

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, March 27, 2024, 6:00 p.m.**  
**100 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 850**  
**Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309**

**Present**

Chair: Ken Reinhardt, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)  
District 1: Jose Luis Rodriguez, City of Coral Springs  
District 2: Gregory Gayle, City of Coconut Creek  
District 3: Darren Badore, City of Plantation  
Wallis Peterson, City of Oakland Park  
District 4: Debon Campbell, City of Miramar  
Marc Weiss, City of Weston

[Chair Reinhardt]

Luz Negrón Alvarez, Broward College

Phil Busey, Broward Sierra Club

Nazbi Chowdury, United Way

Patience Cohn, Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF)

Marc Fermanian, Broward County Board of County Commissioners

Justin Proffitt, Broward County School Board

Michael Smith, Citizens' Advisory Committee

Doris Span, Citizens' Advisory Committee

**Broward MPO Staff**

William Cross, Peter Gies, Miguel Perez, Christopher Restrepo, & Rebecca Schultz

**Also Present**

Todd Brauer, Whitehouse Group

Noah Brown, South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS)

Carlos Cejas, Gannett Fleming

Kris McKirdy, FDOT

Jill Quigley

A meeting of the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizens' Advisory Committee was held via Zoom at 6:00 p.m. on March 27, 2024.

**REGULAR ITEMS**

**(All Items Open for Public Comment)**

**1. Call to Order and Recognition of Quorum**

Chair Reinhardt called the workshop to order at 6:00 p.m. and it was noted a quorum was present.

## **2. Electronic Roll Call**

Roll was taken electronically.

## **3. Approval of Minutes – February 28, 2024**

**Motion** made by Mr. Rodriguez, seconded by Mr. Proffitt, to approve. In an electronic vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **4. Approval of Agenda**

**Motion** made by Ms. Alvarez, seconded by Ms. Cohn, to approve. In an electronic vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **5. Public Comments**

Noah Brown, representing South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS), informed the Committee members of the upcoming Florida Commuter Transportation Summit. The event will be hosted by SFCS, as well as the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Center for Urban Transportation Research, and Commute Broward. The conference will be held from May 20 through May 22, 2024 at the Riverside Hotel in Fort Lauderdale, and will focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, which promote means of transportation such as car- or van-pooling, transit, biking, walking, and other alternative means of commuting.

## **NON-ACTION ITEMS**

### **1. Route to 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Draft List of Prioritized Projects**

Christopher Restrepo of MPO Staff gave a presentation on the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), known as Route to 2050. He noted that the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) members were provided with a draft list of ranked projects for this Agenda Item, and clarified that this is not the same as the MPO's draft Cost Feasible Plan (CFP), which will be presented in April 2024.

Mr. Restrepo explained that the call for projects for the 2050 MTP began in 2023, after which MPO Staff met individually with all local partners who had submitted projects. Once all projects were received, they were categorized into the six funding programs proposed for the 2050 MTP. Staff then applied a series of prioritization factors and criteria to assign points to each project so they could be ranked against one another. This ranking resulted in the draft list of projects.

Projects were submitted by municipalities, FDOT, Broward County, the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA), and other entities. Once the projects were entered into a database, Staff performed an in-house needs assessment with all MPO Departments. Projects were reviewed from the perspectives of the Complete Streets Master Plan (CSMP), Congestion Management Plan (CMP), a mobility hubs assessment, a resiliency assessment, and opportunities for electric vehicle (EV) charging station locations. They also reviewed projects in the existing 2045 MTP which could continue into the 2050 MTP.

In addition, further evaluation led to proposals for new projects identified along a number of specific corridors and intersections. These included grade separation projects, new Tri-Rail stations, mast arm conversion projects, retrofitting for air conditioning (AC) at Tri-Rail locations, a digital twin, and truck parking.

Mr. Restrepo continued that a number of filters were applied to reduce the number of projects included in the needs assessment. This included project "scrubbing:" if a project's cost was below the required cost threshold of \$3 million, the project was removed from the assessment. Projects were also removed if they were already programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or FDOT's Draft Tentative Work Program, as those will be included in the MTP as existing or committed projects. Some municipalities and partner agencies submitted duplicate projects, in which case one of the duplicates was removed and the scopes of the projects were merged.

Staff also checked project eligibility. All eligible projects must fall on the federal aid network. A geographical information systems (GIS) exercise was conducted to overlay the complete project list on this network, and any projects not on the network were removed from the assessment, as funds cannot be applied to them.

The feasibility of projects was also evaluated by sending a list of projects on state- and county-owned facilities to state and county partners. If those entities determined that the projects were not feasible, they were removed from the list. Mr. Restrepo noted that there was also potential for merging smaller projects into larger ones.

A number of projects were also identified which were suitable for the Broward Safety Action Plan. The MPO was recently awarded grant funds for the Safe Streets for All program and will evaluate projects eligible for this program to further develop their scopes. The projects will be amended into the MTP at a later time.

Some projects were removed because they were considered more suitable to be delivered by partner agencies. Lists of these projects were sent to the appropriate partners.

Mr. Restrepo recalled that some months ago, the CAC saw a presentation on resiliency corridors which would be developed as studies. These will be added to the list at a later time. Safety projects will also be added to the MTP by amendment when they have been fully developed through the Broward Safety Action Plan. Existing and committed projects in the TIP for fiscal year (FY) 2025 through 2029 are also not currently on the list, as the TIP is not expected until July 2024. Its projects will be included in the list at that time.

Complete Streets and Other Localized Initiatives Program (CSLIP) projects are programmed each year and will be added to the list each year. The MPO is also awaiting development of the 2050 Strategic Intermodal Systems (SIS) CFP so it can be incorporated into the 2050 MTP. Broward County Transit (BCT) projects are also being developed for the PREMO Plan and will be added later. Broward County surtax projects will be added to the MTP through annual amendments. Seaport projects are expected to be ready for inclusion by November 2024.

Mr. Restrepo reviewed the funding programs for the 2050 MTP:

- Complete Streets: this category will merge CSMP and CSLIP projects
- Roadways: this program will not include resiliency studies, as resiliency will be its own funding program in the 2050 MTP
- Transit and mobility hubs: because the MPO does not actually operate or maintain any transit assets, these two previous categories were merged into one; these projects will complement transit by developing mobility hubs
- Technology: this category will include transportation systems management and operations (TSM&O) but will be separated from the Safety program
- Safety: this program will include projects from the Broward Safety Action Plan
- Resiliency

For prioritization and ranking purposes, Complete Streets, roadways, transit and hubs, and technology programs will be included in the draft list of projects. The safety and resiliency programs are still in the development process.

The goal of the Complete Streets funding program is to fill in regional gaps in bicycle and pedestrian connections. These will include bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, lighting, and feasibility studies that will help make streets complete for all modes and users. The CSLIP competitive funding process will be preserved within this program.

Roadway programs will include roadway capacity and freight projects, including bridges, truck parking, grade separation, turn lanes, and feasibility studies. Grade separation feasibility studies will be an initiative within the 2050 MTP to stop interactions between railroads, pedestrians, and vehicles.

The transit and hubs program will complement existing and proposed transit. Projects will include mobility hubs, transit improvements submitted by SFRTA, and feasibility studies. Mobility hub projects will complement BCT's future PREMO corridors.

The technology program will have a three-tiered system which considers EV charging, fiber, and the digital twin. It will also have the potential for a competitive funding program related to EV charging locations.

The safety program will consider ways to leverage Safe Streets for All grant funding through the Broward Safety Action Plan. It will add additional scope and develop projects for inclusion in the MTP.

The resiliency program will focus on identified resiliency corridors, as well as a mast arm conversion project and retrofitting of Tri-Rail stations for AC systems.

Mr. Restrepo emphasized that the 2050 MTP will include approximately \$11.1 billion in total revenue which can be assigned to projects through 2050. Roughly 82% of these funds, however, are state funds that will be programmed for SIS. The MPO will have direct control and influence over MPO-attributable dollars, which account for approximately 8% of total funds. Over the course of 25 years, these funds total roughly \$92 million. Staff recommends the following funding percentages of MPO-attributable dollars across the six programs:

- Complete Streets: 51%, or \$16.96 million annually
- Roadway: 10%
- Transit and hubs: 12%
- Technology: 12%
- Safety: 10%
- Resiliency: 5%

Complete Streets would receive the majority of these funds, as they represent the greatest need demonstrated by the call for projects and the needs assessment. Mr. Restrepo noted that the 2045 MTP included a Complete Streets Master Plan which encompassed roughly 25% of the total MPO-attributable funding, while CSLIP encompassed approximately 20% of that funding.

Mr. Restrepo also emphasized the importance of the resiliency program, explaining that the majority of the corridors identified for resiliency studies were state roadways. The state has a significantly larger budget to spend on these corridors, while the MPO seeks to focus on local and county roadways.

Resiliency will also comprise a component of each of the other five programs as well as its own funding program. This is accomplished through route markers, which are used to provide additional project-level planning context to be used during a project's scoping

and implementation process. They include a number of visual cues on both the draft prioritized projects list and the draft CFP.

Route markers use GIS technology and shape files to indicate bicycle suitability, high traffic congestion, equity areas, high-injury networks, resiliency/vulnerability, and housing. If a project falls on any of these data sets, it will be coded with a visual icon which indicates it is in an area of need. This will allow feasibility studies or project development and environmental (PD&E) studies to reference the MTP and apply additional scope to the projects.

Mr. Restrepo reviewed the program rankings in the draft list of prioritized projects, as well as project identification used to track projects over their lives. Work mixes are also indicated for greater context, as well as project scopes, municipalities, ownership of roadways, sponsor agencies, estimated total costs, and route markers.

The draft CFP will be presented to the CAC in April 2024. Mr. Restrepo emphasized again that the draft list of prioritized projects is subject to change and does not represent the CFP. Over summer 2024, MPO Staff will reach out to municipalities for Resolutions of support for the projects. A draft MTP is anticipated for review in October or November, with adoption of the document expected at the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Proffitt requested additional clarification of the differences between the funding programs' percentages in the 2045 and 2050 MTPs. Mr. Restrepo reiterated that the CSMP and CSLIP comprised the majority of funding allocations for the 2045 MTP, totaling 45% of the total funding allocation; for this reason, those two categories were combined in the 2050 MTP, and their total percentage of the funding allocation was raised from 45% to 51%.

Mr. Restrepo continued that the roadway program's allocation remained the same at 10%, while the transit and hubs program's allocation decreased slightly when these two 2045 funding programs were combined in the 2050 MTP. Technology and safety were also separated in the 2050 MTP and allocated 12% and 10% respectively, followed by the new funding program for resiliency at 5%.

Mr. Smith addressed two studies for rail grade separations on the draft list, asking if these will be separate from planned I-95 interchange separations south of Griffin Road. William Cross of MPO Staff replied that FDOT has removed a great deal of the funding previously allocated to the I-95 interchanges due to the Governor's initiative to advance other projects instead. He added that many of the grade separation studies focus on the FEC Railroad corridor, which is broken into three separate sections, as the MPO recently received a federal grant which will allow them to address grade separations in the Downtown Fort Lauderdale area. "Placeholder" studies will be added for the FEC corridors south and north of this location.

Mr. Gayle advised that he had emailed a series of questions to Staff regarding the draft list of prioritized projects. He also requested clarification of whether or not the MPO initiates projects on its own or awaits submission of projects from various entities. Mr. Restrepo explained that the MPO requests submission of projects from these entities through its call for projects process; it then overlays identified needs with the submitted projects to determine if there are any duplications.

Mr. Gayle stated that his concern was that some cities are active participants in the MTP process and others are not, which can result in part of the Broward community being neglected. Mr. Restrepo replied that the MPO asks for all municipalities to submit projects and provide feedback on the types of projects they would like to see in their jurisdictions. There is a process through the MPO's CSMP, CMP, mobility hub identification, and resiliency assessment which takes a full geographical view of Broward County. Staff uses all of these plans and interactive maps to review the geographic distribution of projects.

Mr. Restrepo continued that as part of the MPO's City Services Department, Staff reached out to at least one municipality which did not submit projects for the last MTP to determine if it needed assistance in identifying potential projects. Staff worked to develop a Transportation Master Plan for that municipality, which included a number of projects that are now reflected in the 2050 MTP. They will continue to provide this service for other municipalities that may need help identifying projects.

Mr. Gayle also asked if collaborative projects received a higher priority. Mr. Restrepo replied that this was true for grant applications; for the MTP needs assessment, however, cities typically submit projects that are specifically within their own geographical boundaries. He offered the example of geographically adjacent cities on a single corridor who may each want to make their own improvements on that corridor: it may be better to implement a project along the full length of the corridor so it can receive more points and will not require multiple separate studies.

Mr. Restrepo addressed the questions Mr. Gayle had submitted, one of which asked how congestion management was evaluated in the draft list of prioritized projects. He explained that the MPO has a congestion management process which culminates in the CMP, which considers all roadways within Broward to determine whether or not a project is congested. They use a series of GIS-based maps to overlay data sets onto the list of projects received from the needs assessment and identify overlaps. If there are overlaps with the CMP, projects are identified using route markers and one or more countermeasures can be applied to the project to address congestion.

Mr. Gayle asked if the owner of a roadway determines whether or not that roadway is congested, and whether or not all owners use the same criteria for this determination. Mr. Restrepo replied that the MPO uses its own series of metrics, which were developed with a consultant team that has worked with other facility owners such as

FDOT and Broward County. He could not confirm that all owners use the same approach.

Mr. Gayle also asked what countermeasures may be used to address congestion on an identified roadway. Mr. Restrepo stated that these may include engineering interventions such as interchanges or other grade separations; other countermeasures include bicycle/pedestrian-related improvements, transit circulation, and signal synchronization, among others.

Mr. Gayle also requested that Staff address a project located at Atlantic Boulevard and Powerline Road. Mr. Restrepo explained that this is a grade separation project for which a conceptual plan has been developed for a center-turn overpass, which would remove at-grade left turn movements to an elevated intersection. This saves time for through movements by requiring less interaction and fewer vehicle conflict points. At present, this project's cost was estimated at nearly \$200 million in the 2045 MTP; however, an independent cost estimate for the construction phase alone came to roughly \$30 million. The \$200 million estimate includes a number of multipliers, including design and right-of-way acquisition.

Mr. Gayle asked if this meant the total cost estimate should be considered a placeholder rather than actual dollars. Mr. Restrepo advised that these are planning-level cost estimates: when a project enters the PD&E phase, it will go through an alternatives analysis and additional design, which will provide updated cost estimates.

Mr. Cross pointed out that significant progress has been made toward this project since the \$200 million estimate in the 2045 MTP. FDOT has worked with its design team on another center-turn overpass design in Broward County, which has allowed for more refined cost estimates. He also pointed out that estimates are more likely to be slightly high at first due to the number of unknown factors, such as the need for right-of-way acquisition, which may decrease as the project advances.

Mr. Restrepo noted that Mr. Gayle's written list had also asked for more detail about fiber installation on the SFRC rail corridor, on which Tri-Rail currently operates. The purpose of this additional fiber optic installation is to reduce costs associated with dispatch communication lines and provide further Positive Train Control (PTC). PTC addresses communication that can help avoid potential train crashes.

Mr. Gayle requested clarification of the priority assigned to this project. Mr. Cross further clarified that there is currently antiquated communications equipment along that corridor, and the railway hopes to upgrade its video safety monitoring cameras. To do this, they will need to implement a more modern fiber infrastructure along the corridor which will tie the systems together and replace older equipment. The MPO is supportive of this project as a safety consideration and because it makes sense for funding.

Mr. Restrepo added that the project is part of the transit and hubs funding program, which means its funding will not compete with funding for other projects in different funding programs.

Mr. Gayle also asked if the mast arm replacement project was being led by Broward County. Mr. Restrepo confirmed that the County has been working on a plan to identify all mast arm replacement locations; however, the MPO has also worked independently to identify these locations. The next step is for both entities to determine if there are overlaps and clarify which replacements would be funded by which entity.

Mr. Gayle asked if Broward County is aware of when their proposed mast arm project will end. Mr. Restrepo replied that the MPO has not yet received this information. Mr. Cross advised that mast arm conversion is part of the MPO's resiliency plan, with the intent of increasing the pace of this upgrade and determining which entity is responsible for which prioritized locations.

Mr. Smith addressed the Atlantic Boulevard/Powerline Road project mentioned earlier, noting that this east/west roadway is a hurricane evacuation route, and asked how detour information would be communicated with the construction schedule in mind. Mr. Restrepo stated that resiliency priority corridors were overlaid on top of existing evacuation routes to ensure distribution.

## **2. Municipal Capital Projects (MCPs): [www.my-mcps.org](http://www.my-mcps.org)**

Todd Brauer, representing the Whitehouse Group, provided an update on municipal capital projects (MCPs), which are funded using Broward County surtax dollars. The MPO's role in this process is to rank and recommend the applications submitted each year.

Mr. Brauer reported that the education process for Broward municipalities begins before applications are requested for the program. There was an increase in the number of municipalities that both attended training sessions and met one-on-one with representatives of the surtax program. Training sessions were recorded and can be viewed at [www.my-mcps.org](http://www.my-mcps.org). There was also a 50% increase in the number of municipalities that submitted applications.

The first training session focused on the application process, while the second addressed how applications are evaluated. The process is established by the surtax agreement, which determines how projects are scored and recommended.

60 applications were received in 2024, totaling roughly \$198 million in requested projects. The application cycle began on February 9 and closed on March 8, 2024. 23 municipalities submitted projects. Mr. Brauer emphasized that the surtax team reaches

out each month to encourage cities to participate in the program if they have not done so recently.

The surtax program allows for applications to be submitted for both design and construction projects. While 42% of applications were related to design, they only constituted 10% of the overall requests for funding. 90% of 2024 applications included sidewalk and bike lane improvements as well as roadways.

The climate change matrix uses Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps to identify projects located in high-risk areas. A similar matrix tracks projects in underserved communities, which in 2024 included 32% of all applications. Other considerations include proximity to school zones and whether or not projects can help children reach their schools safely.

In 2023, the minimum annual guarantee for the surtax program was \$29 million. This amount constitutes only 15% of the 2024 total funding request of \$198 million: there is significantly more need than funding available.

Mr. Gayle requested clarification of how much funding the Broward County surtax brings in each year. Mr. Brauer explained that when surtax funds come in, 10% of the total is set aside for the minimum annual guarantee, which funds four programs.

Mr. Gayle expressed concern for safety and sidewalks, asking if there is a map of all sidewalks within Broward County. Mr. Brauer replied that there is no such map, but noted that when an applicant indicates that a sidewalk project would fill an existing gap, this is tested through Google and by field site review if necessary.

Mr. Gayle asked if there is a plan to create a working map to understand all sidewalks in Broward County. Mr. Brauer stated that the surtax program is not itself a plan: it is intended to be specific to local communities that are developing their own plans. Mr. Gayle emphasized the importance of increasing safety for all residents.

Mr. Gayle also asked if, in addition to schools, there are other areas within communities that should be prioritized, such as "55-plus" communities where individuals may prefer to walk rather than to drive. Other considerations may be areas where mass transit is not a reliable option. Mr. Brauer advised that these considerations are not part of the surtax program, which is very limited. The County considers public schools as a small subset of the goals and objectives for the surtax program.

Mr. Gayle asked if the program is expected to change substantially over the next 10 years, or if it will continue to wait for municipalities to submit project requests. Mr. Brauer stated that it would be difficult to predict what the program will look like over time. He noted that municipalities draw from their own plans when submitting

applications, which means they are looking at the bigger picture for communities. Municipalities are limited to only three applications per cycle.

Ms. Peterson asked for clarification of the difference between municipalities submitting MTP projects and surtax projects. Mr. Brauer replied that many applicants apply under both the MTP's CSLIP, for example, and under surtax projects in order to increase their chances of being funded.

### **3. Report from Partner Agency – Florida Department of Transportation – SR 5/US 1/Federal Highway at SR 838/Sunrise Boulevard Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study**

Kris McKirdy, representing FDOT District 4, explained that she is the project manager for the Gateway Intersection PD&E study. She introduced project engineer Carlos Cejas, who would provide technical information on the study.

Mr. Cejas stated that the PD&E study for the Gateway Intersection is nearing an end and has included preliminary engineering and environmental analyses as well as public outreach. The project limits extend to at least one signalized intersection beyond the primary intersection itself.

Several alternatives were considered in detail, and public input was used to narrow these to three major alternatives:

- No-build (baseline) alternative
- Triple-left at-grade T-intersection: this alternative includes triple left turn lanes from east- to northbound which have been extended to add greater capacity; the two existing south- to eastbound left turn lanes would be changed to triple left turn lanes; south- to westbound movement would include three right turn lanes rather than two; all movements would continue to be signalized; west- to northbound right turn movements would add a second turn lane for greater capacity; signals would be synchronized for pedestrian crossing; the sidewalk would be widened to a shared-use path beyond the roadway, including some buffered green areas; right-of-way acquisition would be required from two nearby properties, PNC Bank and East Point Towers condominiums, for the shared-use path
- Roundabout alternative with grade separation: this alternative includes two to three lanes throughout the roundabout circle, which would extend slightly past the intersection to the PNC Bank and East Point Towers properties without affecting buildings or parking; costs would increase due to grade separation and right-of-way acquisition; shared-use paths would be implemented around the roundabout; pedestrian activation/signalization would be required due to the roundabout's free flow, which would ultimately prevent the roundabout from operating ideally; variations include a flyover option and an underpass option

Mr. Cejas advised that the at-grade intersection outperforms both the grade separation variations and the no-build alternative. Based on public feedback as well as analysis, the consensus was to proceed with the eastbound triple left turn alternative. He showed multiple views of this alternative.

Next steps include a public meeting in summer, followed by completion of the PD&E study and entry into the design phase with right-of-way acquisition.

Mr. Gayle requested clarification of the number of cars through the intersection. Mr. Cejas explained that peak hour volume is 5100 cars. He noted that the regional model used to determine this traffic also considered future growth in the area over the next 20 years.

Mr. Gayle also asked if mass transit, such as light rail, is expected to play a role in the future plans for the intersection. Mr. Cejas confirmed this, clarifying that there are a number of existing bus stops in the area which would be accommodated and improved by the shared-use paths.

Mr. Gayle expressed concern for pedestrian interaction with cars. Mr. Cejas replied that the plans include concepts to differentiate between the automotive and pedestrian realms, potentially including stamped concrete, use of textures and colors, and landscaping enhancements.

Mr. Gayle also asked if the new configuration would move people more quickly during periods of activity along the beach. Mr. Cejas confirmed that this would be done for bicycle/pedestrian traffic; the addition of vehicular capacity should also decrease congestion by moving more cars through the intersection. The roadway will be designed to a lower speed in order to create a more multimodal facility.

Mr. Busey asked if the selected alternative would result in a net change in total green space. Mr. Cejas advised that the total change in green space approaches a net amount that is the same. He added that there was public feedback expressing concern with too much green space in the median, as this could provide an opportunity for loitering or camping. The next phase will consider making this area more of an urban streetscape with less lush landscaping to address this concern.

Mr. Busey also asked if there had been consideration of a pedestrian over- or underpass. Mr. Cejas confirmed that this was discussed, but explained that challenges included compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in moving pedestrians to different heights, as elevators and ramps require significant space.

Mr. Smith asked if the plan includes replacement of the Middle River Bridge. Mr. Cejas stated that one proposal is for widening of the sidewalk and narrowing of vehicular lanes to continue the shared-use path while maintaining the current bridge structure.

Chair Reinhardt asked how the 20-year projection of intersection throughput compares with current figures. Mr. Cejas estimated that the increase over time was projected at 20% to 30%.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS – no discussion**

- 1. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Actions of the February 28, 2024 Meeting**
- 2. Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization Actions of the March 14, 2024 Meeting**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

#### **1. Member Comments**

Chair Reinhardt referred the members to the Broward MPO's YouTube video series addressing congestion management.

- 2. 2024 Participation Record**
- 3. Notice of an Administrative Modification to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
- 4. Abstention Requirements**

Chair Reinhardt called the members' attention to the requirements that must be met in order to abstain from voting.

- 5. Florida's Turnpike Enterprise Response to February 8, 2024 Broward MPO Board Meeting Public Comments**
- 6. Report from Partner Agency – Florida Department of Transportation – Golden Glades Interchange (GGI) Project**

It was noted that a YouTube video is also available on the Golden Glades Interchange (GGI) construction project, which will connect several managed lanes and streamline these connections.

Mr. Smith commented that this project could provide an incentive for the South Florida transportation planning entities to fund Tri-Rail for additional express train service with fewer stops through this area.

**7. 2024 State of the Region Annual Awards – March 28, 2024**

**8. Save the Date – Route to 2050 MTP Event – September 12, 2024**

Chair Reinhardt advised that no CAC meeting is scheduled for April 2024. The next meeting will be May 22, 2024.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING: May 22, 2024**