if not included as part of the process.
  - (1) Majority of invitees should be representatives from:
    - (a) FDOT Districts
    - (b) Local governments (i.e., planners, public works, traffic engineers)
    - (c) Regional planning councils
    - (d) Metropolitan planning organizations
    - (e) Transit agencies and operators, including paratransit
    - (f) Commuter assistance programs and transportation management associations
    - (g) Bicycle/pedestrian program representatives;
    - (h) School district facility planning and transportation departments;
    - (i) Industry representatives (i.e., freight, land developers, builders associations, etc.)
    - (j) Large employers or institutions (i.e., military bases, universities, etc.)
  - (2) Other invitees may include:
    - (a) Local legislators/elected officials
    - (b) School board
    - (c) AARP or local seniors representative
    - (d) Council of neighborhoods representative

- (e) Media, including local news broadcasters, periodicals, radio stations and trade publications
- H. Select and secure a meeting location based on the number of anticipated participants. The facility should be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
  - (1) Possible locations include FDOT District, RPC, or MPO office (Note: If transit available, encourage participants to travel via that mode to raise awareness of multimodal concerns.)
  - (2) Room set-up: Ideally, the meeting room set-up includes round tables that enable participants to view the front of the room and have small group discussions.
  - (3) Telecommunications; the meeting location should have ability to be setup for teleconferencing.
- I. Secure speakers. A keynote speaker and speakers from each participant group having issues to share should be identified and secured for the chosen date.
- J. Prepare meeting materials (handouts, nametags, name tents, etc.). Allow adequate time for review and printing.

### Step 2: Meeting day logistics

- A. Registration desk. Participants will sign in and receive meeting materials and nametag.
- B. Provide all speakers and facilitators with a detailed itinerary of the day.
- C. Include onsite continental breakfast, lunch, and morning and afternoon coffee breaks. It is important to keep attendees on-site for the day for continuity and to keep participants “on task.” The lunch may be a working lunch; however, some time for phone calls, etc. should be included.

### Step 3: Meeting format

- A. The professional facilitator should establish ground rules for participation. To make this a candid problem solving and trouble shooting working session, attendees need to feel safe to express concerns and this may be difficult if the problems involve coordination issues or if there is a fear of finger pointing.
- B. Welcome (possibly Keynote Speaker), introductions, explain the meeting. Select a theme, issue, or agenda to initially focus the discussion or to get the conversation off the ground. Use an “icebreaker” technique to create a comfortable atmosphere and stress that this regional group is all “on the same team.”
- C. Clearly define the need for multimodal solutions and the expertise of all participants to develop a workable mobility plan.
- D. Transportation system status with emphasis on multimodal efforts. Participants should be encouraged to be candid about challenges and issues rather than presenting a rosy picture; avoid finger-pointing. Each participant should be prepared to share details of the agency:
  - (1) Accomplishments or “what has worked well” for the agency (of the past year or 5 years for first meeting).
  - (2) Plans for the coming year. (Include long range plan information such as future land use map (FLUM) changes, transportation or traffic circulation elements, and capital improvement elements).
  - (3) Challenges, areas of concern, or “what needs refining.” This should also identify where the agency feels need additional coordination or help from this “Peer group.” These could be tied to the specific topics of review process timing/chronology, criteria for review, staffing resources, data needs, lessons learned, etc. Input from participants is critical in this area because the remainder of the meeting is devoted to developing solutions for areas of concern.

- (4) Use a facilitator to capture the area of concern and prioritize for the following breakout sessions.
- E. Breakout discussions. Organize breakout discussions as appropriate.
  - (1) Provide a trained facilitator and recorder for each group.
    - (a) Each group will be devoted to “brainstorming” solutions to identified areas of concern through a facilitated open dialogue.
    - (b) It is intended that solutions will be of a multimodal nature involving more than one agency.
    - (c) Ask each group to report its suggestions to the broader group.
    - (d) Narrow suggested solutions, if necessary, to an appropriate number of key solutions through an iterative combining/ranking process.
- F. Concluding activities. Development of action plans.
  - (1) Reconvene breakout groups using the basic process above.
    - (a) Provide each group with an appropriate number of solutions to address.
    - (b) For each solution ask the group to identify a list of actions needed to advance that solution. Outcomes may include changes in review processes, programming of a corridor management plan, a strategic transit plan, etc.
  - (2) Join the groups and review the list of actions for each solution together
    - (a) Combine similar actions and/or rank them if necessary to establish a short list of key actions.
    - (b) Agree upon role of each agency in implementing key actions, a timeline, if appropriate, and identify how they will know if the action is being accomplished.
  - (3) Produce an action plan after the meeting and send it to each participant for a final review and additional comment period.
  - (4) Provide each agency with the following:
    - (a) The final suggested action plan. Encourage formal agency actions to advance the plan (e.g., adoption through intergovernmental agreement).
    - (b) Contact information of all participants for future exchanges.
  - (5) The action plan may be used as an evaluation tool by meeting hosts or participants prior to the next annual meeting or schedule follow-up meetings.

#### Step 4: Evaluation

- A. The moderator should record:
  - (1) Attendance at peer exchange;
  - (2) Attendance compared to a targeted list of parties;
  - (3) Representation of meeting attendees across various coordinating agencies and municipalities;
  - (4) Active participation during meeting (presence of debate);
  - (5) Evidence of search for and expression of common ground, such as ideal outcome;
  - (6) Identified next steps;
  - (7) Distribution of meeting debriefing and a list of contacts.
- B. In addition, it would be fruitful for peer exchange participants to complete an evaluation form. The moderator should then combine and analyze these evaluations. Evaluations may address:
  - (1) Skilled impartial meeting moderator;
  - (2) Appropriate mix of attendees;

- (3) Candid discussion of issues;
- (4) Ability of attendees of all perspectives to express disagreement;
- (5) Disagreement results in further explanation of perspectives and problem solving;
- (6) Evidence of search for and expression of common ground, such as ideal outcome;
- (7) Did all attendees contribute or were some individuals or groups noticeably silent?
- (8) Was there a consensus on the issues?
- (9) Identified next steps;
- (10) Identified enhanced agency roles;
- (11) Did attendees volunteer to take on follow-up roles?
- (12) Steps made to make coordination easier and more effective;
- (13) Increased contact among agencies;
- (14) What were the best results from the meeting?; and,
- (15) What would you suggest be done differently next year?

## Appendix I – Impact of Multimodal Strategies on Automobile Traffic

Highlights of some resources and publications relevant to the impact of various multimodal strategies on automobile traffic summarized below.

### Connectivity and Reduced Arterial Traffic

- Kloster, Tom, James Daisa and Rich Ledbetter. *Linking Land Use and Transportation through Street Design*. TRB Circular E-C019: Urban Street Symposium, December 2000.

In the late 1990s, Metro, the MPO for the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, conducted a study to analyze the effects of various street designs and classifications on transportation system performance. One task of the study was to evaluate the traffic impacts of increasing the number of local street connections in selected communities. Five geographical areas were analyzed by the project consultant to study the effects of increased or reduced connectivity. Connectivity changes were based on existing roadways and potential future connections reflecting growth concept land use assumptions.

The greatest benefit for auto traffic was observed at 10–16 local street connections per mile. Specifically, the analysis found that increasing the number of street intersections per mile to a range of between 10 and 16 street connections per mile could:

- reduce delay by 17% overall
- decrease arterial traffic by 13%
- increase the percentage of regional traffic (versus local traffic) on arterials.

These were significant findings because they emphasized that even modest improvements in connectivity can benefit local and regional travel in addition to walking, bicycling, and transit access. Based on this analysis, Metro established regional street design policies to guide the eventual design of major streets in the 24 jurisdictions that make up the Portland metropolitan area. The policies include both a design and performance option. Among other things, the design option calls for a maximum street intersection spacing of 530 feet and recommends less than 330 feet in the highest-density, mixed-use areas. No connections would be allowed within 400 ft of major intersections. Where connections are impossible, bike/ped cut-throughs are encouraged at no more than 330 feet spacing.

The performance option provides that the shortest distance from any origin over public streets to a street categorized as a collector or higher should not be more than twice the straight-line distance. For pedestrians the distance should be no more than 1.5 times the straight-line distance.

The street design policies are being implemented through the regional funding process and through local adherence to regional requirements. Specifically, the region's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) requires local governments to review and modify their development codes as needed to promote multi-modal street designs that emphasize walking, biking and pedestrian travel in centers and corridors. In addition, the UGMFP limits cul-de-sac designs to promote better connectivity in local street systems. Local governments in the region now require street connections in the range of 10–16 per mile for new residential and mixed-use development in order to encourage non-auto modes of travel and shorter, more direct auto travel.



### **Transit Oriented Development (TOD), Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND), Mixed Use Development**

- Ewing, Reid, Eric Dumbaugh and Mike Brown. “**Internalizing Travel by Mixing Land Uses: Study of Master-Planned Communities in South Florida.**” *Transportation Research Record 1780, Planning and Administration, Issues in Land Use and Transportation Planning, Models, and Applications*. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2001.

In an attempt to move toward better prediction methods, 20 mixed-use communities in south Florida were studied to determine the effect of land use mix on internal capture rates. All of these communities include housing, shopping, services, and recreational facilities. Some have basic employment as well. Residential subdivisions adjacent to commercial strips were excluded. The size of the developments ranged from 325 acres (Sabel Chase) to 15,517 acres (Weston).

Travel data from a year 2000 study in the three-county region by the Florida Department of Transportation was obtained. This data was summarized in trip records by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). Internal capture rates (i.e., the percent of trips that have both trip ends internal to the community) ranged from 0 to 57 percent.

Land use data was obtained for the 20 communities from the Metropolitan Planning Organizations in Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties. Five land use measures were then calculated:

- size – the sum of population and employment
- density – the sum of population and employment divided by the gross land area
- entropy – the degree of land use mixing within a development
- balance – a comparison of the jobs to population ratio in the development with the jobs to population ratio for the county
- accessibility – the sum of trip attractions in a development multiplied by a friction factor related inversely to travel time between zones.

Various combinations of independent variables were tested to arrive at a best-fit model to predict internal capture. The model explained 49 percent of the variance in internal capture rates across the communities. The following expectations were confirmed:

- internal capture rates increase with size and decrease with accessibility to other regional trip attractions.
- remote communities may place greater demands on the regional road network.

Land use mix and density did not prove to be significant determinants of internal capture rates. The paper speculates on the reasons why land use mix and density did not explain the variation in internal capture rates. The reasons include sampling error from the year 2000 travel study; inaccurate land use data; the measurement of gross acres (including large water bodies in a TAZ) rather than net acres; and the use of a gross density measure over a large area.

The two largest communities (Wellington and Weston) had the highest internal capture rates. Each of them had over 30,000 residents and over 5,000 jobs. Communities of this size can be categorized as suburban activity centers, subdivisions, or planned unit developments. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) excludes these types of communities from the category of multi-use development. ITE recommends against considering this type of development when calculating internal capture rates.

- Florida Department of Transportation/Kittelson & Associates Inc. ***Trip Generation for New Urbanist Developments.*** Viera, FL: District 4, Florida Department of Transportation and Kittelson & Associates Inc., August 2004.

This research, conducted by Kittelson & Associates, Inc. for FDOT District 4, documented how transit supportive design influences impacts trip generation, specifically internal capture rates. Of particular relevance to this study are the following findings from Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 95, Chapter 15 “Land Use and Site Design:”<sup>28</sup>

TCRP Report 95 considers the “3D’s” of transit oriented development – density, diversity and design. *“Density is simply a measure of the concentration of opportunities within a given set of geographic boundaries. Diversity refers to various types of uses within a site and how compatible they are with one another. Design relates to how the various land uses are connected. Design is measured by items such as access and attractiveness.”* The salient features of density, diversity and design as summarized by Kittelson are outlined below.

### Density

Kittelson summarized the density research with the following:

*Higher residential area employment density showed an increase in pedestrian activity and a decrease in auto activity to and from a transit station. Research has shown that vehicle miles of travel (VMT) can be reduced by 10% if traditional neighborhood developments (pedestrian friendly environments) are used instead of conventional planned unit developments.*

*Suburban Activity Centers (SACs) are discussed in the context of past studies. In 1989, Hooper found that SACs with higher employee densities (employees per gross acre) have a lower percentage of single occupant auto trips. For example, Bellevue, WA had a drive alone percentage of 73.2% and a density of 43.2 employees per gross acre, whereas other SACs that had a density of around 28 employees per gross acre had a drive alone percentage of around 92%. This difference in Bellevue could be related to the deliberately tight parking supply and parking pricing. In a follow-up study conducted in 2000, researchers found that the existence of retail in office buildings reduced the number of vehicle trips by 6-8%. In summary, size, density, and tenancy were found to be more influential than land use mix in regards to travel behavior.*

### Diversity

The balance between jobs and housing plays an important role in reducing VMT ranging from 7-30% reduction. Kittelson notes a land use mix relationship to mode choice through these findings: *Cervero in 1989 suggested that centers with some on-site housing had 3-5% more transit, bike, and walk commute trips. He also concluded that for every 10% more commercial or retail space, transit and ridesharing increased around 3 percentage points. Parsons Brinckerhoff and Cervero in 1996 suggested that proximity is [the] most important consideration in choice of non-motorized modes.*

In discussing connectivity in relation to VMT, Kittelson summarized a comparison between traditional neighborhood developments (TNDs) and planned unit developments (PUDs) stating,

*TNDs are characterized by having compact street grids, small blocks, mostly continuous streets, efficient intersections, pedestrian- friendly sidewalks, on-street parking, high density, and a mix of land uses. PUDs are characterized by having residential cul-de-sacs, curvilinear streets, multi-lane arterials, complex intersections, high land use segregation, and lower land use densities. Kulash in 1990 suggested that TND networks produced less VMT than PUD networks by the following percentages: 57% less internal trip VMT overall, 40% less on local streets, 15% less on collector streets, and 25% less on arterial streets.*

---

<sup>28</sup> Kuzmyak, J. Richard, Richard H. Pratt, G. Bruce Douglas, and Frank Spielberg. *TCRP Report 95. Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes, Chapter 15—Land Use and Site Design*. Federal Transit Administration/Transit Development Corporation. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board, 2003.

### Design

The 3<sup>rd</sup> “D” in transit oriented development is design that “*measures by items such as access and attractiveness.*” The livable communities initiative addresses some types of “links” between land uses.

*JHK Associates and K.T. Analytics found in 1993 that improved pedestrian access could reduce vehicle trips by 1-3% [TCRP 95 also noted that provision of bike lanes and storage reduced vehicle trips by a fraction of a percent; provision of a shuttle to nearby rail stations supported by urban design reduced vehicle trips 4 to 6%]. Parsons Brinkerhoff concluded in 1993 that VMT could be reduced by 10% by changing pedestrian environmental factors from average to very pedestrian friendly. In 2001, Ewing and Cervero found that sidewalk completeness, route directness, and network density have vehicle trip elasticity of -0.05 and VMT elasticity of -0.03. [Note: Elasticity is a measure of the responsiveness of one variable to another. These measures indicate that slight changes in trips and vehicle miles traveled can be accomplished through improvements in the stated variables.] In 1994, Cambridge Systematics attempted to quantify transit usage as a function of different design characteristics. This was accomplished by identifying six major design characteristics and looking at the percentage point differences between transit use with and without the design characteristic. Increases in transit usage were found as follows:*

- *substantial land use = 3.5%*
- *accessibility to services = 3.3%*
- *availability of convenience services = 3.7%*
- *perception of safety = 1.8%*
- *aesthetic setting = 4.1%.*

Therefore, this research suggests that proper land use mixing along with incorporating aesthetic qualities into the design can increase the number of transit trips.

The Kittelson research concluded, “...there is no conclusive body of knowledge that provides quantitative guidance as to the amount of internal capture that can be expected relative to the density of development, diversity of development, or design (connectivity) of development.” Kittelson further concluded that a number of factors contribute to greater internal capture rates including land developed densely enough to “to make the trip among land uses convenient for walking or bicycle activity,” diverse land uses, and appropriate internal site design. “Internal site design is a key ingredient for promoting internal trips. Pedestrian connectivity among land uses should include direct (short) paths, shaded external (or air-conditioned internal) connections, and a pleasant walking environment with directional signing.”

- Kuzmyak, J. Richard, Richard H. Pratt, G. Bruce Douglas, and Frank Spielberg. ***TCRP Report 95. Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes, Chapter 15—Land Use and Site Design.*** Federal Transit Administration/Transit Development Corporation. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board, 2003.

The Kittelson report, *Trip Generation for New Urbanist Developments* (above), contained many findings from TCRP 95. In addition, the report found, “Non-motorized travel (NMT) choice, primarily walking and biking, reaches 7 percent of daily trips nationwide at population densities of 2,000 to 5,000 persons per square mile, climbing to 46 percent at over 50,000 persons.” In 2000, the Pinellas County population density was 3,291 persons per square mile.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Pinellas County. *2025 Long Range Transportation Plan Update*. Metropolitan Planning Organization, Pinellas County, FL, October 2004.

### Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

- Winters, Philip L. and Francis Cleland. *Worksite Trip Reduction Model and Manual*. Tampa: National Center for Transit Research/Florida Department of Transportation, BC137, April 2004.

In an effort to assess the trip reduction achievable through transportation demand management programs and transit services, the National Center for Transit Research at the Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) designed a Worksite Trip Reduction Model with an accompanying Manual to predict “the extent that each incentive, disincentive, or program would impact traffic volumes and parking needs in a specific worksite.” The Worksite Trip Reduction Model and Manual use a neural network approach and were developed using existing data on programs, services, and incentives contained in thousands of before and after worksite trip reduction plans in Los Angeles, Tucson, and Washington State.

This study demonstrates how changes to a wide range of transportation-related variables can affect vehicle trip rate (VTR). Approximately 60 different variables were examined and assigned to the following categories:

- facilities and amenities
- guaranteed ride home programs
- flexible timing
- marketing programs
- ride share matching programs
- financial incentives
- parking management
- telecommute programs
- compressed work week programs
- onsite incentives
- non-financial incentives
- commuter tax benefit incentives

*Impact of Employer-Based Programs on Transit System Ridership and Transportation System Performance* ([Resource 26](#))<sup>30</sup> documents the effectiveness of employer-based transportation demand management (TDM) programs on local, corridor, and regional transportation systems. These efforts were developed to be understood by traffic operations professionals, while illustrating the impacts of TDM programs to policy and transportation decision makers.

The report’s findings are based on a database of employers in and survey responses for the Commute Trip Reduction program implemented by Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Analysis was conducted on data taken during the extended AM and PM peak periods of commute trip reduction-participating employers located along an 8.6-mile corridor. The report revealed promising results based on a CORSIM evaluation of pre- and post-program influences on traffic congestion within the corridor. The results showed significant reductions across numerous performance measures, including vehicle-minutes, lane-miles of spatial congestion, travel time, travel speed, and various environmental measures. A web-based program was also developed to give guidance to other transportation professionals on the methodologies created from this study.

---

<sup>30</sup> *Impact of Employer-Based Programs on Transit System Ridership and Transportation System Performance*. Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida, 2007.