



# Appendix B

## 2045 LRTP Review Checklist





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
<b>23 C.F.R. Part 450 – Planning Assistance and Standards</b>		
A-1	<p>Does the plan cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>	<p>Yes. Chapter 1 (Introduction) and Chapter 2 (Plan Context) describe the 20-year planning horizon and purpose of the long range plan and includes population and growth forecast numbers for 2045. Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) Cost Feasible Plan and projects have a planning horizon of 2021 - 2045.</p>
A-2	<p>Does the plan address the planning factors described in 23 C.F.R. 450.306(b)?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>	<p>Yes. Chapter 1 (Introduction), Chapter 3 (Guiding the Plan), Chapter 4 (2045 Needs Plan) demonstrated how the adopted goals, objectives, prioritization criteria, and performance measures address the planning factors (incl. new requirements) and guide the direction of the 2045 LRTP. System performance is addressed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) and in the FDOT System Performance Report (Appendix A). Environmental mitigation, risk and resiliency are addressed in Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) and Chapter 3 (Section 3.4). Tourism considerations are described in Section 2.3.3 and Freight movement is address in Chapter 4 and the 2045 LRTP Goods Movement Tech Memo. Opportunities to implement and explore future technologies are integrated throughout the LRTP and congestion management section described in Section 2.3 and the TSM&amp;O Master Plan. Multimodal, transit, and capacity project phasing, funding, and timeframe are addressed in Chapter 5 (Cost Feasible Plan).</p>
A-3	<p>Does the plan include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(b)</p>	<p>Chapter 4 (2045 Needs Plan) and Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) address long-range and short-range strategies/actions to provide for an integrated multimodal system in five-year increments beginning in 2020 through 2045. The following chapters also address long-range and short-range strategies/actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 4 (Section 4.1 – 4.2) and Freight Element – SHSP Consistency and Freight/Goods Movement</li> <li>- Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) and Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) – Environmental Mitigation and Resiliency</li> <li>- Chapter 5 (Section 5.5) and TSM&amp;O Master Plan - Congestion Management</li> <li>- Chapter 3 (Section 3.6) and Chapter 4 (Sections 4.3-4.4) – Accessibility in the LRTP Planning Process and Access to Transportation Options</li> </ul>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-4	<p>Was the requirement to update the plan at least every five years met?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(c)</p>	<p>Yes – Lee County MPO 2040 LRTP was adopted on December 18, 2015 and Lee County MPO 2045 LRTP was adopted on December 18, 2020</p>
A-5	<p>Did the MPO coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(d)</p>	<p>Lee County MPO is in an Air Quality Attainment Area and is not required to develop transportation control measures in a State Implemented Plan.</p>
A-6	<p>Was the plan updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(e)</p>	<p>The plan was developed using the FDOT District One Regional Planning Model which included the most recent population, employment, congestion, land use, and travel/traffic estimates. See Chapter 2 (Plan Context) and Chapter 4 (Section 4.1-4.2) and Chapter 5 (Section 5.5).</p>
A-7	<p>Does the plan include the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(1)</p>	<p>Transportation modeling using current and projected transportation demand was used to identify needs, which helped to develop the 2045 Cost Feasible Plan. Current and projected goods movement are also considered in the prioritization of improvements in Chapter 2, Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.4, Table 4.2), Chapter 5 (Section 5.7), and the Freight Element.</p>
A-8	<p>Does the plan include existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities, and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(2)</p>	<p>Chapter 2 (Plan Context) shows existing and committed transportation conditions and existing priority projects with an anticipated time frame for construction. Chapter 4 (2045 Needs Plan) describes transportation demand and Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) shows in tables and maps of proposed transportation facilities including major roadway, transit, multimodal/non-motorized facilities and projects as well as TSM&amp;O/Congestion Management projects. In addition, the project prioritization process is described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.4, Table 4.2) as well as emphasized regional facilities such as the Strategic Intermodal System (Section 4.4.2 &amp; Freight Element) that serve important regional and nation functions.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-9	<p>Does the plan include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with §450.306(d)?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(3)</p>	<p>The Plan considers performance standards of level of service on the roadway network, as outlined by the local governments. Chapter 4 (Section 4.1-4.3, Table 4.2), Chapter 5 (Section 5.7), and Appendix A all describe performance measures, performance targets, the evaluation criteria, individual project performance, as well as system-wide performance.</p>
A-10	<p>Does the plan include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in §450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(4)(i)</p>	<p>Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) and Appendix A include updates, project and system-performance, and progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets and comparison to previous reports and baseline data.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-11	<p>Did the MPO integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under 49 U.S.C. chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in 49 U.S.C. 5326;</li> <li>(ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 U.S.C. 148;</li> <li>(iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan in 49 U.S.C. 5329(d);</li> <li>(iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;</li> <li>(v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 U.S.C. 149(l), as applicable;</li> <li>(vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118);</li> <li>(vii) The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and</li> <li>(viii) Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.</li> </ul> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.306 (d)(4)</p>	<p>The MPO integrated federal, state, and local transportation goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets. See Chapter 3 (Section 3.1-3.3, Table 3-1, 3-2) and Chapter 5 (5.5 &amp; 5.7)</p> <p>Additionally, see Chapters 4 (Section 4.1-4.4), Chapter 5 (Section 5.2 &amp; 5.5), Freight Element, and the TSM&amp;O Master Plan for freight, transit, safety, and congestion management. Environmental mitigation and resiliency are addressed in Chapter 4 (Section 4.5) and Chapter 3 (Section 3.4).</p>
A-12	<p>Does the plan include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(5)</p>	<p>Operational and management strategies to improve performance, reduce congestion and increase safety and mobility of people and goods are addressed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.5) and the TSM&amp;O Master Plan</p>







Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-13	<p>Does the plan include consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(6)</p>	<p>Lee County MPO is not designated as an Air Quality non-attainment area.</p> <p>Congestion management strategies and resulting projects are listed in Chapter 5 and resulting projects are listed in the Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan).</p>
A-14	<p>Does the plan include assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(7)</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1-3.3) describe regional priorities and goals, including system preservation and other strategies to preserve existing infrastructure and investment in congestion management projects, resiliency/environmentally sensitive areas, evacuation routes, transit and bicycle and pedestrian projects. Chapter 5 (Section 5.3-5.5) identifies strategies to better manage and operate existing transportation facilities. The transportation needs outlined in Chapter 4 and project prioritization criteria (Section 4.2.4, Table 4.2) emphasize preserving the existing system. Chapter 5 addresses the existing infrastructure with maintenance funds (Section 5.1.1).</p>
A-15	<p>Does the plan include transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(8)</p>	<p>Chapter 4 (Sections 4.3) and Chapter 5 (Sections 5.3) identify the future transit improvements and enhancements via project lists and maps. Furthermore, opportunity for implementation of technology solutions, MOD, and ACES are identified in Section 2.3. Chapter 3 (Section 3.6). The Public Engagement Summary Appendix documents the type of transit and transportation enhancements that are important to the public and stakeholders.</p>
A-16	<p>Does the plan describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(9)</p>	<p>Yes. Roadway and capacity project costs were developed using the FDOT District 1 Costing Tool. Multimodal project costs for transit, bike and pedestrian were based on the LeeTran TDP and the jurisdictional bicycle/pedestrian master plans. See Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) for project costs, assumptions of reasonably available revenues and demonstration of fiscal constraint.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-17	<p>Does the plan include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(10)</p>	<p>Environmental mitigation activities and coordination, identification of sensitive and protected areas, as well as potential areas to carry out these activities are addressed in Section 3.4 and section 4.5.</p>
A-18	<p>Does the plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)</p>	<p>Available revenue projections from federal, state, local, and private sources are addressed in Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) and implementation is addressed in Chapter 6.</p>
A-19	<p>Does the plan include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(i)</p>	<p>System level estimates and revenues are discussed in Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan). Appendix E includes additional details on the goals and financial resources allocated to maintenance, operations and safety related programs.</p>
A-20	<p>Did the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under §450.314(a)?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(ii)</p>	<p>Available revenue projections from federal, state, local, and private sources are addressed in Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan). Estimates of federal and state revenues were provided by FDOT Office of Policy Planning (Appendix E). See Chapter 6 for Implementation and future revenue monitoring activities.</p>
A-21	<p>Does the financial plan include recommendations on additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the plan, and, in the case of new funding sources, identify strategies for ensuring their availability?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iii)</p>	<p>Recommendations on additional financing strategies and availability of funding sources for new projects are addressed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.1.1). No new revenues sources were assumed to be available in developing the 2045 Cost Feasible Plan.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-22	<p>Does the plan's revenue and cost estimates use inflation rates that reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iv)</p>	<p>Yes. Chapter 5 (Table 5-7) includes the FDOT inflation factors that were used to calculate costs and revenues. Chapter 5 details the 2045 revenue forecasts and a summary of the unit costs information included within the FDOT District 1 Costing Tool.</p>
A-23	<p>Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP?</p> <p>23 .F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(vi)</p>	<p>No. This requirement does not apply to Lee County as an Air Quality Attainment Area.</p>
A-24	<p>Does the plan include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C.17(g)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(12)</p>	<p>The bicycle and pedestrian elements in Needs Plan (Section 4.4) and Cost Feasible Plan (Section 5.3) include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Road capacity projects take a Complete Streets approach where possible by including bicycle and pedestrian facilities with each project. Bicycle and Pedestrian needs and facilities are also described in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Element.</p>
A-25	<p>Does the plan integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, or an Interim Agency Safety Plan?</p> <p>Please see the "Technical Topics" section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(h)</p>	<p>The safety measures are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives (Section 3.1-3.3), performance measures (Section 5.7) and prioritization criteria (Section 4.2.4 and Appendix D). Additionally, Section 4.1 discusses the SHSP and safety strategies selected for the 2045 LRTP. One of the main objectives in the TSM&amp;O Mater Plan is to identify projects and strategies to increase safety across all transportation modes.</p>
A-26	<p>Does the plan identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(g)(1)</p> <p>(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or</li> <li>(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.</li> </ol>	<p>Transportation modeling was used to identify needs, which helped to develop the Cost Feasible Plan. See Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. Projected persons and goods movement were also considered in the performance measures described in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2). Prioritization of improvements is described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.4). Environmental mitigation, security, and resiliency are addressed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.6), Chapter 4 (Section 4.5, Map 4-10) and Chapter 3 (Section 3.4).</p>







Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-27	<p>Did the MPO provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(j)</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Section 3.6), Public Involvement Plan, and the Public Involvement Summary Technical Memorandum describe the breadth and scope of the public involvement, comment period and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated. Public comments were encouraged from all interested parties, transportation operators, and user groups throughout the development of the LRTP. Virtual public meetings were held at various times during development of the LRTP for the public to attend. Public participation was also encouraged through videos, TV interviews, and online surveys.</p>
A-28	<p>Did the MPO publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(k), 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(iv)</p>	<p>The approved plan was made available for review electronically. Chapter 3 (Section 3.6) and the Public Involvement Summary Technical Memorandum describe the public comment period, public involvement plan, and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated.</p>
A-29	<p>Did the MPO provide adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(i)</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Section 3.6). Public Involvement Plan (PIP), and the Public Involvement Summary Technical Memorandum describe the public notice requirements and the notification that took place ahead of public participation activities and key decision points to provide timely and adequate notice to support full public access and input at key decisions points and on the proposed LRTP.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-30	<p>In developing the plan, did the MPO seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems such as low-income and minority households?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(vii)</p>	<p>An analysis of Lee County demographic data was completed to identify areas with higher concentrations of environmental justice populations. Environmental Justice and the needs of traditionally underserved populations were considered in the performance measures and public participation efforts. See Sections 3.6, 3.5, and 5.7.2 regarding the Environmental Justice analysis.</p>
A-31	<p>Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the plan? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft plan, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vi) &amp; 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(2)</p>	<p>The public involvement element in Chapter 3 (Guiding the Plan) and the Public Involvement Summary Technical Memorandum includes all comments received during the public events and meetings, as well as the public comment period. Public comments were considered for developing the Needs and the Cost Feasible Plans, responses to public comments are provided where appropriate.</p>
A-32	<p>Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final plan differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(viii)</p>	<p>There were no significant changes between the draft plan and the final plan document adopted in December 2020. Several projects that were noted during the public outreach and adoption of the LRTP have been noted in Chapter 6 as key areas of focus for future coordination and community support.</p>





Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-33	<p>Did the MPO consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning area that are affected by transportation, or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the <a href="#">2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter</a> for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(b)</p>	<p>The MPO consulted with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning areas as described as described in Section 3.6 and Public Involvement Summary Technical Memorandum. Each member jurisdiction was consulted in the development of the Cost Feasible project list.</p>
A-34	<p>If the MPO planning area includes Indian Tribal lands, did the MPO appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(c)</p>	<p>There are no designated tribal lands located within the boundaries of the MPO’s Planning Area.</p>
A-35	<p>If the MPO planning area includes Federal public lands, did the MPO appropriately involve Federal land management agencies in the development of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(d)</p>	<p>Previous study efforts evaluating alternative transportation options were undertaken in partnership with the J.N. “Ding” Darling National Wildlife Refuge to identify appropriate and environmentally sensitive solutions for managing traffic volumes of visitors.</p> <p>In advance of the 2045 LRTP, the MPO participated in the City of Sanibel’s Shared Use Path Master Plan Update. The Master Plan update included coordination of walking and cycling recommendations that provided safer access to the Wildlife Refuge to reduce pressure on limited parking spaces and automobile trips.</p> <p>Map 3-1 recognizes Sanibel Captiva Road as constrained from future widening due to the environmental constraints.</p>
A-36	<p>In urbanized areas that are served by more than one MPO, is there written agreement among the MPOs, the State, and public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan transportation planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent plans across the planning area boundaries, particularly in cases in which a proposed transportation investment extends across those boundaries?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.314(e)</p>	<p>The MPO has joint planning responsibilities with the Charlotte County Punta Gorda MPO, and the Collier MPO. Joint meetings of the MPO Boards are held annually for coordination of transportation Planning and funding.</p>





Section B- State Requirements Where and How Addressed

**Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175**

<p><b>B-1</b></p>	<p>Are the prevailing principles in s. 334.046(1), F.S. – preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida’s economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the plan?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1), (5) and (7), F.S.</p>	<p>The principles are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives and emerging issues as described in Chapter 2 &amp; 3 including improving travel choices, mobility, enhancing economic competitiveness, and preservation of the existing transportation infrastructure. Chapter 5 (Section 5.7) emphasizes preserving the existing system through funding operations and maintenance. Chapter 4 &amp; 5 detail transportation projects to improve travel choices and ensure mobility.</p>
<p><b>B-2</b></p>	<p>Does the plan give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1) and (7)(a), F.S.</p>	<p>There is major emphasis placed on Strategic Intermodal System facilities, such as I-75, US 41, FDOT Multi-Use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES) and other state roadways. See Section 4.2 and Chapter 5 (Table 5-2 and 5-15) for SIS funding and SIS cost feasible projects.</p>
<p><b>B-3</b></p>	<p>Is the plan consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved comprehensive plans for local governments in the MPO’s metropolitan planning area?</p> <p>ss.339.175(5) and (7), F.S.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Section 3.3 and 3.6) describes relevance and consistency with elements of local government comprehensive plans. Additionally, each member jurisdiction was consulted in the development and prioritization of the Cost Feasible project list.</p>
<p><b>B-4</b></p>	<p>Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</p> <p>ss.339.175(1) and (7) F.S.</p>	<p>The MPO considered consistency with local government land use planning policy as noted in Chapter 3 (Section 3.3) and Chapter 2 (Section 2.2) to identify constrained roadways and areas of expected growth to facilitate sustainable land use and transportation development. Congestion Management and technology based projects included in the TSM&amp;O Master Plan seek to reduce congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Increased transit service frequencies and expansion will provide transportation options and reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.</p>
<p><b>B-5</b></p>	<p>Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered?</p> <p>s.339.175(7)(a), F.S.</p>	<p>The FTP principles are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives, as well as the performance measures and prioritization criteria. See Section 3.1-3.3 (Table 3-1).</p>





Section B- State Requirements		Where and How Addressed
B-6	<p>Does the plan assess capital investment and other measures necessary to 1) ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system, including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities; and 2) make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>s.339.175(7)(c), F.S.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 assess capital investment, operation and maintenance, and other congestion management strategies to preserve existing transportation and make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities. The TSM&amp;O Master Plan describes in greater detail strategies to relieve vehicular congestion and the Freight Element outlines ways to maximize the mobility of goods.</p>
B-7	<p>Does the plan indicate, as appropriate, proposed transportation enhancement activities, including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic easements, landscaping, historic preservation, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff, and control of outdoor advertising?</p> <p>s.339.175(7)(d), F.S.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 (2045 Needs Plan) and Chapter 5 (2045 Cost Feasible Plan) provide for transit, environmental (protected areas and pollution), and bicycle and pedestrian facility enhancements. Road capacity projects take a Complete Streets approach where possible by including bicycle and pedestrian facilities and landscaping and other aesthetic treatments with each project. This is also described in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Element.</p>
B-8	<p>Was the plan approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present?</p> <p>s.339.175(13) F.S.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

