

## TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The following abbreviations and acronyms are used throughout this Transportation Element:

AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
County	Palm Beach County
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FIHS	Florida Intrastate Highway System as defined in s. 338.001 F. S.
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
TPSO	Palm Beach County Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance Ord. 2007-27 and 2007-34
CRALLS	Constrained Roadway at Lower Level of Service
SIS	Florida's Strategic Intermodal System

### Goals, Objectives and Policies

**GOAL 2.1.: MAINTAIN LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS WHICH SHALL ACCOMMODATE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH THROUGH FINANCIALLY FEASIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO DEVELOP A CONVENIENT, SAFE, AND ENERGY EFFICIENT MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR ALL PERSONS LIVING IN AND TRAVELING THROUGH THE CITY.**

**Objective 2.1.1.: To maintain adopted level of service (LOS) standards on the City's traffic circulation system.**

**Policy 2.1.1.1.:** Level of Service standards shall be as shown on Tables 2A-1 and 2A-2 and shall be applicable to the urban and rural service areas. Level of Service for FIHS roads will be measured utilizing the FDOT Generalized Peak Hour Directional Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas (Table 2B), or FDOT Generalized two-way Peak Hour Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas (Table 2C), or utilizing the FDOT 2009 Quality/Level of Service Handbook (FDOT Handbook) and the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Level of Service for non-FIHS roads that are part of the County thoroughfare system will be measured utilizing the volumes provided in the Transportation Element of the 1989 Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan, revised November 26, 2007, (Table 2D), or utilizing the methodologies provided in the TPSO. Level of Service for City roads will be measured utilizing the service volumes and capacities adopted in the City's Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance (Table 2E) or utilizing the FDOT Manual and 2000 HCM procedures.

**Policy 2.1.1.2.:** By December 31, 2009, the City shall adopt peak-hour directional, daily, and intersection LOS standards and regulations to determine the applicability and procedures for all LOS analysis.

**Policy 2.1.1.3.:** The City shall use the best available data and use professionally accepted practices in reviewing existing and future LOS on all roadways for Future Land Use Amendments and determination of the concurrency management system.

**Policy 2.1.1.4.:** The City will amend its Comprehensive Plan and land development ordinances as needed to maintain consistency between its accepted methods of measuring the Level of Service on FIHS or County thoroughfare roads and the most current methods adopted by the FDOT or County, respectively.

**Policy 2.1.1.5.:** The City shall review all development proposals for consistency with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of this element including consistency with the traffic circulation plans and the level of service standards. An assessment of the projected impact of project generated traffic on the roadway network within and serving the City shall be obtained. The net amount of project trips projected at build out will be used as a guideline for determining the radius of development influence. At a minimum, road segments within the appropriate radius as noted on Table 2F will be analyzed. The project's impacts will be projected for each phase of the project through the estimated date of completion.

**Policy 2.1.1.6.:** The City shall require that adequate roadway capacity, at the adopted level of service standards, is or will be available when needed in order to serve new development.

**Policy 2.1.1.7.:** Future Land Use Map Amendments shall be internally consistent with all Elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Using the maximum amount of potential development based on the intensity standards established in the Future Land Use Element, a transportation analyses is required for a proposed Future Land Use Map Amendment, demonstrating whether there is available uncommitted capacity on the roadways. The analyses shall include, but not limited to, a five-year short-term analysis and a long-term analysis to the planning horizon for the comprehensive plan. If the analyses demonstrate a roadway will operate below the adopted level of service, then the necessary roadway improvement or alternative measures to maintain the adopted level of service should be identified and if the necessary measure is a capital improvement it should be included within the first five years of the financially feasible capital improvement program or on the long range transportation map depending on the timing of the need for the improvement to the roadway. Alternatively, the potential amount of development that is permitted on the site shall be reduced to ensure the future land use plan is coordinated with the transportation plan.

**Policy 2.1.1.8.:** The City shall investigate possible mechanisms for removing ghost trips from City roads. Ghost trips arise when development proceeds at a lower intensity than that at which it was approved. The intent of this policy is to prevent ghost trips from decreasing the amount of roadway capacity a new project can rely on in obtaining a County traffic concurrency certificate.

**Policy 2.1.1.9.:** The City shall conduct a review of high traffic accident locations to identify those occurrences on City maintained roadways. The City shall investigate the causes to provide corrective measures to mitigate future accidents.

**TABLE 2A-1  
LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARD**

<b>Facility Type</b>	<b>Daily and Peak Hour Level Of Service Standard</b>
Neighborhood Collector	D
City Collector	D
<b>Non-FIHS roads that are part of the County Thoroughfare plan:</b>	
County Minor Arterial	D
State Minor Arterial	D
State Principle Arterial	D
<b>FIHS roads</b>	
All roadways except Beeline Highway between Northlake Blvd & CR-711	D
Beeline Highway (Northlake Blvd to CR-711)	C

**TABLE 2A -2  
LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS FOR CONSTRAINED ROADWAYS AT LOWER LEVEL OF SERVICE (CRALLS)<sup>1,2</sup>**

<b>Roadways</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Daily Traffic Volumes</b>	<b>Peak Hour Volumes (Directional)</b>
<b>Roadways</b>				
Northlake Blvd	Military Trail	Prosperity Farms Rd	-	3,890
	Interstate 95	Congress Ave	60,000	3,890
Prosperity Farms Rd	Donald Ross Rd	Gardens Parkway	19,460	1043
	Burns Road	Northlake Blvd	20,950	1102
PGA Blvd <sup>3</sup>	Florida's Turnpike	Central Blvd	-	2747
	Central Blvd	Military Trail	-	2900
	Military Trail	Interstate 95	-	3720
	Interstate 95	RCA Blvd	-	4811
	RCA Blvd	Alternate A1A Fairchild Gardens	-	4835
	Alternate A1A Fairchild Gardens	Ave	-	4016
	Ave	Prosperity Farms Rd	-	3406

	Prosperity Farms Rd	US-1	-	2990
<b>Intersections</b>				
<b>Location</b>		<b>Critical Movement Analysis Volume (CMA)</b>		
Northlake Boulevard & Military Trail		1,500		
Northlake Boulevard & Interstate 95		1,500		
Northlake Boulevard & Congress Avenue		1,500		
Northlake Boulevard & Alternate A1A		1,500		
Northlake Boulevard & Prosperity Farms Road		1,500		
PGA Boulevard and Military Trail		18,000 <sup>3</sup>		

Notes:

1. Based of Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan and subject to stipulations referenced in the Plan.
2. Refer to Palm Beach County Comprehensive Plan for project specific CRALLS designations.
3. Applies only to properties subject to the forbearance agreement entered into by the City on April 15, 1999.

**Table 2B**

**Generalized Peak Hour Directional Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas<sup>1</sup>**

9/4/09

STATE SIGNALIZED ARTERIALS						FREEWAYS					
<b>Class I (&gt;0.00 to 1.99 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						Lanes	B	C	D	E	
Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	2	2,200	3,020	3,720	4,020	
1	Undivided	510	820	880	***	3	3,300	4,580	5,580	6,200	
2	Divided	1,560	1,890	1,960	***	4	4,400	6,080	7,420	8,400	
3	Divided	2,400	2,860	2,940	***	5	5,500	7,680	9,320	10,580	
4	Divided	3,240	3,830	3,940	***	6	7,560	10,220	12,080	12,780	
<b>Class II (2.00 to 4.50 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						<b>Freeway Adjustments</b>					
Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	Auxiliary Lanes	Ramp Metering	Oversaturated Conditions*			
1	Undivided	**	560	810	860	+ 1,000	+ 5%	-10% of E			
2	Divided	**	1,330	1,770	1,870						
3	Divided	**	2,080	2,680	2,830						
4	Divided	**	2,830	3,590	3,780						
<b>Class III/IV (more than 4.50 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						<b>UNINTERRUPTED FLOW HIGHWAYS</b>					
Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E
1	Undivided	**	270	630	790	1	Undivided	400	800	1,140	1,440
2	Divided	**	670	1,500	1,700	2	Divided	1,770	2,560	3,320	3,760
3	Divided	**	1,050	2,330	2,570	3	Divided	2,660	3,840	4,980	5,650
4	Divided	**	1,440	3,170	3,450	<b>Uninterrupted Flow Highway Adjustments</b>					
						Lanes	Median	Exclusive left lanes	Adjustment factors		
						2	Divided	Yes	+5%		
						Multi	Undivided	Yes	-5%		
						Multi	Undivided	No	-25%		
<b>Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments</b> (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.)						<b>BICYCLE MODE<sup>2</sup></b> (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)					
Major City/County Roadways - 10%						Paved Shoulder/ Bicycle Lane					
Other Signalized Roadways - 35%						Coverage	B	C	D	E	
						0-49%	**	170	650	>650	
						50-84%	130	200	>200	***	
						85-100%	340	>340	***	***	
<b>State &amp; Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments</b> (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.)						<b>PEDESTRIAN MODE<sup>2</sup></b> (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)					
<b>Divided/Undivided &amp; Turn Lane Adjustments</b>						Sidewalk Coverage					
Lanes	Median	Exclusive Left Lanes	Exclusive Right Lanes	Adjustment Factors		0-49%	**	**	270	770	
2	Divided	Yes	No	+5%		50-84%	**	100	600	1000	
2	Undivided	No	No	-20%		85-100%	**	610	1000	>1000	
Multi	Undivided	Yes	No	-5%		<b>BUS MODE (Scheduled Fixed Route)<sup>3</sup></b> (Buses in peak hour in peak direction)					
Multi	Undivided	No	No	-25%		Sidewalk Coverage	B	C	D	E	
-	-	-	Yes	+ 15%		0-84%	>5	≥4	≥3	≥2	
<b>One-Way Facility Adjustment</b> Multiply the corresponding volumes in this table by 1.20.						85-100%	>4	≥3	≥2	≥1	
<p><sup>1</sup> Values shown are presented as hourly directional volumes for levels of service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specifically stated. To convert to annual average daily traffic volumes, these volumes must be divided by appropriate D and K factors. This table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Calculations are based on planning applications of the Highway Capacity Manual, Bicycle LOS Model, Pedestrian LOS Model and Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual, respectively for the automobile/truck, bicycle, pedestrian and bus modes.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this table is based on number of motorized vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the facility.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single direction of the higher traffic flow.</p> <p>* For oversaturated conditions during peak hour, subtract 10% from the LOS E (capacity volumes). This number becomes the new maximum service volume for LOS D, and LOS E cannot be achieved.</p> <p>** Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults.</p> <p>*** Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the automobile mode, volumes greater than level of service D become F because intersection capacities have been reached. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (including F) is not achievable because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using table input value defaults.</p>											

Source:  
Florida Department of Transportation  
Systems Planning Office  
605 Suwannee Street, MS 19  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**TABLE 2-C**

**Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Florida's Urbanized Areas<sup>1</sup>**

9/4/09

STATE SIGNALIZED ARTERIALS						FREEWAYS						
<b>Class I (&gt;0.00 to 1.99 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						Lanes	B	C	D	E		
2	Median	B	C	D	E	4	4,000	5,500	6,770	7,300		
4	Undivided	930	1,500	1,600	***	6	6,000	8,320	10,150	11,290		
4	Divided	2,840	3,440	3,560	***	8	8,000	11,050	13,480	15,270		
6	Divided	4,370	5,200	5,360	***	10	10,000	13,960	16,930	19,250		
8	Divided	5,900	6,970	7,160	***	12	13,730	18,600	21,950	23,230		
<b>Class II (2.00 to 4.50 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						<b>Freeway Adjustments</b>						
Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	Auxiliary Lanes	Ramp Metering	Oversaturated Conditions*				
2	Undivided	**	1,020	1,480	1,570	+ 1,800	+ 5%	-10% of E				
4	Divided	**	2,420	3,220	3,400							
6	Divided	**	3,790	4,880	5,150							
8	Divided	**	5,150	6,530	6,880							
<b>Class III/IV (more than 4.50 signalized intersections per mile)</b>						<b>UNINTERRUPTED FLOW HIGHWAYS</b>						
Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	Lanes	Median	B	C	D	E	
2	Undivided	**	500	1,150	1,440	2	Undivided	730	1,460	2,080	2,620	
4	Divided	**	1,220	2,730	3,100	4	Divided	3,220	4,660	6,040	6,840	
6	Divided	**	1,910	4,240	4,680	6	Divided	4,840	6,990	9,060	10,280	
8	Divided	**	2,620	5,770	6,280	<b>Uninterrupted Flow Highway Adjustments</b>						
						Lanes	Median	Exclusive left lanes	Adjustment factors			
						2	Divided	Yes	+5%			
						Multi	Undivided	Yes	-5%			
						Multi	Undivided	No	-25%			
<b>Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments</b> (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.)						<b>BICYCLE MODE<sup>2</sup></b> (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)						
Major City/County Roadways - 10%						Paved Shoulder/ Bicycle Lane						
Other Signalized Roadways - 35%						Coverage	B	C	D	E		
						0-49%	**	310	1,180	>1,180		
						50-84%	240	360	>360	***		
						85-100%	620	>620	***	***		
<b>State &amp; Non-State Signalized Roadway Adjustments</b> (Alter corresponding state volumes by the indicated percent.)						<b>PEDESTRIAN MODE<sup>2</sup></b> (Multiply motorized vehicle volumes shown below by number of directional roadway lanes to determine two-way maximum service volumes.)						
<b>Divided/Undivided &amp; Turn Lane Adjustments</b>						Sidewalk Coverage	B	C	D	E		
Lanes	Median	Exclusive Left Lanes	Exclusive Right Lanes	Adjustment Factors			0-49%	**	**	480	1,390	
2	Divided	Yes	No	+5%			50-84%	**	**	1,100	1,820	
2	Undivided	No	No	-20%			85-100%	**	1,100	1,820	>1,820	
Multi	Undivided	Yes	No	-5%			<b>BUS MODE (Scheduled Fixed Route)<sup>3</sup></b> (Buses in peak hour in peak direction)					
Multi	Undivided	No	No	-25%			Sidewalk Coverage	B	C	D	E	
-	-	-	Yes	+ 15%			0-84%	>5	≥4	≥3	≥2	
<b>One-Way Facility Adjustment</b> Multiply the corresponding two-directional volumes in this table by 0.6.								85-100%	>4	≥3	≥2	≥1

<sup>1</sup> Values shown are presented as hourly two-way volumes for levels of service and are for the automobile/truck modes unless specifically stated. Although presented as peak hour two-way volumes, they actually represent peak hour peak direction conditions with an applicable D factor applied. This table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The table and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Calculations are based on planning applications of the Highway Capacity Manual, Bicycle LOS Model, Pedestrian LOS Model and Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual, respectively for the automobile/truck, bicycle, pedestrian and bus modes.

<sup>2</sup> Level of service for the bicycle and pedestrian modes in this table is based on number of motorized vehicles, not number of bicyclists or pedestrians using the facility.

<sup>3</sup> Buses per hour shown are only for the peak hour in the single direction of the higher traffic flow.

<sup>4</sup> For oversaturated conditions during peak hour, subtract 10% from the LOS E (capacity volumes). This number becomes the new maximum service volume for LOS D, and LOS E cannot be achieved.

\*\* Cannot be achieved using table input value defaults.

\*\*\* Not applicable for that level of service letter grade. For the automobile mode, volumes greater than level of service D become F because intersection capacities have been reached. For the bicycle mode, the level of service letter grade (including F) is not achievable because there is no maximum vehicle volume threshold using table input value defaults.

Source:  
Florida Department of Transportation  
Systems Planning Office  
605 Suwannee Street, MS 19  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**TABLE 2D: MAXIMUM VOLUME FOR NON-FIHS COUNTY AND CITY ROADS**

Type Of Road		LOS "D"		LOS "E"	
		ADT	Two-Way Peak Hour	ADT	Two-Way Peak Hour
2 lanes undivided	2L	12,300	1,170	13,000	1,240
2 lanes one-way	2LO	19,600	1,870	20,700	1,960
3 lanes two-way or 2 lanes divided	2LD	15,400	1,460	16,300	1,550
3 lanes one-way	3LO	29,500	2,810	31,100	2,950
4 lanes undivided	4L	24,500	2,330	25,900	2,450
4 lanes divided	4LD	32,700	3,110	34,500	3,270
5 lanes two-way	5L	32,700	3,110	34,500	3,270
6 lanes divided	6LD	49,200	4,680	51,800	4,920
8 lanes divided	8LD	63,800	6,060	67,000	6,360
4 lanes expressway	4LX	67,200	6,250	76,500	7,110
6 lanes expressway	6LX	105,800	9,840	120,200	11,180
8 lanes expressway	8LX	144,300	13,420	163,900	15,240
10 lanes expressway	10LX	182,600	16,980	207,600	19,310

Source: Article 12 of the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code effective date August 23, 2007.

**TABLE 2E**  
**RADIUS OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE**

<b>Net External Peak Hour Two-Way Trip Generation</b>			<b>Radius in Miles</b>
1	through	20	Directly accessed link(s) of first accessed major thoroughfare(s)
21	through	50	
51	through	100	
101	through	500	
501	through	1,000	
1,001	through	2,000	
2,001	through	Up	

- Notes: (1) Based on Article 12 of the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code  
(2) Actual radius of influences may be greater than identified in this guideline  
(3) Levels of significance shall be 5% on I-95 roadways and 1% on all other roadways.

**Policy 2.1.1.10.:** The City shall exercise one or more of the following options to mitigate future LOS deficiencies, included, but not limited to:

- A. Adopted Constrained Roadways At a Lower Level of Service (CRALLS);
- B. Road and intersection improvements;
- C. Transit Oriented Development (TOD); or
- D. Multi-modal improvement plans.

**Policy 2.1.1.11.:** The City Council shall retain the right to adopt LOS "E" for local roads or specific segments of local roads within transit oriented developments, where to do so would be consistent with established planning practice in promoting a pedestrian/transit oriented environment.

**Policy 2.1.1.12.:** City Council shall retain the right to adopt alternative Level of Service standards for specified roadway links, which, due to circumstances beyond City Council's control, are currently or are projected to exceed the Level of Service standard in Policy 2.1.1.1., or if improvements to a roadway link or intersection will be prohibited due to physical, environmental, historical, or aesthetic constraints. Alternate levels of service shall be, to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the State and County standards.

**Policy 2.1.1.13.:** The City shall prepare, in conjunction with the MPO and other governmental agencies, a bi-annual report that identifies City collectors which have no excess service volume; and develop a list of improvements, transportation demand, and transportation system management strategies to increase that service volume. Before adding improvements for constrained or physically-limited roadways to the Capital Improvement Program or before adopting a lower level of service standard for the roadway, the City will attempt to improve roadway capacity by implementing the transportation demand and transportation system management strategies identified as of greatest potential benefit by the evaluation referred to in Policy 2.2.1.1.

**GOAL 2.2.: CONTINUE TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN SUSTAINABLE, SAFE AND EFFICIENT INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION LINKAGES THROUGH A BALANCE OF TRAFFIC CIRCULATION SYSTEMS, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, AND PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE NETWORKS.**

**Objective 2.2.1.: To encourage strategies which reduce demand on the City's traffic circulation system and alleviate street traffic congestion.**

**Policy 2.2.1.1.:** The City shall encourage the utilization of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to increase the efficiency of the transportation system and influence the amount and demand for transportation. These strategies may include ridesharing programs, flexible work hours, telecommuting, shuttle services, and parking management. By December 31, 2009, the City shall adopt and implement TDM strategies through the following programs:

- Coordination with the Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Traffic Calming
- Intersection improvements
- Coordination with Palm Tran routes
- Transit Oriented Development/ Tri Rail

**Policy 2.2.1.2.:** The City shall continue its efforts to establish city-wide continuity of bikeways, particularly between major sources of and destinations for vehicle trips in the City.

**Policy 2.2.1.3.:** The City shall evaluate and encourage improvements to the Conceptual Thoroughfare Plan (Map A.19.) to ensure that there is an adequate network of public streets (City Collectors, Neighborhood Collectors and Local Roads) to efficiently move traffic within the City and serve as a backup system to the County thoroughfare roads. Actual alignments for these public roadways will be established as part of the development review process.

**Policy 2.2.1.4.:** By December 31, 2010, the City shall adopt a City-wide Bicycle and Pedestrian network plan, which shall include an inventory and evaluation of the existing network. At minimum, the network plan shall propose strategies to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to public schools. The City shall utilize the Bicycle and Pedestrian network plan in its review of all proposed development for its accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic needs.

**Policy 2.2.1.5.:** By December 31, 2010, the City shall establish regulations to control vehicular access onto arterials and collectors in order to reduce existing or potential congestion problems. Whenever possible, the City shall encourage minimizing access points by requiring shared access with adjacent development.

**Policy 2.2.1.6.:** Encourage connectivity of roadways and cross connection of property with similar or compatible land uses in the City to reduce congestion on arterial and collector roads, including bicycle and pedestrian connections, and utilize traffic calming measures to minimize the traffic impacts on residential neighborhoods.

**Policy 2.2.1.7.:** The City shall encourage initiatives that relieve congestion on Federal Interstate Highway System roads by encouraging parallel roadways, transit routes or other local traffic initiatives facilitating local traffic flow.

**Policy 2.2.1.8.:** The City shall encourage the utilization of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies to optimize the efficiency of the transportation system through technology. These strategies may include arterial management systems, such as advanced signal systems and surveillance systems, incident management coordination, transit and work zone management systems, and dynamic message signs. The City shall coordinate with the County's Traffic Division in support of efforts to plan for or implement ITS infrastructure within the City.

**Objective 2.2.2.:** To maintain a sustainable transportation system through the adoption of a financially feasible Capital Improvement Program.

**Policy 2.2.2.1.:** The City shall develop, on an annual basis, a Capital Improvement Program for roadway improvements within the City. The findings of the annual report prepared under Policy 2.1.3.3. shall be utilized in developing the Capital Improvement Program.

**Policy 2.2.2.2.:** Proposed roadway projects will be reviewed and ranked in order of priority according to the following guidelines:

- a) Whether the project is needed to protect public health and safety, to fulfill the County's legal commitment to provide facilities and services, or to preserve or achieve full use of existing facilities; and
- b) Whether the project increases efficiency of use of existing facilities, prevents or reduces future improvement cost, provides service to developed areas lacking full service, or promotes in-fill development
- c) Whether the project represents a logical extension of facilities and services within a designated urban service area; and
- d) Whether the project will contribute to the achievement of level of service volumes set forth in Policy 2.1.1.1.

**Policy 2.2.2.3.:** The City shall utilize an impact fee program as one of the methods to fund local (city) roadway capital improvements. The City shall continue to assess and improve the performance of the impact fee program.

**Objective 2.2.3.:** To establish a network of streets that provide multiple routes for intra community trips and alternate routes for external travel so that neighborhood collector streets can be maintained as two-lane streets, adequate ingress and egress is available for police, fire and emergency evacuation, and no one neighborhood is unduly burdened by providing more than its fair share of roadway capacity.

**Policy 2.2.3.1.:** The hierarchy of City streets and their functions shall be as follows:

City Collectors - (example Burns Road) collect and distribute traffic from neighborhood to neighborhood throughout the City and provide back-up routes to the County thoroughfare system, may be greater than two lane and are always public, unless designated a private road pursuant to a PUD or PCD approval prior to the construction of the road. The goal is to have a network sufficient to maintain these roads at no more than four lanes.

Neighborhood Collectors - (example Holly Drive) collect and distribute traffic within a Planned Unit Development or from limited access subdivisions, will be maintained as low speed, two lane public roads (unless designated a private road pursuant to a PUD or PCD approval prior to the construction of the road) suitable

for fronting residential development, institutional, or neighborhood commercial development.

Local Roads - (example Buttercup) all other City roads, may be public or private.

**Policy 2.2.3.2.:** Minimum right-of-way requirements for new roadways shall be:

- a) Arterial/Primary roadways - right-of-way and laneage based on County and State standard;
- b) City Collector roadways - 120' right-of-way;
- c) Neighborhood Collector roadways - 80' right-of-way
- d) Local roads - 60' right-of-way (swale drainage); and 50' right-of-way (curb and gutter).
- e) Parkways - 300-400' right-of-way.

**Policy 2.2.3.3.:** By December 31, 2010, the City shall assess the minimum right-of-way requirements and adopt a method of accepting lesser widths in the event of the redevelopment of existing right-of-ways that have been built at a lesser width or the establishment of right-of-ways with other physical or natural constraints.

**Policy 2.2.3.3.:** The City shall maintain minimum standards for Neighborhood Collector roadways in the land development regulations to ensure that neighborhood collectors can remain two-lane roadways through build-out of the County. Actual alignments for these roadways will be established as part of the development review process.

**Policy 2.2.3.4.:** Rights-of-way shall continue to be formally identified at the time of development approval and a priority schedule for acquisition or reservation established.

**Policy 2.2.3.5.:** As a condition of plat or development order approval, the City shall require mandatory dedications of rights-of-way, easements, or fees when the required ROW is not under the same ownership as the property being platted, or during the site plan review process.

**Policy 2.2.3.6.:** The City shall encourage the use of roundabouts at suitable locations, in order to provide efficient flow of traffic.

**Objective 2.2.4.:** In accordance with section 163.3202, F.S., maintain and revise where necessary, the land development regulations for the provision of motorized and non-motorized transportation.

**Policy 2.2.4.1.:** The City shall generally prohibit on-street parking on all arterial, City and Neighborhood collector roads that do not maintain safety performance standards and efficient traffic flow. On-street parking may be allowed, with specific City Council approval and as necessary the approval of the agency having jurisdiction over said roadway, when the design of the roadway in relation to adjacent uses maintains safety performance standards and efficient traffic flow. On-street parking is encouraged within mixed use developments, and on collector roads that meet the adopted level of service standards.

**Policy 2.2.4.2.:** By December 31, 2009, the City shall review the Land Development Regulations to consider incentives and accommodate the needs of compact four and two wheel vehicles (such as hybrids, smart cars, and vespas/scooters, etc.) by assessing the parking requirements and other provisions of the code.

**Objective 2.2.5.:** To maintain land development regulations which set requirements for safety and aesthetics in the transportation system.

**Policy 2.2.5.1.:** The City shall continue to enforce its adopted design standards, which minimize roadway hazard by:

- a) Requiring the provision of adequate storage and weaving areas;
- b) Providing turn lanes with adequate storage;
- c) Limiting direct access from residential driveways and local roads onto high-speed traffic lanes;
- d) Reducing conflicts between roadway and pedestrian or rail traffic;
- e) Providing adequate capacity for emergency evacuation;
- f) Providing standard signing and marking for roadways, bikeways, sidewalks, and intersections;
- g) Controlling access between dissimilar land uses;
- h) Regulating the length of cul-de-sacs; and
- i) Road drainage.

**Policy 2.2.5.2.:** The City shall adopt bicycle use, urban aesthetics, and accepted traffic calming techniques specific to each classification of roadways. The techniques should encourage street trees for green linkages outside of the parkway system, in order to connect with the parkway system.

**Objective 2.2.6.:** To continue coordinating Transportation planning with the future land uses shown on the Future Land Use Map of this plan, the FDOT Five Year Transportation Plan, plans of neighboring jurisdictions, and Palm Beach County transportation and future land use plans.

**Policy 2.2.6.1.:** The City shall review subsequent versions of the FDOT Five Year Transportation Plan and Palm Beach County Five-Year Road Improvement Program in order to update or modify this element, if necessary.

**Policy 2.2.6.2.:** The City shall review for compatibility with this element, the transportation plans and programs of the unincorporated County and neighboring municipalities as they are amended in the future.

**Policy 2.2.6.3.:** The City shall coordinate with State and County traffic agencies to change the classification of Holly Drive on plans and models to that of a neighborhood collector.

**Objective 2.2.7.:** To continue to plan for and provide transportation facilities encouraging various modes of transportation. The City shall plan and provide for alternate routes to major arterials within the City Center area, which is bounded by RCA Blvd. to the south, Prosperity Farms Road to the east, Military Trail to the west, and Atlantic Avenue to the north. Accordingly, the City adopts and incorporates into the Conceptual Thoroughfare Plan map and the Future Land Use Map Series the City Center Linkages Plan (Maps B.1., B.2., and B.3.) for the City Center area to serve as alternate routes to PGA Blvd., Prosperity Farms Road, and Alt. A-1-A, and other major thoroughfares within the City. The plan provides facilities for vehicles, pedestrians, as well as bicyclists within the right-of-way.

**Policy 2.2.7.1.:** The City shall require individual developments to dedicate the needed right-of-way during the site plan review process, be consistent with, and conform to the City Center Linkages Plan. However, the City Council may in its discretion accept a perpetual public access easement in lieu of dedication of right-of-way on neighborhood collectors and local roads only. This shall apply only to neighborhood collectors and local roads that are part of the City Center Linkages Plan. Roadway alignments, right-of-way, cross sections and construction of each link shall be consistent with the standards specified in the City's Land Development Regulations. However, granting of waivers may permit minor deviations from the plan and or roadway construction standards affecting such links. Such waivers are granted only by the City Council acting upon a recommendation from the Local Planning Agency. The City reserves the right to expand the laneage within the right-of-way and or the right-of-way itself, if so determined by the City, should the need arise in the future on roadways upon which the City is granted perpetual public access easements. Maintenance of such roadways, upon which the City is granted the mentioned easement, shall be the sole responsibility of the property owners/developers.

**Policy 2.2.7.2.:** The Parkway System is shown on Map A.1. and include the following facilities:

- 1) PGA Boulevard from Beeline Highway to Central Boulevard.
- 2) Central Boulevard from PGA Boulevard to Donald Ross Road.
- 3) Donald Ross Road from Prosperity Farms Road westward to the Palm Beach Gardens city limits.
- 4) Beeline Highway from PGA Boulevard to the Caloosa subdivision.
- 5) Hood Road from Prosperity Farms Road to a future North-South Artery west of Florida's Turnpike.
- 6) Future North-South Artery west of Florida's Turnpike.
- 7) Future East-West Artery north of PGA Boulevard and south of Hood Road.

**Policy 2.2.7.3.:** The Parkway System shall include pedestrian ways within the additional rights-of-way.

**Policy 2.2.7.4.:** The designated rights-of-way for the Parkway System shall be 300-400 feet. A right-of-way may be averaged, with City Council approval, to include in the calculation restored wetlands and upland habitat set-aside on the site in order to maintain a native greenway and promote linkages of the natural environment, including wildlife corridors. Hood Road between Prosperity Farms Road and Central Boulevard shall receive parkway treatments within a 55' corridor.

**Policy 2.2.7.5.:** The City shall encourage the development of a people moving system (such as a trolley or any combination of similar systems) to provide connections within the City Center area and connection to the surrounding residential community.

**Objective 2.2.8.:** To encourage the use of public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian paths within City boundaries and in conjunction with surrounding municipalities through use of the Parkway System and support the proposed multi-modal program, more specifically explained in Policy 1.1.1.20.

**Policy 2.2.8.1.:** The City shall continue to require new developments to construct bicycle and pedestrian ways within and on roadways adjacent to those developments and to identify future on-site centralized transit pick-up/drop-off points.

**Policy 2.2.8.2.:** The City shall continue to make continuity between pedestrian paths in the older portions of the City a priority in the Capital Improvement Element.

**Policy 2.2.8.3.:** The City shall continue to require elements of the parkway system to connect to existing road facilities so that a continuous pedestrian system occurs.

**Policy 2.2.8.4.:** The City shall coordinate with the Town of Jupiter in an effort to identify appropriate bike trail linkages between the PBCC campus in Palm Beach Gardens and the Florida Atlantic University campus and The Scripps Research Institute in the Abacoa development in the Town of Jupiter. The proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan (Policy 2.2.1.4.) shall assess opportunities for additional linkages to neighboring municipalities.

**Policy 2.2.8.5:** Facilities which accommodate the needs of the handicapped, pedestrians and bicyclists shall be assessed and required during the development review process.

**Policy 2.2.8.6.:** By December 31, 2011, the City shall adopt a sustainable Multi-Modal Transportation Plan incorporating the findings of the Transit Needs Assessment and Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The Plan shall develop a long term strategy to reduce CO2 emissions, provide the public and business additional transportation alternatives, but will not replace, reduce or weaken road concurrency measurements.

**GOAL 2.3.: TO PROVIDE A SAFE AND ACCESSIBLE PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEM ENCOURAGING A SUSTAINABLE AND ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO AUTOMOBILE USE.**

**Objective 2.3.1.:** To coordinate with the Metropolitan Planning Organization, South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, Palm Beach County, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, Palm Tran, other local transit service providers and local municipalities in the City's transit initiatives.

**Policy 2.3.1.2:** The City shall continue to provide Palm Tran, the local transit authority, with employment and development activity on projects within the City in order to identify potential sources of and destinations for people using transit and assist them in the extension of transit service in the City as ridership need is identified.

**Policy 2.3.1.3.:** The City shall coordinate efforts with Palm-Tran to increase public awareness of the expanded Palm-Tran service through the following efforts:

1. Work with identified area attractors (examples: Gardens Mall, Government Center, libraries) to produce public information displays on how to access the attractors by Palm-Tran.
2. Provide displays in all City offices and parks indicating the location and stop number of the closest Palm-Tran stop.
3. Include information on the location and number of the closest Palm-Tran stop in advertisement of all City sponsored public events.

**Policy 2.3.1.4.:** The City shall continue to participate with the MPO in a study of the feasibility of a semi-local, independent shuttle or transit system within the north county area.

**Policy 2.3.1.5.:** The City shall continue to require parkway system improvements, as defined in the Future Land Use Element of this Comprehensive Plan, to be introduced into newly developed areas to incorporate.

**Policy 2.3.1.7.:** The City shall adopt and maintain an advanced right-of-way acquisition program to provide for the protection and acquisition of existing and future rights-of-way, including public transit right-of-way and exclusive public transit corridors.

**Policy 2.3.1.8.:** The City shall coordinate its transportation and mass transit strategies and policies with strategies and policies supported by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC).

**Objective 2.3.3.:** To promote sustainable growth, the City recognizes the direct link between public transit, land use, workforce housing, and economic development.

**Policy 2.3.3.1.:** [RESERVED]

**Policy 2.3.3.2.:** [RESERVED]

**Policy 2.3.3.3.:** The City shall support efforts to extend the Tri-County Commuter Rail on the FEC railroad track.

**Policy 2.3.3.4.:** The City shall encourage redevelopment providing workforce housing, pedestrian oriented design, and access to public transit.