1. Florida Department of Transportation LRTP Review Checklist

**FDOT LRTP Review Checklist**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section A- Federal Requirements | | Where and How Addressed |
| [**23 C.F.R. Part 450 – Planning Assistance and Standards**](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=78330bbda702d727013904bac5da6fe8&mc=true&node=pt23.1.450&rgn=div5) | | |
| A-1 | Does the plan cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?  Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(a) | The Cost Feasible Plan’s horizon year in 2045 (Chapter 8). Chapter 1: Introduction highlights the planning horizon for the Plan. |
| A-2 | Does the plan address the planning factors described in 23 C.F.R. 450.306(b)?  Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  Risk and Resiliency  Does the plan improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation?  Travel and Tourism  Does that plan enhance travel and tourism?  Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(a) | The planning factors (incl. new requirements) are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives, as well as the performance measures and prioritization criteria. See Chapter 2 (Tables 2-1 to 2-4), Chapter 8, and Chapter 9. The plan integrates travel and tourism into the Plan’s goals (Chap 2) and the criteria used to prioritize LRTP project (Section 8.2). Risk and resiliency are addressed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.1 & 5.2). Additionally, new requirements are addressed in Chapter 7 (Section 7.5 & 7.6), and Chapter 4 (Phase I).  Project phasing, funding, and timeframe are addressed in Chapter 8: Cost Feasible Plan (Table 8-3 to 8-6). |
| A-3 | 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?    Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(b) | Chapter 8 shows roadway, transit, and bicycle & pedestrian projects organized by specific time increments beginning in 2021 through 2045 (Table 8-6, 8-7, 8-8). The following chapters also address long-range and short-range strategies/actions:   * Chapter 5 (Section 5.1 & 5.2) * Chapter 6 (Section 6.4) * Chapter 7 (Section 7.4, 7.5 & 7.6) |
| A-4 | Was the requirement to update the plan at least every five years met?  Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(c) | Yes – The 2040 LRTP was adopted on October 5, 2015 and the 2045 LRTP was adopted on October 5, 2020. |
| A-5 | 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)?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(d) | N/A Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO is in an Air Quality Attainment Area and is not required to develop transportation control measures in a State Implemented Plan. |
| A-6 | Was the plan updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity?  Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(e) | The 2045 LRTP was developed using the new FDOT District One Regional Planning Model which included the most recent population, employment, land use, economic, and travel/traffic estimates. See Chapter 3, Chapter 4 (Section 4.3), Chapter 6, and Chapter 7 (Section 7.2 to 7.6). |
| A-7 | 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?  Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(1) | Transportation modeling which used projected transportation demand of persons and goods aided in identifying needs, which helped to develop the Cost Feasible Plan. See Chapter 7 and Chapter 3. Projected persons and goods movement were also considered in the performance measures described in Chapter 2 (Section 2.5), prioritization of improvements as described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.2) and Chapter 9 (Plan Performance). |
| A-8 | 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?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(2) | The LRTP emphasizes existing and proposed projects on Strategic Intermodal System facilities such as I-75, US 17, US 41, and FDOT Multi-use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES). See Chapter 7 and Section 2.6 Table 2-5. |
| A-9 | 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)?  Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(3) | Performance measures and performance targets (incl. new requirements) are described in Chapter 2 (Tables 2-4), Chapter 9, and Appendix B (System Performance Report). |
| A-10 | 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?  Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(4)(i) | Yes, in Appendix B (System Performance Report). |
| A-11 | 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:  (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;  (ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 U.S.C. 148;  (iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan in 49 U.S.C. 5329(d);  (iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;  (v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 U.S.C. 149(l), as applicable;  (vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118);  (vii) The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and  (viii) Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.  Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.306 (d)(4) | The MPO integrated federal, state, and local transportation goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.1 to 2.5, Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4), Chapter 8 (Section 8.2), Chapter 9, and Appendix B. Additionally, see Chapters 6 and 7 (Section 7.5 & 7.6) for freight, transit, safety, and congestion management. |
| A-12 | 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?  Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(5) | Operational and management strategies are addressed in Chapter 6 (Congestion Management). |
| A-13 | 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?  Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(6) | Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO is not designated as an Air Quality non-attainment area.  Congestion management strategies are addressed in Chapter 6 and resulting projects are listed in the Chapter 8 Cost Feasible Plan. |
| A-14 | 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?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(7) | Chapter 2 (Sections 2.2 & 2.6) and the project prioritization criteria (Table 8-2) describe regional priorities and goals, including system preservation. Chapter 6 (Section 6.4) identifies strategies to better manage and operate existing transportation facilities. The transportation needs outlined in Chapter 7 emphasize preserving the existing system. Chapter 8 addresses the existing infrastructure with maintenance funds. |
| A-15 | 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)?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(8) | Transportation and transit enhancement projects are identified in Chapter 8 (Sections 8.6 & 8.7). Chapter 6 includes transit related congestion reduction strategies; see Section 6.4. Chapter 4 (Section 4.3 incl. Stakeholder Interviews) documents the type of transit and transportation enhancements that are important to the public and stakeholders. |
| A-16 | Does the plan describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?  Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(9) | See Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) for project costs and revenues. |
| A-17 | 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?  Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(10) | Environmentally sensitive lands were taken into consideration in this Plan and are described in Chapter 5. Potential environmental mitigation activities are also identified in Chapter 5 (Section 5.1 and 5.2 and Table 5-1). |
| A-18 | Does the plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented?  Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11) | See Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) and Chapter 10 (Plan Implementation). |
| A-19 | Does the plan include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(i) | See Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources. |
| A-20 | 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)?  Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(ii) | Yes, see Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) for available revenue projections from federal, state, local, and private sources. See Chapter 10 for Implementation. |
| A-21 | 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?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iii) | See Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) on financing strategies and project and program funding. |
| A-22 | 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)?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iv) | See Chapter 8 (Cost Feasible Plan) for revenue and cost estimates. See Table 8-4 for Inflation Factors. |
| A-23 | Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(vi) | N/A Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO is not designated as an Air Quality non-attainment area. |
| A-24 | Does the plan include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C.17(g)?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(12) | Chapters 7 and 8 Bicycle and Pedestrian sections identify and provide for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In addition, road capacity projects take a complete streets approach where possible by including bicycle and pedestrian facilities with each project. |
| A-25 | 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?  Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(h) | The safety measures are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives (Section 2.2), performance measures (Section 2.5 and Chapter 9) and prioritization criteria (Section 8.2).  Additionally, see Chapter 6 (Section 6.3, 6.4, 6.5) for discussion of HSIP goals, strategies, and countermeasures selected for the 2045 LRTP. |
| A-26 | 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?    23 C.F.R. 450.324(g)(1) | Transportation modeling was used to identify needs, which helped to develop the Cost Feasible Plan. See Chapter 7 and Chapter 3. Projected persons and goods movement were also considered in the performance measures described in Chapter 2 (Section 2.5), prioritization of improvements as described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.2) and Chapter 9 (Plan Performance). |
| A-27 | 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)?  23 C.F.R. 450.324(j) | All interested parties and those discussed in Chapter 4 and Technical Report 2 (Public Participation Plan) were coordinated with and provided reasonable opportunity to comment. A Public Participation Plan was created at the beginning of the update. Public comments were encouraged throughout the development of the plan. Public meetings were held at various times at multiple locations throughout the county to allow more opportunities for the public to attend. Public participation was also encouraged through videos, virtual workshops, and online interactive activities such as surveys and interactive maps. Chapter 4 describes the public comment period, public participation plan, and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated. |
| A-28 | 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?  Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.324(k), 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(iv) | The approved plan was made available for review electronically on the project website and at locations around the MPO’s region. Chapter 4 describes the public comment period, public participation plan, and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated. |
| A-29 | 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?  Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(i) | Public notice of public participation activities are described in Chapter 4 and Technical Report 2 (Public Participation Plan). Public participation activities provided reasonable opportunity and time to comment. Chapter 4 describes the public comment period, public participation plan, and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated. |
| A-30 | 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?  Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(vii) | An analysis of Charlotte County demographic data was completed to identify areas with higher concentrations of environmental justice populations, see Technical Report 5 (Sociocultural and Environmental Justice). Additionally, analysis of the projects included in the LRTP was conducted to ensure that the cost feasible projects do not disproportionately or adversely impact human health or the environment in these identified areas (see Section 5, Technical Report 5).  Environmental Justice and the needs of traditionally underserved populations were considered in the performance measures and public participation efforts. See Chapter 5 (Section 5.3) regarding the Environmental Justice analysis and Chapter 4 for how the needs of environmental justice and traditionally underserved population were considered in the public participation activities. |
| A-31 | 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?  Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vi) & 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(2) | Technical Report 2 (Public Participation Summary) includes all comments received during the public events, surveys, interactive activities, meetings, and public comment period. Chapter 4 describes the public comment period, public participation activities, and how information regarding the LRTP was communicated. |
| A-32 | 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?  Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(viii) | The final plan did not differ significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and did not raise new material issues. |
| A-33 | 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?  Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf) for guidance.  23 C.F.R. 450.316(b) | Yes, the MPO consulted with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning areas as described in Chapter 4 (see Stakeholder Interviews and Board and Committee meetings). Chapter 2 and Technical Report 1 also highlight the consistency between the LRTP goals and relevant land use and transportation plans within Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO’s jurisdiction. |
| A-34 | 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?  23 C.F.R 450.316(c) | N/A – There are no designated tribal lands located within the boundaries of the MPO’s Planning Area. |
| A-35 | If the MPO planning area includes Federal public lands, did the MPO appropriately involve Federal land management agencies in the development of the plan?  23 C.F.R 450.316(d) | The MPO area does not include any Federal public land. |
| A-36 | 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?  23 C.F.R. 450.314(e) | The MPO has joint planning responsibilities with the Sarasota/Manatee MPO to the North and Lee County MPO to the South. Joint meetings of the MPO Boards are held annually for coordination of transportation planning and funding. |

| Section B- State Requirements | | Where and How Addressed |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175**](http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0300-0399/0339/Sections/0339.175.html) | | |
| B-1 | 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?  ss.339.175(1), (5) and (7), F.S. | The principles are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives, as well as the performance measures and prioritization criteria. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.3 Tables 2-1), Chapter 7 (Section 7.4 & 7.5), Chapter 8 (Section 8.2), and Chapter 9. |
| B-2 | Does the plan give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities?  ss.339.175(1) and (7)(a), F.S. | The LRTP emphasizes existing and proposed projects on Strategic Intermodal System facilities such as I-75, US 17, US 41, and FDOT Multi-use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES). See Chapter 7 and Section 2.6 Table 2-5 and Chapter 8. |
| B-3 | 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?  ss.339.175(5) and (7), F.S. | Chapter 2 (Section 2.4) and Technical Report 1 highlight the consistency between the LRTP goals and relevant land use and transportation plans within Charlotte County-Punta Gorda MPO’s jurisdiction. |
| B-4 | Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions?  ss.339.175(1) and (7) F.S. | Yes, see Chapter 2 (section 2.5), Chapter 6 (Section 6.4 & 6.5) and Chapter 7. |
| B-5 | Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered?  s.339.175(7)(a), F.S. | The FTP principles are reflected in the adopted Goals and Objectives, as well as the performance measures and prioritization criteria. See Chapter 2 (Section 2.1 and 2.3 Tables 2-1) |
| B-6 | 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?  s.339.175(7)(c), F.S. | Chapter 2 (Sections 2.2 & 2.6) and the project prioritization criteria (Table 8-2) describe regional priorities and goals, including system preservation. Chapter 6 (Section 6.4) identifies strategies to better manage and operate existing transportation facilities and relieve vehicular congestion. The transportation needs outlined in Chapter 7 emphasize preserving the existing system and maximizing the mobility of people and goods. Chapter 8 addresses the existing infrastructure with maintenance funds. |
| B-7 | 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?  s.339.175(7)(d), F.S. | Chapter 6 (Section 6.5.2) identifies priority corridors which include aesthetics and landscaping, transit and bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Environmental mitigation and water pollution are addressed in Chapter 5. Chapters 7 and 8 Bicycle and Pedestrian sections identify and provide for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In addition, road capacity projects take a complete streets approach where possible by including bicycle and pedestrian facilities with each project. |
| B-8 | Was the plan approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present?  s.339.175(13) F.S. | Yes. |