

H. State/Federal Requirement Checklist

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
23 CFR Part 450 – Planning Assistance and Standards		
A-1	<p>Does the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(a)</p>	Adoption in November 2025, horizon year 2050 – 25-year horizon
A-2	<p>Does the LRTP address the planning factors described in 23 CFR 450.306(b)23?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p><u>Risk and Resiliency</u> Does the LRTP improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation?</p> <p><u>Travel and Tourism</u> Does the LRTP enhance travel and tourism?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(a)</p>	<p>Planning factors addressed in 3. Goals and Objectives, <i>Table 3-2. RMP Goals & National Planning Factors</i>.</p> <p>Fiscal Constraint addressed in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-6. Cost and Revenue Balance Table</i></p> <p>Resiliency and Reliability addressed in 5. Needs Assessment, <i>Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria</i></p> <p>Travel and Tourism addressed in 5. Needs Assessment, <i>Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria</i></p>
A-3	<p>Does the LRTP 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>The RMP include long- and short-range improvements in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i></p> <p>Multimodal projects, both long- and short-range, are included in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i></p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-3 cont.	Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance . 23 CFR 450.324(b)	
A-4	Was the requirement to update the LRTP at least every five years met? Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter and 2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance . 23 CFR 450.324(c)	2045 plan adopted November 23, 2020, 2050 plan adopted November 17, 2025.
A-5	Did the MPO coordinate the development of the LRTP with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP)? See 2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(d)	Boxed funds categories include short-range projects and long-range funding commitments to bike/ped and TSM&O improvements - included in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan , <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> .
A-6	Was the LRTP 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 for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(e)	Current population, employment, and congestion were assessed and summarized in 2. State of the Region , <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Population: <i>Table 2-1. Population by County since 2013</i> • Current Employment: <i>Table 2-2. Employment by County since 2013</i> • Current Congestion: <i>Figure 2-16. Traffic Congestion</i> • Future Population & Employment: <i>Table 2-3. Expected Population and Employment in 2050 by County</i> Future congestion was assessed and summarized in 5. Needs Assessment , <i>Figure 5-4. Mobility/Congestion Focused Needs Assessment</i> .

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-7	<p>Does the LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(1)</p>	<p>Future demand was assessed and summarized in chapter 5. Needs Assessment, <i>Figure 5-4. Mobility/ Congestion Focused Needs Assessment</i>.</p>
A-8	<p>Does the LRTP 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 CFR 450.324(f)(2)</p>	<p>Existing transportation facilities are included in chapter 2. State of the Region,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadways: <i>Figure 2-6. Federal Aid Eligible Roadway Network</i> • Sidewalks: <i>Figure 2-7. Sidewalk Network</i> • Bicycle Facilities: <i>Figure 2-8. Bicycle Network</i> • Public Transit: <i>Figure 2-9. Public Transit Routes</i> • Freight Facilities: <i>Figure 2-10. Air, Rail, & Highway Freight Facilities</i> <p>Proposed future facilities are summarized in Chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Figure 7-1. Cost Feasible Plan – Roadway Capacity and <i>Table 7-3. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i>.</p>
A-9	<p>Does the LRTP include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with 23 CFR 450.306(d)?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(3)</p>	<p>The Transportation Performance Measures and targets are summarized in Appendix C. System Performance Report.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-10	<p>Does the LRTP 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 23 CFR 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(4)(i)</p>	<p>The Transportation Performance Measures and targets are summarized in Appendix C. System Performance Report.</p>
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 USC Chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:</p> <p>(i) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 USC 119(e) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in 49 USC 5326;</p> <p>(ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 USC 148;</p> <p>(iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, as specified in 49 USC 5329(d)49;</p> <p>(iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;</p> <p>(v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 USC 149(l), as applicable;</p> <p>(vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118);</p> <p>(vii) The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and</p>	<p>The RMP integrated goals and objectives described in other local and State plans, as described in 3. Goals and Objectives, Table 3-1. State, Local, and Federal Plans Reviewed.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-11 cont.	<p>(viii) Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter and 2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.306 (d)(4)</p>	<p>The RMP integrated goals and objectives described in other local and State plans, as described in 3. Goals and Objectives, Table 3-1. State, Local, and Federal Plans Reviewed.</p>
A-12	<p>Does the LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(5)</p>	<p>The RMP includes operational and management strategies, including a boxed fund for TSM&O (chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan) and assessment of four facilities for potential TSM&O improvements (Appendix D. TSM&O Examples)</p>
A-13	<p>Does the LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(6)</p>	<p>The RMP includes a boxed fund for congestion management strategies summarized in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan.</p>
A-14	<p>Does the LRTP 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 CFR 450.324(f)(7)</p>	<p>Preservation, multimodal capacity, and vulnerability to natural disasters were all assessed as part of the RMP Needs Assessment, through a data-driven analytical process, which is summarized in chapter 5. Needs Assessment, Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-15	<p>Does the LRTP 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 USC 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 USC 5302(a)49? 23 CFR 450.324(f)(8)</p>	<p>Public transit was included in the RMP, but no transit investments beyond bus replacements and other maintenance of service improvements were considered for the Cost Feasible Plan due to financial resource limitations.</p>
A-16	<p>Does the LRTP describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(9)</p>	<p>The RMP describes all cost feasible improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> and <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i>.</p>
A-17	<p>Does the LRTP include a discussion of the 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 LRTP?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(10)</p>	<p>The RMP includes a discussion of environmental mitigation activities in Appendix A. Environmental Mitigation.</p>
A-18	<p>Does the LRTP include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted LRTP can be implemented?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)</p>	<p>The RMP describes revenue projections and cost feasible improvements in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> and <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i>.</p>
A-19	<p>Does the LRTP include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation? 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(i)</p>	<p>The RMP describes system-level estimates of costs and revenue estimates to operate the transportation system in chapter 6. Financial Revenue Estimates, <i>Tables 6-2 through 6-10</i>.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-20	<p>Did the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support LRTP implementation, as required under 23 CFR 450.314(a)</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(ii)</p>	<p>The RMP describes State/Federal revenue estimates provided by FDOT and public transit revenues based on the StarMetro Transit Development Plan in chapter 6. Financial Revenue Estimates, Tables 6-2 through 6-10.</p>
A-21	<p>Does the financial plan include recommendations on additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the LRTP, and, in the case of new funding sources, identify strategies for ensuring their availability? 23 FR 450.324(f)(11)(iii)</p>	<p>The financial plan does not recommend new funding sources, but optimizes existing sources using a ROW Strategy in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan.</p>
A-22	<p>Does the LRTP'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 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv)</p>	<p>The RMP costs and revenue estimates are all presented in year of expenditure dollars based on inflation rates summarized in chapter 6. Financial Revenue Estimates, <i>Table 6-1. FDOT Inflation Factors</i>.</p>
A-23	<p>Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP)? 23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(vi)</p>	<p>Boxed funds categories included in the RMP Cost Feasible Plan include funding commitments to bike/ped and TSM&O improvements as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i>.</p>
A-24	<p>Does the LRTP include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 USC 217(g)? 23 CFR 450.324(f)(12)</p>	<p>Existing walkway and bicycle facilities are included in 2. State of the Region,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks: <i>Figure 2-7. Sidewalk Network</i> • Bicycle Facilities: <i>Figure 2-8. Bicycle Network</i> <p>Proposed future walkway and bicycle facilities are summarized in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i>.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-25	<p>Does the LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(h)</p>	<p>The RMP integrated goals and objectives described in State safety plans as well as other local and State plans, as described in 3. Goals and Objectives, Table 3-1. State, Local, and Federal Plans Reviewed.</p>
A-26	<p>Does the LRTP identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the LRTP? 23 CFR 450.324(g)(1)</p>	<p>The RMP assessed current and 2050 projected demand, using the Northwest Florida Regional Planning Model, as described in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current demand: 2. State of the System, Figure 2-16. Traffic Congestion. • Future demand: 5. Needs Assessment, Figure 5-4. Mobility/Congestion Focused Needs Assessment.
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 LRTP using the MPO’s adopted Public Participation Plan (PPP) developed under 23 CFR 450.316(a)? 23 CFR 450.324(j)</p>	<p>The CRTPA provided the public and stakeholders at large with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the RMP at various plan milestones, including the Goals and Objectives phase, Needs Assessment phase, and Cost Feasible Plan phase. The engagement process was based on a Public Involvement Plan developed for the project (included in Appendix A. Public Involvement Plan), which was developed to be consistent with the CRTPA Public Involvement Plan. The RMP public and stakeholder engagement process and results are described in detail in chapter 4. Public Involvement Summary. Inclusion of public input in shaping the plan is also described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-28	<p>Did the MPO publish or otherwise make readily available the LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.324(k), 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(iv)</p>	<p>The CRTPA published the draft Cost Feasible Plan for public review on the project website (https://connectcapitalregion.com) in advance of plan adoption.</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 LRTP?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(i)</p>	<p>The CRTPA provided adequate public notice of public participation at key decision points, including the Goals and Objectives, Needs Assessment, and Cost Feasible Plan phases of the planning process using social media, the web, and print advertisements as described in 4. Public Involvement Summary.</p>
A-30	<p>In developing the LRTP, 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vii)</p>	<p>The CRTPA sought out and considered the needs of traditionally underserved populations in multiple ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of underserved populations described in Appendix B. Transportation Disadvantaged Areas. • Public engagement at community events in Transportation Disadvantaged areas, described in 4. Public Involvement Summary, Community Events section. • Engagement of community stakeholders who represent transportation disadvantaged population, described in 4. Public Involvement Summary, Stakeholder Meetings section.

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-31	<p>Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the LRTP? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft LRTP, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final LRTP?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vi) & 23 CFR 450.316(a)(2)</p>	<p>The RMP public and stakeholder engagement process and results are described in detail in 4. Public Involvement Summary. Inclusion of public input in shaping the plan is also described in 7. Cost Feasible Plan.</p>
A-32	<p>Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final LRTP 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 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(viii)</p>	<p>The final RMP did not differ significantly from the version that was made available for public comment.</p>
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 in the development of the LRTP?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 CFR 450.316(b)</p>	<p>The CRTPA consulted with other planning agencies and officials through stakeholder meetings as described in 4. Public Involvement Summary, Stakeholder Meetings section and through CRTPA Technical Advisory Committee meetings as described in 4. Public Involvement Summary, Introduction section.</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 LRTP? 23 CFR 450.316(c)</p>	<p>N/A</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 LRTP? 23 CFR 450.316(d)</p>	<p>The CRTPA consulted with representatives of the U.S. Forest Service.</p>

Section A- Federal Requirements		Where and How Addressed
A-36	<p>In U.S. Census designated urban areas of more than 50,000 people 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 CFR 450.314(e)</p>	N/A
A-37	<p>Did the MPO consider projects and strategies that will promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local housing patterns (in addition to planned growth and economic development patterns) in the development of the LRTP?</p>	<p>The CRTPA considered consistency between transportation improvements and housing patterns through the inclusion of affordable housing locations and mixed use areas in the Needs Assessment process, as described in chapter 5. Needs Assessment, <i>Table 5-3 Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria</i>.</p>

Section B- State Requirements		Where and How Addressed
Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175		
B-1	<p>Are the prevailing principles in s. 334.046(1), FS– preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida’s economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the LRTP? s.339.175(1), (5), and (7), FS</p>	<p>Preservation, economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices were all assessed as part of the RMP Needs Assessment, through a data-driven analytical process, which is summarized in 5. Needs Assessment, Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria.</p>
B-2	<p>Does the LRTP give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities? s.339.175(1) and (7)(a), FS</p>	<p>The RMP is focused on the federal aid eligible highway network, with emphasis on SIS and intercounty regional facilities, as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan.</p>
B-3	<p>Is the LRTP 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? s.339.175(5) and (7), FS</p>	<p>The RMP is consistent with land use elements and comprehensive plan goals and objectives, as described in 3. Goals and Objectives, Table 3-1. State, Local, and Federal Plans Reviewed.</p>
B-4	<p>Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the development of the LRTP? s.339.175(1) and (7) FS</p>	<p>The CRTPA considered strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning through the inclusion of affordable housing locations and mixed use areas in the Needs Assessment process, as described in 5. Needs Assessment, Table 5-3 Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria.</p>
B-5	<p>Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered in the development of the LRTP? s.339.175(7)(a), FS</p>	<p>The RMP is consistent with the goals and objectives in the Florida Transportation Plan, as described in chapter 3. Goals and Objectives, Table 3-1. State, Local, and Federal Plans Reviewed.</p>
B-6	<p>Does the LRTP 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</p> <p>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), FS</p>	<p>The RMP assesses both capital investments and operational investments, as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan and operational investments to relieve congestion as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan, Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan.</p>

Section B- State Requirements		Where and How Addressed
B-7	Does the LRTP 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), FS	The RMP includes a boxed funds category in the Cost Feasible Plan bike/ped improvements, as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan , <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> .
B-8	Was the LRTP approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present? s.339.175(13) FS	The 2050 RMP was approved on a recorded roll call vote at the CRTPA Board's November 17, 2025 meeting.

Section C- Proactive Recommendations		Where and How Addressed
Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175		
C-1	Does the LRTP attempt to improve the resilience and reliability of the transportation system or mitigate the impacts of stormwater on surface transportation? 23 CFR 450.306(b)(9)	Resiliency and Reliability addressed in chapter 5. Needs Assessment , <i>Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria</i> .
C-2	Does the LRTP proactively identify climate adaptation strategies including—but not limited to—assessing specific areas of vulnerability, identifying strategies to reduce emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation, or devising specific climate adaptation policies to reduce vulnerability?	Resiliency addressed in 5. Needs Assessment , <i>Table 5-3. Needs Assessment Prioritization Criteria</i> . Non-motorized investments included in bike/ped boxed fund as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan , <i>Table 7-5. Non-Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> .
C-3	Does the LRTP consider the transportation system's accessibility, mobility, and availability to better serve an aging population?	The RMP considers the aging population, which is included in transportation disadvantaged population definition as described in Appendix B. Transportation Disadvantaged Areas .
C-4	Does the LRTP consider strategies to promote inter-regional connectivity to accommodate both current and future mobility needs?	The RMP is focused on the federal aid eligible highway network, with emphasis on SIS and intercounty regional facilities, as described in chapter 7. Cost Feasible Plan , <i>Table 7-3. Roadway Capacity Projects Funded in Cost Feasible Plan</i> .

Section C- Proactive Recommendations		Where and How Addressed
C-5	Did the MPO consider the short- and long-term effects of population growth and or shifts on the transportation network in the development of the LRTP?	<p>Current population, employment, and congestion were assessed and summarized in chapter 2. State of the Region,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Population: <i>Table 2-1. Population by County since 2013</i> • Current Employment: <i>Table 2-2. Employment by County since 2013</i> • Current Congestion: <i>Figure 2-16. Traffic Congestion</i> • Future Population & Employment: <i>Table 2-3. Expected Population and Employment in 2050 by County</i> • Future congestion was assessed and summarized in chapter 5. Needs Assessment, <i>Figure 5-4. Mobility/ Congestion Focused Needs Assessment.</i>