

**Thomas A. Hall, Inc.**  
**1355 Adams Street**  
**Hollywood, FL 33019**  
954-288-4447  
tomhall1234@gmail.com

April 27, 2021

Randy L. Daniel, P.E., PMP, CFM  
Assistant City Engineer  
City of Margate  
Department of Environmental & Engineering Services  
901 NW 66th Avenue, Suite A  
Margate, FL 33063

**RE: Margate Cares for Heroes Traffic Statement – Response to Comments**  
**Project No. 202027.01**

Dear Mr. Daniel:

This is in response to comments received from you, dated March, 16, 2021. Your comments and our responses follow:

**A. Trafficways**

As a preamble to the following discourse and review, the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services (DEES) hereby indicates dissatisfaction with the accuracy of the Traffic Statement (TS) that was submitted for review. As a consequence, there may be additional inaccuracies in the Statement that were not discovered and therefore not discussed below. Furthermore, based on the discrepancies found in the report, DEES is not confident that the Traffic Statement was diligently prepared, despite the required oversight provided by Professional Engineer Partington.

*Response: Duly noted.*

Comment 1: Paragraph 3 of the TS states that “an analysis of trips expected to be generated by both the prior and the proposed developments was conducted”. Please provide the details of the analysis and the results that compared the prior development with the proposed; clearly illustrate the increase/decrease in trip counts in accordance with the selected parameters.

*Response: Comment 1, Part a: The majority of the traffic statement that follows the quoted text is “...the details of the analysis and the results that compared the prior development with the proposed.” A revised traffic statement has been prepared that makes the trip analysis more explicit.*

Randy L. Daniel, P.E., PMP, CFM

April 27, 2021

Page 2 of 4

*Response: Comment 1, Part b: The revised traffic statement states that the proposed use will generate 70 additional daily trips, nine (9) additional morning peak-hour trips, and eight (8) additional afternoon peak-hour trips.*

Comment 2: Section 31-37 in the City's code clearly requires that "a proposed development shall be presumed to have the maximum impact permitted under applicable land development regulations..." Replace average value with the value that has the greatest impact for use in Table 1.

*Response: The revised traffic statement explicitly declares the maximum trip generation for the proposed land use to be that which is derived from use of "employees" as the independent variable. The maximum trip generation is used in the analysis.*

Comment 3: Please explain how the data in Table 1 was derived from Tables 2-13.

*Response: The revised traffic statement expands the discussion of Table 1 and its derivation from Tables 2-13. The trip generation tables identified as Tables 2 through 13 each show a number of trips in the bottom right corner. The number in the lower right corner is the number of trips that are net new trips as a result of the proposed change in land use. Those numbers shown in the lower right corner of Tables 2 through 13 are summarized in Table 1. Again the maximum trip generation calculated is used in the analysis.*

Comment 4: Tables 2 -13 indicate that the greatest impact to the trip generation characteristic, of the four (4) characteristics analyzed, is the **number of employees**, with an associated number of 144 new daily trips generated. Accordingly, please reconcile the number of new trips generated by employees (144) and the number recorded in table 1 (31).

*Response: Table 1 has been revised to clearly identify the maximum net new trips. Looking at Tables 11 through 13 at the bottom right corner of each table, the maximum net new trips associated with the proposed change in land use are reproduced in Table 1. [ 70 trips]. The revised traffic statement expands on this discussion to further explain how these numbers were derived.*

Comment 5: Paragraph 5 speaks to "common practice of traffic engineering around the nation" in regards to the decision to use "dwelling units as the independent variable" in the analysis. Please provide supporting documentation for this claim.

*Response: No survey of traffic engineers was conducted in response to this comment. The current report has an expanded discussion of the justification for continuing to use dwelling units as the independent variable for the trip generation for the existing land use.*

Comment 6: Both Policy 2.1.2 in Element II - Transportation of the City's Comprehensive plan (pp II-80 /II-81) and Section 31-48 (C) of the City's Code of Ordinances require the Level of Service (LOS) for Local Roads to be "C". Melaleuca Drive is a local road but the Traffic Statement inaccurately states that LOS "D" shall be the Level of Service required for local roads. Please redo the analysis using LOS "C".

*Response: We concur. Melaleuca Drive was inaccurately identified as a collector roadway. The revised report corrects this error.*

Comment 7: Melaleuca Drive is not a signalized roadway, yet Table 4 of the TS references “State Signalized Arterials”. Please redo analysis and omit references to signalized intersections. Melaleuca Drive is not an arterial road.

*Response: The City of Margate’s Transportation Element, as a footnote to Table II-3, cites the following references for determining roadway capacity and level of service:*

- 1. Roadway Capacity Analysis for 2001 and 2025, Department of Planning and Environmental Protection, Transportation Planning Division, Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization, September 2002.*
- 2. Year 2001 Traffic Count Report, Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection, Transportation Planning Division, March 2002.*
- 3. 2002 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Florida Department of Transportation, 2002.*

*Of these three references, the Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) 2002 Quality/Level of Service Handbook is the source for generalized levels of service and maximum service volumes for roadways in the State of Florida. Table 4 - Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Florida’s Urbanized Areas, which is appended to the traffic statement, is from the most recent version of the Handbook. Table 4 is the basis for Broward County’s own peak-hour roadway capacity evaluations as well, as can be seen by a comparison of the capacity values shown in Reference 1 above to those in Reference 3 above.*

*FDOT does not publish a separate table for local, unsignalized roadways. What they do provide, as are highlighted in Table 4, are factors that serve to reduce the capacity of the roadway based on it not being a State Roadway, not having a median divider or turn lanes, etc. Given Melaleuca Drive’s status as a local road with a maximum acceptable level of service of “C,” the capacity calculation is as follows:*

LOS C maximum two-way peak-hour service volume = [660 trips – 10% for being a non-state road (66 trips) – 20% for not having either left- or right-turn lanes (119 trips)] = 475 trips.

*This is the maximum level of service “C” service volume for this roadway as both FDOT and Broward County would calculate it.*

Comment 8: Parking is not required for the Traffic Statement and should be removed. Parking requirements are stipulated in Section 33.3 of the City Code of Ordinances.

*Response: Parking was discussed in the previous traffic statement due to comments received from City staff. The parking discussion has been removed from the revised traffic statement, but remains available upon request.*

Randy L. Daniel, P.E., PMP, CFM

April 27, 2021

Page 4 of 4

There were no further comments. Should you have any questions regarding these responses, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

Thomas A. Hall  
President



*Peter Partington*  
4/27/2021  
Peter Partington, P.E.  
FL Registration No. 45099  
1521 NE 53<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334

TAH/kh