



# AGENDA TAC

Technical Advisory Committee  
Collier County Growth Management Department  
Conference Rooms 609/610  
2800 Horseshoe Drive North  
Naples, Florida 34104

**September 24, 2018**  
**9:30 am**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of the Agenda**
4. **Approval of August 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes**
5. **Open to Public for Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**
6. **Agency Updates**
  - A. FDOT
  - B. MPO Executive Director
7. **Committee Action**
  - A. Endorse Transit Impact Analysis Scope
  - B. Endorse Collier County Transit Asset Management Targets
  - C. Endorse Annual FDOT Safety Targets
  - D. Endorse Amendment to FY2019 – FY2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
8. **Reports and Presentations (May Require Committee Action)**
  - A. N/A
9. **Member Comments**
10. **Distribution Items**
  - A. TAC member comments on Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan
11. **Next Meeting Date**

*October 29, 2018 – 9:30 a.m.*  
*Growth Management Department –*  
*Conference Rooms 609/610*
12. **Adjournment**

**PLEASE NOTE:**

This meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is open to the public and citizen input is encouraged. Any person wishing to speak on any scheduled item may do so upon recognition of the Chairperson. Any person desiring to have an item placed on the agenda shall make a request in writing with a description and summary of the item, to the MPO Director 14 days prior to the meeting date. Any person who decides to appeal a decision of this Committee will need a record of the proceedings pertaining thereto, and therefore may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization 72 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 252-5814. The MPO's planning process is conducted in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Related Statutes. Any person or beneficiary who believes that within the MPO's planning process they have been discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, or familial status may file a complaint with the Collier MPO Executive Director and Title VI Specialist Ms. Anne McLaughlin (239) 252-5884 or by writing Ms. McLaughlin at 2885 South Horseshoe Dr., Naples, FL 34104.

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Collier County Growth Management Division  
Planning & Regulation, Rooms 609 & 610  
2800 North Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104  
9:30 A.M.**

**August 27, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Holland called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Mr. Ortman called the roll and confirmed that a quorum was present.

**TAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Holland, City of Naples Planning, Chair  
Michelle Arnold, Collier County PTNE, Vice-Chair  
Lorraine Lantz, Collier County Transportation Planning  
Ute Vandersluis, City of Naples Airport Authority  
Don Scott, Lee County MPO  
Daniel Smith, City of Marco Island Community Affairs  
Dan Hall, Collier County Traffic Operations  
Tim Pinter, City of Marco Island

**TAC MEMBERS ABSENT**

David Ogilvie, Collier County School Board - *Non-voting*  
Debbie Brueggeman, Collier County Airport Authority (Alternate)  
Gregg Strakaluse, City of Naples Streets and Stormwater

**MPO STAFF**

Anne McLaughlin, MPO Executive Director  
Eric Ortman, MPO Senior Planner  
Karen Intriago, MPO Administrative Assistant

**FDOT**

Victoria Peters, FDOT District 1 Liaison  
Sarah Catala, FDOT Growth Management Coordinator  
Bill Hartman, Project Development Manager  
Kellie Spurgeon, Project Development Manager  
Fidel Vargas, Project Development Manager

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Betty Osceola  
Frank Denninger

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

Mr. Holland entertained a motion for approval of the agenda.

**Mr. Hall:**                   **Move to approve.**

**Mr. Pinter:**               **Second.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4. Approval of May 21, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Holland entertained a motion to approve the May 21, 2018 meeting minutes.

**Ms. Arnold:**               **Move to approve.**

**Mr. Smith:**               **Second.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**5. Open to Public for Comments on Items Not on the Agenda**

Mr. Denninger expressed concerns over the process of how projects are conducted. The issue he's noticed is that some advocates focus on creating maps of what they desire in a certain area, and don't focus on conducting an in-depth search of the whole area. Mr. Denninger clarified that he's not against making non- motorized transportation more efficient but stated that he would like to see a facility that specializes on conducting a thorough search of every aspect of an area that's being considered. He also expressed concern regarding how bike laws instruct riders to move with the flow of traffic instead of against it. He remembers that as a kid he was taught to ride against traffic to be able to see what was coming his way. He stated that approaching traffic from the opposite direction minimized the amount of accidents.

**6. Agency Updates**

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters notified the committee that they have a new Project Management team in the Southwest Area office (SWAO) in Fort Myers. This team will be assisting with reviewing design projects for the southern six counties with District 1, including: Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Hendry, Glades, and Desoto. This will provide a local Department resource instead of needing to use Bartow. Ms. Peter also stated that she will be presenting the MPO Board with a summary of the SR 82 pathway project on September 14<sup>th</sup>. She stated that she will be giving them information including future cost to help guide them on decision making. She introduced the FDOT project team that attended the meeting. FDOT has also been putting together the next work program for FY24. They have been coordinating with the county and MPO staff on advancing projects and looking into the bridge project for 16<sup>th</sup> street.

B. MPO Executive Director

Ms. McLaughlin stated that April Olson from the Southwest Florida Conservancy is interested in becoming a member of the TAC. Her application will be taken to the Board on September 14 for approval. Ms. McLaughlin also stated that the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan is entering the procurement process for a Request for Professional Services. There will be a preliminary screening of the entities submitted, followed by a presentation from the entities. This will occur in the months of September and October.

**7. Committee Action**

**A. Endorse Roll Forward Amendment to FY2019 – FY2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Ortman stated that every March the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) provides the districts with the Tentative Work Program that is to be adopted on July 1. The MPO's TIP incorporates the Tentative Work Program and is also adopted by July 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Ortman stated that year one of the TIP and the Work Program should always match, However, when the new TIP and Work Program are adopted on July 1, there are often projects that were supposed to get authorized and encumbered prior to June 30 (i.e., when the previous TIP and Work Program were in effect), but did not. These projects will automatically roll forward in the Work Program but will not roll forward in the TIP. In order to have the first-year match, the TIP must be amended to include these projects. This is accomplished by the Roll Forward Amendment. The 21-day public comment period ended August 15<sup>th</sup> and no comments were received. The TIP will be effective on October 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Mr. Smith: Move to approve.**

**Ms. Lantz: Second.**

Ms. Lantz asked if FDOT consulted with CAT in order to include transit projects in the Roll Forward Amendment.

Ms. Peters stated that she has not coordinated with Michelle Arnold but would coordinate with her to ensure that no projects are left off the list. Mr. Pinter asked why projects are being shown prior to 2019 if this is the 2019-2023 TIP. He stated that his projects have been funded, paid for and closed. Ms. Peters explained that the projects are closing out but must be included because they fall in the gap between the state and federal fiscal year. Mr. Scott stated that there may be money left over that needs to be removed from the project.

Mr. Holland called the question.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**B. Endorse Supporting FDOT Bridge, Pavement and System Performance Targets**

Ms. McLaughlin recommended that the committee endorse supporting FDOT's Bridge, Pavement and System Performance Targets. She stated that the targets apply to the National Highway System (NHS) which FDOT oversees. The MPO is not responsible for the NHS, but is supportive of FDOT's endeavors when they approve the programming for the TIP. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the deadline for this item to be brought to the Board is mid-November.

Ms. Lantz asked if there will be a follow up in terms of performance target requirements for local county roads. Ms. McLaughlin stated that it did not affect county roads.

**Mr. Pinter: Move to approve.**

**Mr. Hall: Second.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**8. Reports and Presenttions (May Require Committee Action)**

**A. FDOT – Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) FY 2029 – 2045 Long Range Coast Feasible Plan**

Ms. Catala presented a Power Point “*Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) FY 2029 – 2045 Long Range Coast Feasible Plan*” (available on the MPO’s website) Main points of the presentation included:

- Developing a long-range cost feasible plan for capacity improvements to the SIS beyond the 10-year SIS Plan in accordance with statutory direction.
- Ensure that the SIS Cost Feasible plan is consistent with FDOT revenue forecasts.
- Provide guidance to the MPOs for SIS capacity improvements that are used in the development of their own Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP).
- Ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) and the SIS Policy Plan.
- CFP is distributed to MPOs for their use in LRTP development.
- CFP is used to feed projects into the 2nd 5-Years SIS Plan and the Department’s Five-Year Work Program.
- Updated every 3-5 years.
- Revenues for the state are anticipated to be approximately \$30 billion for SIS projects and investments.
- District 1 is expected to receive approximately \$800 million in Project Development and environmental (PD&E) and design funding and \$4.2 billion in construction funding.

#### **B. FDOT – SR 29 from I-75 to Oil Well Rd**

Mr. Hartman presented a Power Point “*SR 29 from I-75 to Oil Well Rd*” (available on the MPO’s website) Main points of the presentation included:

- Currently in the Project Development & Environment (PD&E) phase which includes the preparation of all preliminary engineering and environmental documentation.
- Project is included in the Collier MPO 2040 Transportation Long Range Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- SR 29 is one of 4 designated Freight Mobility Corridors in Collier County.
- Improving SR 29 from I-75 to Oil Well Road is the final piece of a unified regional approach that addresses the critical freight needs along all of SR 29.
- 2017 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is 3,700; anticipated No-Build 2045 AADT is 8,500; anticipated build 2045 is 11,400
- 4-lane widening is necessary to meet demand and improve safety.
- Provides opportunities for greater wildlife protection.

Ms. McLaughlin encouraged the FDOT to meet with the Miccosukee Tribal Council to obtain their input on the study.

Ms. Arnold asked if the study would include a bike path. Mr. Hartman stated that at the current moment no decision has been made, but that it would be evaluated during future studies.

Ms. Arnold also stated that Transit currently has routes on portions of SR 29 and would like FDOT to coordinate with Collier Area Transit regarding some issues they currently have.

#### **C. FDOT – SR 82 from Hendry County Line to Gator Slough Lane**

Ms. Spurgeon presented a Power Point “*SR 82 from Hendry County Line to Gator Slough Lane*” (available on the MPO’s website) Main points of the presentation included:

- Widening from two lanes to four lanes
- Bridge replacements with wildlife crossings; under the canal and at Gator Slough
- 10-foot Multi-use path, south side
- 5-foot concrete sidewalk, north side

- Currently in design, right-of-way programmed in FY2019 and construction is in FY2023
- Estimated cost - \$36 million

#### **D. FDOT – SR 29 from SR 82 to Hendry County Line**

Mr. Vargas presented a Power Point “*SR 29 from SR 82 to Hendry County Line*” (available on the MPO’s website) Main points of the presentation included:

- Existing roadway is centered within 200’ Right of Way (R/W)
- Total length is 1.87 miles
- 41’ to 71’ of additional R/W is needed
- New travel lanes will be constructed for Southbound direction; Existing travel lanes will remain for Northbound direction
- Total project cost is \$13,941,000
- Project will be let in July 2022

#### **E. Discuss Draft Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan**

Mr. Ortman stated that the material in the first five chapters has been presented to the committee in other formats and items have been discussed previously but that this is the first time that the committee has seen the actual document. Mr. Ortman stated that the draft was developed based on safety, Environmental Justice, public and committee comments, and socio-economic and bicycle and pedestrian crash data.

Mr. Blain presented a Power Point to the committee which is available on the MPO website. Mr. Blain stated that the goal is to have the plan endorsed at the October 12<sup>th</sup> Board meeting but that there is room for fluidity. Main points of the presentation included:

- Needs based plan will focus on safety, connectivity and equity or environmental justice (EJ)
- Bicycle and pedestrian crashes occur primarily on arterials and collectors
- EJ areas were identified at the Census Block Group level and by the number of EJ factors met
- Block groups with EJ criteria greater than 10 percent above the County average were listed as EJ
- Plan will make recommendation to improve the process of coordination with the county to include bike and pedestrian facilities in resurfacing projects where possible.
- Plan seeks to identify potential additional funding sources and opportunities without prescribing how dollars should be spent outside of treating safety and environmental justice as the highest priorities.
- Education is an important safety tool for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists.
- Needs were grouped into: high crash areas, gaps on arterials and collectors; local road priorities; and greenway opportunities
- Will develop a summary document Plan could be used in place of a call for projects while still allowing jurisdictions flexibility in adding other projects.
- Allocating funds for recommendations from Road Safety Audits
- Census data will be evaluated for accuracy

Mr. Holland asked how the plan will identify a specific list of local road projects. Mr. Blain stated that schools and transit stops will be identified by GIS and local roads within one mile will be identified as tier one.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that the bike lanes on US 41 between San Marco Road and SR 29, and on SR 29 from Everglades City to Immokalee will be removed from all maps in the plan. This removal is a result of consultation with the Miccosukee Tribe last year when the Board was discussing the River of Grass Greenway. Their identification as needs in this draft was in error because it contradicts the Board resolution and the Board’s Government to Government communications policy in that the Tribe has not been consulted.

Mr. Denninger stated that he was having trouble understanding exactly what Environmental Justice was and asked why areas where no people lived were showing up as Environmental Justice areas. He expressed concern over how the EJ section was worded. Mr. Denninger asked why people over 65 were being considered as a causative factor in crashes.

Ms. Osceola stated that she too had concerns regarding areas on the map that were identified as Environmental Justice as well as the definition of Environmental Justice. Ms. Osceola also questioned the reasoning why areas on the map such as SR 29 north of Everglades were identified as a sidewalk need when these are mostly rural areas. Ms. Osceola stated that just because something is feasible does not mean it needs to be done.

Mr. Blain stated that Environmental Justice was being used as a screening tool and not as a decision tool. The reason why some areas are showing up as EJ even when there are few people living there is that the data was gathered at the block group level; the Census covers the entire area and does not exclude places where there may be no one living. Mr. Blain stated that all comments and concerns will be evaluated and addressed.

Other comments made include:

- Better explanation of EJ including why the data is producing anomalies
- Having maps at the ends of chapters is confusing; including them where are being discussed would be better
- Road (re)construction should incorporate bike/ped infrastructure into the design even it is not going to be built now. This would significantly lower the cost of retrofitting.
- Description of the level of coordination with County Parks and Rec
- Explanation of where all the data came from
- What is an “aging driver” and why are they considered to be a causative factor in crashes
- Maps and charts need to be clearer
- Explanation of why a sidewalk is listed as a need where there is no development

#### **F. Discuss Scope of Work for Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)**

Mr. Ortman stated that, in 2013, Collier County Traffic Operations submitted an application for a county-wide Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The proposal was ranked 9<sup>th</sup> on the congestion management priority list which was approved by the MPO Board in June 2011. The SHSP is funded in the current FY2019/2023 TIP for \$200,000. Mr. Ortman stated that the scope is modeled after FDOT’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The Scope would guide the MPO and its transportation partners in identifying implementation efforts that support FDOT’s Vision Zero. Mr. Ortman also stated that depending on how in-depth the analysis is, the budget could be adjusted. Mr. Ortman stated that other MPOs with similar SHSPs spent between \$70,000 and \$100,000.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that there is an opportunity with the current programmed funding to go more in-depth than other MPOs have done. It may also increase the MPO’s opportunities for funding implementation components such as road safety audits. Ms. McLaughlin asked the committee for their comments and if there were any specific details they would like included in the scope. Ms. Arnold stated that transit has data related to proximity of bike/ped facilities to transit facilities that they would be able to provide to the MPO to add to the study. Ms. Lantz suggested looking for patterns of contributing including road and weather conditions.

#### **9. Member Comments**

Ms. Lantz provided an update on the Vanderbilt Beach Road Extension and stated that the ultimate plan is for it to be a 6-lane facility with on street bike lanes, a sidewalk and a shared use path.

#### **10. Distribution Items**

None.

#### **11. Next Meeting Date**

September 24, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further comments Mr. Holland adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.



**COMMITTEE ACTION**  
**ITEM 7A**

**Endorse Collier Area Transit (CAT) & Collier Area Paratransit (CAP) Transit Impact Analysis & Funding Strategies Scope of Work**

---

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to review and endorse the scope of work for the CAT and CAP Transit Impact Analysis and Funding Strategies study.

**CONSIDERATIONS:** The Public Transit & Neighborhood Enhancement Division (PTNE) is responsible for the management of the Collier Area Transit (CAT) System. CAT provides Fixed Route and Paratransit services. The Fixed Route system provides public transit service to the urbanized areas of the County, including Naples, Marco Island and Immokalee. Limited Fixed Route service is also provided in the Golden Gate Estates area. CAT also partners with Lee County Transit (LeeTran) to provide an express route between the two counties. The Collier Area Paratransit (CAP) system provides passenger door to door trips funded by two different programs; Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Through the years the service to the community has grown in response to the development that has occurred in the area. The transit system has been responding to development rather than being a part of the planning process so that the service can be provided as an alternative mode when then development is completed. For Transit to be included as part of the development process it is necessary to understand the demand placed on the community's transit network by development when assessing the effects of development.

This study is intended to assess the effects that a development's traffic will have on the transit network in the community and provide criteria for determining the capital or operating improvements required to the transit system in the form of stop improvements, route modifications or additions based on the defined impacts. By preparing this study the transit system will be provided the nexus required to include measurable Goals, Objectives and policies in the Growth Management Plan and applicable land development codes to support the need to conduct a Transit Impact Analysis prior to approving future developments inclusive of the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Collier County. The study will help answer the questions of the implications of land use decisions on the transit system.

Funding is identified in the FY 2018/19-2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for this study. The deadline identified in the UPWP for the final endorsement and approval of the study is June 30, 2019.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee endorse the scope of work for the CAT and CAP Transit Impact Analysis and Funding Strategies study.

Attachments:

1. Draft CAT and CAP Transit Impact Analysis and Funding Strategies Scope of Work

Prepared By: Brandy Otero, MPO Senior Planner

# Collier Area Transit & Collier Area Paratransit Transit Impact Analysis & Funding Strategies Scope of Work

---

## Background

The Public Transit & Neighborhood Enhancement Division (PTNE) is responsible for the management of the Collier Area Transit (CAT) System. CAT provides Fixed Route and Paratransit transportation services to the residents of Collier County. The Fixed Route system provides public transit service to the urbanized areas of the County, including Naples, Marco Island and Immokalee. Limited Fixed Route service is also provided in the Golden Gate Estates area. CAT also partners with Lee County Transit (LeeTran) to provide an express route between the two counties. The Collier Area Paratransit (CAP) system provides passenger door to door trips funded by two different programs; Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Through the years the service to the community has grown in response to the development that has occurred in the area. The transit system has been responding to development rather than being a part of the planning process so that the service can be provided as an alternative mode when then development is completed. For Transit to be included as part of the development process it is necessary to understand the demand placed on the community's transit network by development when assessing the effects of development.

All development generates traffic, and some may generate enough traffic to create congestion on the existing roadways system requiring the community to invest more capital in the form of new roads, added lanes, traffic signals or turn lanes. Currently as new development or redevelopment is proposed, there are traffic impact studies that are required of the petitioner to analyze the impacts on the roadway network but not the transit system as a component of the overall transportation network. Understanding traffic impacts becomes even more important as budgets for public facility and infrastructure improvements become increasingly strained. It is important to ensure that the evaluation of the traffic impacts includes a multi-modal aspect to help expand the capacity of the existing roadway system.

In a community like Collier County, there are considerable numbers of elderly and young residents that do not have access to a vehicle and may be willing to use public transportation. The community has a very seasonal population that are used to public transportation as an option in the communities that they are visiting from or would like the option of a transit system to take them to destinations they are not familiar with. The Collier County, Cities of Marco Island, Naples & Everglades Growth Management Plans and land development regulations do not contemplate transit impacts during the typical transportation impact statement review. Without this alternative mode being considered as an option during the development process, the transit agency is faced with finding a way to accommodate the demand after the fact and without the necessary resources.

The PTNE Division would like to have a study which assesses the effects that a development's traffic will have on the transit network in the community and provide criteria for determining the capital or operating improvements required to the transit system in the form of stop improvements, route modifications or

additions based on the defined impacts. By preparing this study the transit system will be provided the nexus required to include measurable Goals, Objectives and policies in the Growth Management Plan and applicable land development codes to support the need to conduct a Transit Impact Analysis prior to approving future developments inclusive of the incorporated and unincorporated areas of Collier County. The study will help answer the questions of the implications of land use decisions on the transit system.

The responsibility to upgrade transit network and associated amenities in conjunction with new development is currently the sole responsibility of the Transit agency. Yet Transit agencies often lack funding for improvements necessary to keep pace with development.

This study should provide information and analysis that can be used to develop funding strategies for the benefit of enhancing transit to meet the development demands. These funding strategies may include the development of parameters that can be applied to developments based on the land use being developed (residential units; commercial use; # of jobs generated; etc.) to determine the improvement that would be needed to support the impact (bus route; bus stop/shelter; park-n-ride lot; etc.). The funding strategies could also include the establishment of funding sources that could support improving the “backlog” of operational improvements and infrastructure as well as new improvements/infrastructure. The research for the development of funding strategies should include an evaluation of what other Counties/Transit Agencies are doing within this realm.

## **SCOPE OF SERVICES**

The following tasks are requested as part of this scope and will correspond with the project schedule and budget:

1. ***A kick-off meeting will be held via conference call.*** The kick-off meeting will confirm project objectives, schedule, and deliverables. The meeting will also provide an opportunity to introduce staff and identify roles and responsibilities for this project.
2. ***Data Collection and analysis.*** Data shall be collected of the transit service (system coverage, hours of operations; headways; etc.) and cost; existing development and associated transit uses; analysis of enhanced transit service and anticipate cost increase; anticipated components of capital cost increase based on added service (buses/bus stops/shelters, transfer stations, park-n-ride facilities, fleet maintenance etc.); and any other data and analysis needed to develop transit planning parameters to be utilized during the development review to identify the impact on transit. The data collected should also be usable to develop a nexus for the potential establishment funding strategies for transit. If a fee structure is contemplated the nexus could be structured in a way that for the desired development pattern being proposed, the amount of Transportation impact fee would be lower and/or transferred to promote transit development rather than adding another fee. Conversely, if the proposed development is low density urban sprawl or in a rural area where it would be more expensive to provide transit service, the fee would be higher.

The Consultant should develop a standard where trip generation rates and trip reduction factors include calculations whereby if Transit is introduced along a corridor adjacent to the proposed development what impacts that would have on their traffic impact statement and what contributions to the service the development would be required to make; and determine how to obtain funding

from existing developments that already impact transit and as a result, require implementation of enhanced service to improve the service delivery to that area.

3. ***Prepare draft findings and analysis.*** A draft report of the findings, analysis and recommendation for the Transit parameters, impact assessment and mobility nexus should be prepared and presented to staff for their review and comments. The document shall be modified to incorporate staff comments and input where applicable.
4. ***Conduct two public involvement workshops and two charrette type sessions.*** Workshop notices will be prepared along with e-mail communications for CAT and the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to distribute and advertise as appropriate. The consultant will prepare information for dissemination and present the proposed Transit impact analysis and funding strategies to the public. The Consultant will work with CAT to ensure that workshop materials are multi-lingual and persons at the workshop have access to multi-lingual staff for information dissemination and questions in accordance with the Collier MPO Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan.

Two Charrette style sessions shall be conducted with invitations to developers; major employers; and others that might be impacted by new regulations to incorporate transit in the development process in an effort to receive their feedback. The input received from these sessions should be considered and incorporated into the report.

5. ***Prepare documentation and present to committees/boards.*** A final draft report will be prepared to include all analysis; public, developer and employers' comments; and a recommendation for how Transit should be included in the development review process, including the implementation of any funding strategies proposed. Staff will be allotted a minimum of two weeks to review the final draft and provide comments back to the Consultant for incorporation into a final report. Presentations will be given based on direction from CAT. It is anticipated that these presentations will be given to the Development Services Advisory Committee, the Public Transit Advisory Committee (PTAC), the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Collier MPO Board, and the Collier County Board of County Commission.

Any other tasks respondents to this scope of services believe are necessary to produce the best quality report and analysis should be included in the proposal. This scope of work will be completed within 6 months and a schedule identifying individual tasks is to be provided.

**COMMITTEE ACTION**  
**ITEM 7B**

**Endorse Transit Asset Management Performance Targets**

---

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to endorse the Transit Asset Management Performance Targets established by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners

**CONSIDERATIONS:** On July 26, 2016, FTA published the final Transit Asset Management rule. This rule applies to all recipients and subrecipients of Federal transit funding that own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets. The rule defines the term “state of good repair,” requires that public transportation providers develop and implement transit asset management (TAM) plans and establishes state of good repair standards and performance measures for four asset categories: transit equipment, rolling stock, transit infrastructure, and facilities. The rule becomes effective on October 1, 2018.

Public transportation providers set and report TAM targets annually. They are required to provide their asset conditions and TAM targets to each MPO in which the transit provider’s projects and services are programmed in the MPO’s TIP. Subsequent MPO targets must be set when updating the LRTP. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider’s targets or set their own separate regional targets for the MPO’s planning area. Regional TAM targets may differ from agency TAM targets, especially if there are multiple transit agencies in the MPO’s planning area, or in the event that one or more transit agencies have not provided TAM targets to the MPO.

Collier County’s Public Transportation and Neighborhood Enhancement (PTNE) Division has prepared a Draft Transit Asset Management Plan which includes Performance Targets and Measures. The earliest the BCC will review the draft is in October 2018. The draft targets are as follow.

<b>Asset Class</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Draft 2019 Target</b>
<b>Rolling Stock</b> <i>All revenue vehicles</i>	<b>Age</b> - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	10%
<b>Equipment</b> <i>Non-revenue vehicles</i>	<b>Age</b> - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their useful Life Benchmark (ULB)	10%
<b>Facilities</b> <i>All buildings or structures</i>	<b>Condition</b> - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	25%

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee endorse the Transit Asset Management Performance Targets established by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director

**COMMITTEE ACTION**  
**ITEM 7C**

**Endorse FDOT Safety Performance Targets for 2019**

---

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to endorse FDOT's Safety Performance Targets for 2019

**CONSIDERATIONS:** FDOT's Safety Performance Targets for calendar year 2019 remain the same as last year. The MPO's have 180 days, or until February 27<sup>th</sup>, to choose whether to support the Department's statewide targets or set their own quantifiable targets.

Last year the MPO Board voted to support FDOT's targets, which remain the same for 2019.

<b><u>Performance Measures</u></b>	<b><u>Targets</u></b>
1. Number of Fatalities	0
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	0
3. Number of Serious Injuries	0
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	0
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	0

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee endorse FDOT's Safety Performance Targets for 2019.

**Attachment 1:** FDOT Safety Performance Targets for 2019

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director

## 2018 Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program

**34. Safety Performance Targets****Calendar Year 2019 Targets \***

**Number of Fatalities** 0.0

**Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.**

Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for total fatalities on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 2,797 and 3,117 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for fatalities is zero in 2019. While the data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for fatalities could continue to trend upward in 2018 and 2019, the FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will mitigate the data forecast and ultimately reduce the number of traffic fatalities. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for fatalities is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 3,117 in order to satisfy the federal requirement.

**Number of Serious Injuries** 0.0

**Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.**

Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for total serious injuries on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 19,340 and 21,107 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for serious injuries is zero in 2019. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for serious injuries could continue to trend downward in 2018 and 2019. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance the downward trend in the number of serious injuries on Florida's roads. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for serious injuries is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 21,107 in order to satisfy the federal requirement.

**Fatality Rate** 0.000

**Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.**

Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for fatality rate per 100 million Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 1.08 and 1.63 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current

## 2018 Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program

state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for fatality rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2019. While the data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for fatality rate per 100 million VMT could continue to trend upward in 2018 and 2019, the FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will mitigate the data forecast and ultimately reduce the fatality rate per 100 million VMT. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for fatality rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 1.63 in order to satisfy the federal requirement. Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for total serious injuries on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 19,340 and 21,107 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for serious injuries is zero in 2019. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for serious injuries could continue to trend downward in 2018 and 2019. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance the downward trend in the number of serious injuries on Florida's roads. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for serious injuries is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 21,107 in order to satisfy the federal requirement.

**Serious Injury Rate** 0.000

### **Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.**

Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for total serious injury rate per 100 million VMT on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 7.789 and 10.846 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2019. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT could continue to trend downward in 2018 and 2019. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance the downward trend in the serious injury rate per 100 million VMT on Florida's roads. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 10.846 in order to satisfy the federal requirement.

**Total Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries** 0.0

### **Describe the basis for established target, including how it supports SHSP goals.**

Based on statistical forecasting, the five year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries on Florida's roads is forecast to be between 3,117 and 3,801 in 2019. This forecast was made by combining FARS data with current state data from 2009 to 2017 to predict probable outcomes for 2018 and 2019. Florida's target for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries is zero in 2019. The data forecast indicates Florida's five year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and



## 2018 Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program

serious injuries could continue to tend downward in 2018 and 2019. The FDOT State Safety Office expects the projects chosen for funding will enhance this downward trend in non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. An interim performance measure is required by our federal funding agencies in order to receive federal funding. We firmly believe that every life counts and although our target for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries is zero in 2019, Florida has forecast an interim performance measure of 3,801 in order to satisfy the federal requirement.

### **Enter additional comments here to clarify your response for this question or add supporting information.**

Florida shares the national traffic safety vision, "Toward Zero Deaths," and formally adopted our own version of the national vision, "Driving Down Fatalities," in 2012. FDOT and its traffic safety partners are committed to eliminating fatalities and reducing serious injuries with the understanding that the death of any person is unacceptable and based on that, zero deaths is our safety performance target. This target is consistent throughout our Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Highway Safety Improvement Program and Highway Safety Plan.

Florida's data forecasts have been established using an ARIMA Hybrid Regression Model (0, 1, 1)(2, 0, 0)(12) with VMT. Nine independent variables were tested to assess correlations; only Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) and gas consumption have relatively high correlations with fatalities and serious injuries and of these two variables only VMT was useful in predicting future fatalities and serious injuries. The first three performance measures (number of fatalities, number of serious injuries, and fatality rate per 100M VMT) have been forecasted based on a five year rolling average and the remaining performance measures will be forecasted annually. The forecasts for 2017 and 2018 are based on monthly data from 2005 through 2016 using statistical forecasting methodologies.

Forecasts for serious injury rate per 100 million VMT and non-motorist fatal and serious injuries have been established using the AAA version of the Exponential Smoothing (ETS) algorithm.

[Source: FDOT Highway Safety Plan, 2018]

**COMMITTEE ACTION**  
**ITEM 7D**

**Endorse Amendment to FY 2019-FY 2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

---

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to endorse the amendment to the FY 2019-FY 2023 TIP

**CONSIDERATIONS:** The following revisions to the FY2019 – FY 2023 TIP were requested by the Florida Department of Transportation:

1. Amendment related to two Lake Trafford Rd. bike/ped projects, FPN 4418451 and 4418452. This amendment will delete these two projects and replace them with the following two projects:
  - a. 4433751 Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes (PE, \$92,000)
  - b. 4433752 Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes (PE, 83,000)
2. Amendment to SR 951 – From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd, FPN 4351112. This amendment will add an additional phase (ROW) and funding (\$4,387,800 DS and DIH).
3. Amendment to SR 29 from Oil Well Road to Sunniland Nursery Road. This amendment will add additional funding to FY2024 and is required to show planning consistency. A new phase (PE) and funding (\$250,000) to FY 2024 was recently added to this project. This phase and funding are not currently shown in the FY2019 – FY2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to achieve planning consistency for the SR 29 Immokalee PD&E Study which is being sought by the Department this year as well as the subsequent authorization of federal funds.
4. Administrative Modification to two sidewalk projects on Marco Island to change the funding code from SA to LF.
  - a. 4418781 Bald Eagle Drive from Collier Blvd to Old Marco Ln (\$36,000)
  - b. 4418791 Inlet Drive from Addison Ct to Travida Terrace (\$31,000)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee endorse the amendment to the FY 20019-FY 2023 TIP

**Attachments:**

1. Amendment Sheets to the FY20019-FY2023 TIP
2. FDOT letters requesting amendment.

Prepared By: Eric Ortman, MPO Senior Planner

**TIP Amendment for Approval by MPO Board on September 14, 2018  
for FY 2019 through FY 2023**

FPN	Action	Project Name	Requested By	Fund	Phase	FY	Amount
4418451	Delete Project	Lake Trafford Road from Little League Road to Laurel Street	FDOT	SA	PE	2019	(\$92,245)
4418452	Delete Project	Lake Trafford Rd from Carson Rd. to Laurel St..	FDOT	SA	PE	2019	(\$71,209)
4433751	Add Project	Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes	FDOT	EM19	PE	2019	\$92,000
4433752	Add Project	Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes	FDOT	EM19	PE	2019	\$83,000
4351112	Additional Phase and Funding	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	FDOT	DS	ROW(48)	2019	\$114,330
4351112	Additional Phase and Funding	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	FDOT	DS	ROW (43)	2019	\$423,639
4351112	Additional Phase and Funding	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	FDOT	DS	ROW (43)	2020	\$3,812,751
4351112	Additional Phase and Funding	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	FDOT	DIH	ROW (41)	2019	\$37,080
4175402*	Additional Funding to Show Planning Consistency	SR 29 from Oil Well Road to Sunniland Nursery Road	FDOT	ACNP	PE (31)	2024	\$250,000

\*Project FPN 4175402 recently added a new phase and funding to FY 2024 for Collier County. This phase and funding are not currently shown in the FY2019 – FY2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to achieve planning consistency for the SR 29 Immokalee PD&E Study which is being sought by the Department this year as well as the subsequent authorization of federal funds.

(Amendment Continued on Next Page)

**TIP Amendment for Approval by MPO Board on September 14, 2018  
for FY 2019 through FY 2023**

FPN	Total Project Cost	Responsible Agency	TIP Reference Page	L RTP Reference Page
4418451	(\$92,245)	Collier County	90	CFP p6-25, Appendices A & D
4418452	(\$71,209)	Collier County	91	CFP p6-25, Appendices A & D
4433751	\$92,000	Collier County	90	CFP p6-25, Appendices A & D
4433752	\$83,000	Collier County	91	CFP p6-25, Appendices A & D
4351112	Information to Follow from FDOT			
4351112	Information to Follow from FDOT			
4351112	Information to Follow from FDOT			
4351112	Information to Follow from FDOT			
4175402	Information to Follow from FDOT			

COLLIER METROPOLITAN  
PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Attest By: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Anne McLaughlin  
Collier MPO Executive Director

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Agency  
Collier MPO Chair William L. McDaniel, Jr.

**TIP Administrative Modification for MPO Executive Director Approval  
for FY 2019 through FY 2023 TIP**

<u>Action</u>	<u>FPN</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Description &amp; Limits</u>	<u>Requested By</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Phase</u>	<u>FY</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Change Fund Code from SA to LF	4418791	Inlet Drive from Addison Ct to Travida Terrace		Marco Island	PE	LF	2019	\$31,000
Change Fund Code from SA to LF	4418781	Bald Eagle Drive from Collier Blvd to Old Marco Ln		Marco Island	PE	LF	2019	\$36,000

Total Cost of Projects: \$77,000

Responsible Agency: Marco Island

TIP Reference Pages: 93 and 94

L RTP Reference Page: CFP p6-25, Appendices A & D

COLLIER METROPOLITAN  
PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Approved By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Anne McLaughlin, MPO Executive Director

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

MIKE DEW  
SECRETARY

September 13, 2018

Ms. Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director  
Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization  
2885 S. Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104

**RE: Request for Amendment to the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through Fiscal Years 2022/2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Dear Ms. McLaughlin:

The letter is a formal request for the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to approve the following amendment to the FY2018/19 – FY2022/23 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) at the October 12, 2018 Collier MPO Board Meeting.

These two projects were recently deleted from the FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program for Collier County. These projects are currently shown in the first year of the FY 2018/2019 to FY 2022/2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to remove these projects from the MPO's TIP to ensure planning consistency and transparency.

FPN Number	Federal Project Description	Phase Group	Amount	Funding Type	Fiscal Year	Comments
441845-1	Lake Trafford Road from Little League Road to Laurel Street	PE	\$92,245	SA	2019	Deleted from FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program
441845-2	Lake Trafford Road from Carson Road to Laurel Street	PE	\$71,209	SA	2019	Deleted from FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program

Ms. Anne McLaughlin  
September 13, 2017  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (239) 225-1974.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Victoria Peters". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Victoria Peters  
Community Liaison

VGP:vgp

cc: Danielle Blackshear, Federal Highway Administration  
Mark Reichert, Florida Department of Transportation  
Melissa Slater, Florida Department of Transportation  
Nicole Mills, Florida Department of Transportation  
Wayne Gaither, Florida Department of Transportation



*Florida Department of Transportation*

**RICK SCOTT**  
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**MIKE DEW**  
SECRETARY

September 13, 2018

Ms. Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director  
Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization  
2885 S. Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104

**RE: Request for Amendment to the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through Fiscal Years 2022/2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Dear Ms. McLaughlin:

The letter is a formal request for the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to approve the following amendment to the FY2018/19 – FY2022/23 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) at the October 12, 2018 Collier MPO Board Meeting.

These two projects were recently added to the FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program for Collier County. These projects are not currently shown in the first year of the FY 2018/2019 to FY 2022/2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to add these projects into the MPO's TIP to ensure planning consistency and transparency.

FPN Number	Federal Project Description	Phase Group	Amount	Funding Type	Fiscal Year	Comments
443375-1	Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes	PE	\$92,000	EM19	2019	Addition to FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program
443375-2	Collier County Lake Trafford Road Sidewalk and Bike Lanes	PE	\$83,000	EM19	2019	Addition to FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program



Ms. Anne McLaughlin  
September 13, 2017  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (239) 225-1974.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Victoria Peters", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Victoria Peters  
Community Liaison

VGP:vgp

cc: Danielle Blackshear, Federal Highway Administration  
Mark Reichert, Florida Department of Transportation  
Melissa Slater, Florida Department of Transportation  
Nicole Mills, Florida Department of Transportation  
Wayne Gaither, Florida Department of Transportation



**Florida Department of Transportation**

**RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR**

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**MIKE DEW  
SECRETARY**

September 13, 2018

Ms. Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director  
Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization  
2885 S. Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104

**RE: Request for Amendment to the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through Fiscal Years 2022/2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Dear Ms. McLaughlin:

The letter is a formal request for the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to approve the following amendment to the FY2018/19 – FY2022/23 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) at the October 12, 2018 Collier MPO Board Meeting.

This project recently added a new phase and funding to the first and second year to the FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program for Collier County. This phase and funding are not currently shown in the FY 2018/2019 to FY 2022/2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to ensure authorization of federal funds and planning consistency.

FPN Number	Federal Project Description	Phase Group	Amount	Funding Type	Fiscal Year	Comments
435111-2	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	ROW (4B)	\$114,330	DS	2019	Additional phase and funding added to FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program
		ROW (43)	\$423,639			
		ROW (43)	\$3,812,751	DS	2020	
435111-2	SR 951 - From Manatee Rd to N of Tower Rd	ROW (41)	\$ 37,080	DIH	2019	Additional phase and funding added to FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 Five Year Work Program

Ms. Anne McLaughlin  
September 13, 2017  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (239) 225-1974.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Victoria Peters", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Victoria Peters  
Community Liaison

VGP:vgp

cc: Danielle Blackshear, Federal Highway Administration  
Mark Reichert, Florida Department of Transportation  
Melissa Slater, Florida Department of Transportation  
Nicole Mills, Florida Department of Transportation  
Wayne Gaither, Florida Department of Transportation



**Florida Department of Transportation**

**RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR**

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

**MIKE DEW  
SECRETARY**

September 13, 2018

Ms. Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director  
Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization  
2885 S. Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104

**RE: Request for Amendment to the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization’s  
Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through Fiscal Years 2022/2023 Transportation  
Improvement Program (TIP)**

Dear Ms. McLaughlin:

The letter is a formal request for the Collier Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to approve the following amendment to the FY2018/19 – FY2022/23 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) at the October 12, 2018 Collier MPO Board Meeting.

This project recently added a new phase and funding to FY 2024 for Collier County. This phase and funding are not currently shown in the FY 2018/2019 to FY 2022/2023 TIP and an amendment is necessary to achieve planning consistency for the SR 29 Immokalee PD&E Studies which is being sought by the Department this year as well as the subsequent authorization of federal funds.

This “project” is one segment in a series of SR 29 segments being studied in the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) phase. If the entire corridor project is to move forward, this segment must illustrate that it is funded for design in the FY 2018/2019 to FY 2022/2023 TIP/STIP before the Environmental Document can be approved.

FPN Number	Federal Project Description	Phase Group	Amount	Funding Type	Fiscal Year	Comments
417540-2	SR 29 from Oil Well Road to Sunniland Nursery Road	PE (31)	\$250,000	ACNP	2024	To show planning consistency

Ms. Anne McLaughlin  
September 13, 2017  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (239) 225-1974.

Sincerely,



Victoria Peters  
Community Liaison

VGP:vgp

cc: Danielle Blackshear, Federal Highway Administration  
Mark Reichert, Florida Department of Transportation  
Melissa Slater, Florida Department of Transportation  
Nicole Mills, Florida Department of Transportation  
Wayne Gaither, Florida Department of Transportation

**COMMITTEE DISTRIBUTION**  
**ITEM 10A**

**TAC Member Comments on Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan**

---

**OBJECTIVE:** For the Committee to receive a copy of TAC member comments on the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

**CONSIDERATIONS:** At the TAC meeting held on August 27, 2018, committee members made the following comments on the draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan:

- Error in sidewalk cost, should be 200K not .02
- Explanation of how the local roads list was prioritized
- Describe level of coordination with County Parks and Rec
- Greater explanation of what EJ is
- Discussion on anomalies in EJ data as a result of being gathered at block group level
- Maps and charts need to be clearer, maps should be larger
- Having maps at ends of chapters is confusing, would be better if placed with matching text
- Explain what “aging driver” means when listed as contributing factor in crashes
- Explain rationale of listing a sidewalk as a need where there is no development
- Explanation of how data was acquired
- Just because something is feasible does not mean it is also a need
- Suggestion to make some clarifications to the EJ data/maps
- Road (re)construction should plan ahead to incorporate bike/ped infrastructure into the design even if it is not going to be built now lower the cost of retrofitting later

Collier County Transportation Planning subsequently submitted the comments shown in **Attachment 1**. Addressing all of the comments received will require additional research, analysis, and reporting. The MPO will bring a revised draft plan back to advisory committees for review later this fall.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** That the Committee receive a copy of TAC member comments on the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Attachment 1:** Collier County Transportation Planning comments on BPMP

Prepared By: Anne McLaughlin, MPO Director

**County Comments on Draft Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan 8/30/18**

General Comments:

- There is no plan cover page, index, opening/introduction or closing/conclusion. The pages should be either numbered sequentially or add a footer to note the chapter and page.
- Paragraph structure, naming the figures and tables consistently, grammar and run-on sentences should be corrected.
- Lack of analysis of the data causes the reader to draw different conclusions than the plan.
- The intent was that this plan would contain policy requirements or suggestions for the municipalities to incorporate into their own plans/codes, etc.:
  - Size/width of a standard sidewalk, both sides of the street, requirements for construction...
  - Create a way to prioritize streets with undeveloped infrastructure or gaps in infrastructure
- Ultimately the list of projects in a prioritized order and 1 map with those projects is vital to understanding the plan and is missing.
- Please note that when discussing coordination with the County, the Plan should also acknowledge that there should be coordination with the other jurisdictions/agencies/departments, etc.....Cities, Park and Rec, Tribes, etc. Other entities not just The County.
- It is confusing to flip to the maps at the end of the chapter. Recommend they be placed in the text where they are referenced.
- Where are the appendices? I can't fully comment on a document when back up documentation has never been provided.
- It would have been more helpful to have brought tech memos, unfortunately you will find in my comments that some concerns have found their way to be the basis of your recommendations.

Chapter 1, Page 1:

- Was the facilities map in Figure 1 ever adopted by the MPO Board? The version on the website is the approved map, dated December 9, 2011. Not the map in the figure. Please confirm what map was approved and use and site the correct map.
- Under Demographics – re-word sentence – “However, there are areas within Collier County – most notably, Golden Gate City (GGC), Immokalee, and Naples Manor (NM), but also including other smaller areas – where incomes are significantly lower, levels of poverty are significantly higher, and more people are without access to a vehicle than county or Florida averages as shown in Table 1.” The table should state that EC, MI and Naples are all cities. The areas called out in the table are only GGC, Immokalee and NM. Should other smaller areas be called out. What other smaller areas have lower incomes? This table should have all the demographic info. called out referenced – poverty, income, access to vehicles, size of the area...
- Table 1 references 2016 census – is that really the American Community Survey? What years?

- If the methodology is to look at 10% of the county average for EJ areas (page 2) then shouldn't we know what that 10% is? Does this table relate to the 10%? It needs a better explanation.

Page 2:

- Paragraph 1 – Now you are referring to a different census (2017 census) with estimate...be consistent with data, it is difficult to correlate the information. In addition, the paragraph states that people 65 and older may use transit...what does the data say? Did you coordinate with CAT to see if they have information?
- Paragraph 2 – Whereas widening roads to accommodate additional vehicle traffic is one approach, continuing to build those roads to accommodate different modes of travel...
- Paragraph 3 – please explain.
- Paragraph 4 – how was 10% of the county average decided? Is that a generally accepted standard? A table indicating what 10% of the county looks like as a number would be helpful.
- Paragraph 4 – The methodology for EJ map described does not match the map? You need to look at the information in depth, many of these areas don't have residents. This is a huge sticking point because it becomes the basis of recommendations.
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure
  - First paragraph – need to fill in the missing data. Does this include city numbers or only unincorporated Collier County. Remove the sentence “Aside from I-75, bicyclists may use any of these roads.” It is redundant. Are you counting local roads in the total of miles needed? If so, it is misleading since this plan doesn't plan for a system on local roads only in select areas.
  - Second Paragraph – Is this unincorporated only OR geographical County?

Page 3:

- 1<sup>st</sup> partial paragraph – states that pathways within parks and sanctuaries are considered active transportation, I don't know that a loop in a park meets that intent...
- City of Everglades City – this indicates that they have a plan. Do they actually have a plan?
- Immokalee is not a separate city or jurisdiction and does not have a separate plan. It should be considered with unincorporated Collier County. If you are addressing it separately because there is a CRA – please note Bayshore should also be elevated to that same level.
- Note also that Immokalee did not received the TIGER grant – that was submitted by and awarded to Collier County. Immokalee is the location of the project not the entity receiving it.
- The only reference to the prior Comprehensive Pathways Plan is to say it was incorporated in the TIGER Grant. It should be discussed in conjunction with the existing conditions, maps 2 and 3 and how this plan is moving forward – is different, etc.

Page 4



- The MPO did not conduct the Bayshore walkability Study – that was done by the MSTU/CRA there.
- Why is Safety discussed here and in Chapter 2? This is repetitious.
- Paragraph 3 references 808 reported crashes and paragraph 6 includes 809 reported crashes. Please confirm and correct.
- Last paragraph – is this saying that age (over 65) is a contributing factor in accidents? Are aggressive driving and age the contributing factors in 33% of crashes? Also, this paragraph indicates that one or more of the drivers were 65 years of age and old AND it was noted as contributing factors, did it really indicate that was a contributing factor?

#### Map 1

- Extremely hard to read based on the choice of colors for the water and the factors. Cannot differentiate between medium and high. Should age of over 65 be a factor? How many categories are triggered with a low rank? Need to see and understand the methodology. If areas are triggered because they only have 1 criteria (age) should they be called out? Need to see the 10% referred to. Is the location of the Immokalee label correct? Is label for Naples and Marco Island referencing the City or that there is an inset?
- What is the data used for the EJ area determination? Is it the 2016 Census? What is the 2016 Census – is that really the American Community Survey – for what years?
- Overall many of the areas just don't make common sense.

#### Map 2 and 3

- The chapter was supposed to talk about existing conditions, but the map is the only reference to the completed projects. What was accomplished by the Comp. Plan?
- What is the Immokalee Urban Area?
- Green line is for greenways but also to show the Naples and Marco Island inserts.
- If this is an E + C map, what is the source? Committed by when? Is TIGER included, TIP projects?
- The maps are hard to read at the 8x11 size.
- What does programmed mean? What about Golden Gate City, really need an inset. Also, you should include Charter and Private Schools.

#### Chapter 2, Page 1

- 808 crashes conflicts with prior chapter statistics.
- Reference to “Tip of the iceberg” should be removed.
- Paragraph 3 – bike crashes have decreased in the past 4 years not 6. Where is the paragraph about pedestrian crashes?
- Explain the data in paragraph 4. Are there more bike crashes but they are less fatal? There are double the amount of pedestrian fatalities (29%) then bike fatalities (16%). What is the conclusion the reader should draw from that? My reaction is build better sidewalks or shared use paths, not bike lanes. Is that the intended take away? This is

directing the reader to expect that since pedestrian crashes are the more fatal crashes the safety focus of this plan should be on keeping pedestrians safer on sidewalks.

- Based on this data, the plan should focus on building better pedestrian facilities, because of the fatalities and serious injuries are the performance measures that the MPO adopted based on FDOT's focus on Vision Zero.
- Indicates that the crash data was mapped and analyzed. Later in the document, it says they didn't analyze the crash data. What exactly did the consultant do?

Page 2:

- This is extremely confusing. If the methodology were included it might be easier to understand. Generally, it states that the cost of bike/ped crashes does not exist but then includes the costs in the table. The text states that the study and FDOT have not developed costs per crash for bike/ped crashes but then the number appears in the table...how? If the numbers don't exist, how were they created? The text also states that no adjustments were made for the difference in types of vehicles (cars vs. bikes) then what is the table showing?

Page 3:

- How was Table 1 created and extrapolated?
- Contributing factors in the text do not match the figure. Aggressive driving 29% or 37% and aging driver 32% or 25% do not correspond to the statement previously that aggressive + aging = 33% of the factors. Depending on which numbers are correct it can be either 54%, 61%, 62% or 69% - this is very confusing data. What age is an aging driver? Is it 65 or older? If it is over 65 – why is the EJ criteria 65?
- The colors in figure 3 are hard to differentiate and compare to the legend. Applaud the use of the MPO colors, but there needs to be more of a contrast between them.
- Pie graph – Is Aging Driver listed as a contributing factor or is this based on age provided in the crash report?
- What about who was at fault (bike, ped or vehicle) along with the contributing factors? This would allow targeted education, enforcement and engineering to reduce crashes.
- Speed of Traffic – need to have a discussion regarding interconnections.

Page 4

- A map of the accidents would be helpful in this section.
- Figure 4 – Why are 70-year-old pedestrians the statistic used for survival rates and not 65-year-old. How is the age of 70 used in the study? Is an aging driver 70 or older? Why is 65 the base for the EJ areas and not 70?
- First full paragraph (below Figure 4) – this should talk about interconnections, parallel road, reducing gated communities, etc.

- Last paragraph – The first sentence cannot be supported by facts and should therefore be removed. Conclusion drawn from the last paragraph is that speed is not a factor in crashes. Is the goal of the plan to eliminate crashes or severe/fatal crashes?

#### Page 5

- Conclusions drawn are that higher speeds cause death, but that speed does not cause accidents. Recommendation of plan is to slow traffic – but is that the best change to eliminate crashes?
- First full paragraph – where's the survey, it should be provided as an exhibit. This paragraph discusses lighting, but it doesn't present the converse side of the argument regarding lighting such as residents who don't want it or challenges with ongoing operations and maintenance.
- Second paragraph is the 1<sup>st</sup> time the survey is mentioned. It should be explained better as to what was done, how many questions, etc.
- Third full paragraph (begins Acknowledging this ) – Need to discuss alternative or parallel corridors. The last sentence states County staff, what about City staff? Are they off the hook? re-word last sentence for grammar issues. Is there a reference to a solution or policy change in future chapters to address the intersections?
- Road Safety Audits – Only discusses the US 41 and Airport Road (BTW, it is no longer Airport Pulling Road, it is only Airport Road) there are other RSA that have been done by the entities that the MPO participated in.
- Fourth paragraph – what constraint? Is this referring to crashes, size of intersections, the survey and lighting? This seems to be addressing the speeds again and RSA. Should this paragraph be moved? Is this plan supporting the conclusions of the FDOT RSA that recommended reducing speeds on 41? Why is it here? What conclusions were made about that RSA other than it was a good thing to do? If speed does not cause accidents, why is there a concern for slowing vehicles down. If the conclusion is to do a RSA to come up with recommendations to improve facilities, that is a reasonable policy for doing them. Doing a RSA to recommend lowering speed is pre-determining the outcome of the RSA and not a good reason to do one.
- Sixth paragraph – is the conclusion to be drawn that the RSA's should be done in high crash areas where there is a future resurfacing project to get a chance at safety funds? Doing the RSA did not trigger the resurfacing project. The coordination and everyone working together is what should be focused on. Conducting a RSA as a tool to evaluate areas to develop safety ideas or prioritize needs is good but doing a RSA to justify speed reductions or to assume that funding is available is not.

#### Page 6

- Where is the high crash map? Explain the difference between Table 2 page 6 and Chapter 6 Table 1? Both have the exact same roads listed. Table 2 is the high bike crash corridors with intersections listed and Table 1 is the areas to do a RSA.

- Why weren't all red and orange areas highlighted? Why were some yellow prioritized over the orange areas? Map is bike and ped, but table is only bike – why? Where is the ped – sidewalk table?
- What is the difference between the 2 lists and the 2010 study locations? Are there more areas or less, is this a continued problem or is it getting better? What is the conclusion the reader should draw from this section other than cross referencing it and causing confusion?
- What is the timeframe for Table 2? Is this just a regurgitation of what the MPO did previously or did you look at the latest crash information and adjust accordingly?

#### Page 7

- First full paragraph – I am unsure what the consultant did for crash analysis, did you just look at location?
- Second full paragraph – Why did the crashes reduce during the economic slowdown? Why are they increasing as the economy has recovered??? Recession was from 2007 – 2009. Rebound started in 2010. Crash data from that time was not evaluated. How can there be a conclusion about the notable reduction in crashes if there is no crash data for that time evaluated? Ped crashes in 2011 was the lowest it has been in the time evaluated but bike in 2011 and 2012 were the highest. The data is not consistent with what the plan is concluding.
- Unreported Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes – Statement “Crash reports often are limited to events that occur on a public roadway and exclude ...” is this plan intended to address those other items as well? Or are you staying focused on the public right-of-way. Delete “Tip of the iceberg” in text and call out box.

#### Page 8

- The parenthetical in paragraph 1 indicates that the study done in 2013 was not statistically representative of the County. Is the same disclosure made for the entire public involvement effort (noted as a success in all presentations)? The current plan only had the same fraction of 1% of involvement, why is that not disclosed? If the plan makes an effort to point out that 478 responses to a survey should not be considered representative of the county's population, then why is it discussed? It seems discredited and then elevated and analyzed. This is confusing.
- Note the 600 responses that this plan received should also be noted as not representative. What is the point of the disclosure? Why is it not being made for every plan and why is the consultant raving about the success of the involvement if the MPO does not consider it a success?
- Safety Performance Targets are a repeat of page 4 chapter 4. Why are they repeated? Should it direct the reader to focus on fatalities and serious injuries only and not the other crashes?

#### Chapter 3, page 1 and 2

- Indicates that public involvement was a success because you received 600 comments, however, in the prior chapter you indicate that the # of survey comments only

represented a fraction of the county's total population and shouldn't be considered statistically representative. Don't contradict yourself.

- Was there an on-line survey? What are on-line survey comments? What were the questions/responses? Please explain.
- Page 1 indicates that 20 people signed in for the workshop #1 but the chart on page 2 indicates 16 people attended. Please correct.
- Need to fill in data. You need to talk about where your meetings were held and when? You focus on EJ areas, but were meetings and comment opportunities held in EJ areas and were individuals given ways to comment other than through the internet??
- Page that has engagement process – where and when were the community events, how many committee meetings, how many attended meeting # 2?
- Interactive map – this only indicates bicycle needs, what about pedestrians?

#### Page 3

- Map does not have a legend, lack of definitions for orange circles with X, blue circles with stars, blue circles with pedestrians, and all colorful lines. Bias to bikes in the map as they were the only marks discussed in the text.
- Why was this area chosen in the map? Is there a reason or was it just as an example?
- Where is the Appendix – what were the responses?
- What were the questions and how many responses could be used per question? Were they allowed to use 3 responses – how can lack of facilities be 81% and driver behavior be 78%? Were these fill in the blank or provided? What was the 'other' answer?
- Figure 2– Is this only for this area? That's it? Countywide?

#### Page 4

- Figure 3 – Should that say lack of facilities? Or was it specific “bike” facilities. Based on the feedback, I would think stronger recommendations about parallel routes and more network would be included.
- Figure 4 (pie chart) hard to tell what % goes with what category.
- Paths/trails is this considered sidewalks/multi-use paths or off-road trails?

#### Page 5

- Same pie chart comment.

#### Chapter 4, Page 2

- RSA usually have short, mid and long-term recommendations – how are all projects identified in a RSA going to get high priority for funding? That is not realistic for the number of projects, the cost of them and funding available.
- What is High Visibility Enforcement? How will the MPO work with FDOT on that effort?

- Should the MPO work with all jurisdictions and agencies not just FDOT to reduce the crashes? Why not work to reduce the number of crashes as well as the severity?
- Strategies –
- Indicates to collaborate with law enforcement to develop enforcement and education techniques. This plan does not help us understand what we should be focusing on. The MPO, County, municipalities, SO and PD's have limited resources. We should focus our education and enforcement on what would be helpful, not just throwing spaghetti at the wall.
- Complete Streets – this plan must have a discussion of what Complete Streets really is. It is not just bike/ped, which unfortunately, it is often construed that way. Please provide a more elaborate discussion.

#### Page 3

- Notations for the County should also include the other jurisdictions and agencies (City of Naples, CTST, etc.)
- Locate projects in areas with great impacts. This plan is identifying and locating them? Should the strategy be prioritizing projects for funding not locate projects?
- #3 Strategies – Doesn't CAT already provide bike racks at shelters? What are bike parking facilities? Is that a park and ride or a bike locker?
- Safe, convenient and accessible use of transit
- What is the difference between bullet 3 and 4? Similar to issue above – this should be prioritized or select not just locate.
- Bullet 5 – Select projects in EJ areas – does that mean make EJ the #1 priority and everything else does not matter (crashes, locations, etc.)?
- What about supporting walkability in transportation design by working with implementation agencies....
- #4 proper name is Collier County Health Department and Florida Department of Health. What other areas of concern are going to be identified?
- How are projects going to be added to the needs list if they are not in this plan? Not sure I understand the process or intent of this plan. Projects have to be in this plan to qualify for funding. How will projects be added to a needs list?
- I can't comment on what funds to use on projects until I fully understand the list of projects. Some of the projects may not be good candidates for TMA funds particularly if they are on a collector or arterial that is planned for expansion.

#### Page 4

- What is a lively pedestrian environment?
- What about reduced congestion – travel delay causes emissions and air pollution.
- Walking helps with physical activity, reduces diabetes, ...
- Coordinate with implementation agency to develop or suggest areas for wayfinding signs...
- How is the plan selecting projects for access to employment if the only projects being prioritizes are EJ?

- Is #5 geared towards choice recreational riders or for those that must ride for work? Is the goal to provide for both? EJ areas are probably not tourist areas, however areas that the underserved work in may be destinations for work and play but not on the EJ map.
- #6 – how does mode choice protect the environment? Maybe include a reference to street trees here. What about off-road greenways/trails on utility easements? Strategy could be working with agencies to have land-use compatibility.
- Repeat of Ch. 2 page 8 here.

#### Page 5

- Are the listed bullets the ‘Other Performance Measures’? If these are MPO Performance Measures – should they be something the MPO can control? Shouldn’t it be the project is prioritized by the MPO and then funded through that prioritization – SU, Box, UPWP?
- How is the MPO planning to measure these targets? Are these measurable by the MPO? If additional work (another study or plan) has to be done to create targets and then measure them – what are these? Explain. Is your only way of measuring this plan based on how many miles are built? If so, that certainly puts the only emphasis on the engineering side, not education or enforcement...

#### Chapter 5, Page 1

- Role of Policies – I do not fully understand what the MPO’s priorities are for this plan, so I am uncertain as to what our role will be.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Paragraph starting with, “Often, policies that are....” An ineffective policy can be tracked to education...does that mean that the policy was bad or the education that implemented it was bad? Please explain. What is the idea that is trying to be conveyed? Is it that bad policy created bad implementation or that people misunderstand how to implement it? Is this plan suggesting there be no differences in policies (5’ vs. 8’ width)?
- Complete Streets Policies – this write up perpetuates the misconception that Complete Streets is bike/ped only, all the time. While I understand the emphasis in this plan, this is not helpful in education of the intent of Complete Streets.
- 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph – unrealistic. How is teaching a committee (BPAC or CAC) about the Florida Green Book going to create any change in implementation? The implementation agencies already have to comply with statutes, regulations, etc. the MPO should not be teaching that nor does it have the expertise to do so. Are the county-wide standards meant to be inclusive of the cities and other jurisdictions?
- Is the issue with implementation that agencies are not building as fast as the needs (resident’s wants) or is it that they are building incorrectly? This makes it sound like the county has no standards and they are implementing bad work.

#### Page 2 & 3

- What is the Palm Beach MPO complete street policy? Does this plan create a Complete Streets Policy? The suggestion to create one seems to have a lot of description on how to write one. Is that necessary for this plan? Is that part of this effort? The excerpt makes me think that we would broaden our funding strategies to include freight improvements if we are going to implement Complete Streets policies (because it isn’t only bike/ped).

- Where is the Appendix?
- Funding Bullet Points – What about new or creative ways to fund?
- Bullet 2 – What do you want on the roads? This plan does not do a good job of summarizing what the desire is. I don't know what the utopia is for these roads.
- Bullet 3 – Why is the County building trails adjacent to the State Roads. Isn't that FDOT's responsibility? And what about other roads beyond state roads.
- Bullet 4 – What about the cities?
- Are there projects identified for SRTS funding? Should there be?
- Any County reference should be to agencies or jurisdictions?
- What does all roads in populated areas mean? Is that Urban Areas?
- Opportunity - Bullet 1 – what about the cities?
- Bullet 3 – How is this going to be coordinated? Will the MPO go to the CCPC? Will the policies adopted in the plan be incorporated into the LDC? Or the other codes in the cities?
- Are the policies actual policies or goals?
- The intent was that this plan would contain policy requirements or suggestions:
  - Size/width of a standard sidewalk, both sides of the street, requirements for construction...
  - Create a way to prioritize streets with undeveloped infrastructure or gaps in infrastructure
  - List projects recommended as needs by the public
  - Bullet 4 under opportunities seems like a policy we are looking for. Need more of these policies.
    - If the size, speed and location of the road all matter when determining what the facility should be there should be a policy or at least a table for that recommendation. 6 lane divided highway with design speed of 45 mph in a rural area = bike lane on both sides, a SUP and a sidewalk....
- Is the reference to County Engineering and Public Works Dept. really intended to mean city and county development review process? Is this going to be applicable to the cities as well? What is the expectation of this? I can't hold up my timeframes based on the MPO's schedule.
- Bullet 6 – this needs to be incorporated in comp plan and land development code?
- How will the MPO comment on plan reviews? Is the MPO going to become a reviewer within the project development/review perimeters? Should the MPO be involved in that?
- Connectivity – does this extend to all local areas not just the county? BTW, need to consult a County Org Chart and identify divisions and departments properly. And where did 100' come from? Is that an industry standard?
  - Is this implying that the MPO should attend CCPC meetings? ? What is the intent of this? Is the MPO going to modify their meeting schedule to meet my review deadlines?
  - What about issues with access management – driveways and interconnections between commercial or connecting roads and no cul-da-sacs.



- The intent was for this plan to draft policies for consideration or recommend policies - not for the County or Cities to develop policies. That is more of what they currently do.

Page 4

- Education and Enforcement Bullet 2 – This should be more targeted educational efforts.
- Maintenance – what does support coordination for maintenance mean? This is funny. FDOT doesn't want to maintain trail facilities within their ROW. I don't see the MPO weighing in on who they think should be maintaining facilities within their ROW.
- Policy and Code Review – what does the last sentence of the page mean? Does it mean that existing plans address the pedestrian issues – or that they should with collaboration?

Page 5

- 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – what additional policies are in the Appendix? Why are they not included in the body of the plan? It is hard to determine if they are acceptable if they are not included and cannot be reviewed.
- Programs? Are these recommended programs for the future? Are these in addition to the toolkit projects listed in Chapter 7? Is the MPO committing to participating / funding / sponsoring / conducting these programs? Why are they listed? Is the policy to conduct these programs?
- Atlanta MPO is funding their programs according to their LRTP – is that the recommendation of this plan – for the MPO to fund these programs?
- A lot of attention in the beginning chapters was given to RSAs – why are they not included as a recommendation to do a RSA to create opportunities for recommendations or strategies for the future.

Chapter 6, page 1

- Paragraph 2 – “MPO and County staff have made great progress implementing previously-identified projects, with the majority constructed or funded for construction.” Is this correct? This implies that the previous comprehensive pathways plan implemented most of the needs identified. Is this the intent of the sentence? This is not accurate. There are a great many needs identified in that plan that have not been constructed by the Cities or the County. To say that majority are constructed is inaccurate. To imply that the cities have not had any part of that is unfair. Please revise. A better transition might be to say that those needs were great and that the MPO has redirected its focus to give safety projects a higher priority.
- “Opportunities noted below...” Does this refer to a needs list of projects? Where is that list? Is this sentence intended to be a policy – to have development complete gaps?
- Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 are very confusing. Please clarify what the intent of these paragraphs is. #3 – that there is a change from the BPAC prioritizing and ranking projects to the MPO Board doing so. #4 – Is this saying that outside of the process FDOT works with MPO staff to fund safety projects? Was the RSA funded with a block grant? Was the resurfacing on 41 funded with a block grant? #5 that MPO staff move

projects into the design phase to take advantage of funding opportunities – what about the priority process?

Page 2

- Paragraph 1 seems like policy. Should this be in the other chapter? What is needed for the LRTP projects? I am unclear based on the plan that was provided. There is not a good place to send our engineers where they can clearly figure out what the intent of this plan is for a specific facility.
- “As projects identified in the last plan had been substantially funded...” This is not accurate. It is a very misleading overstatement.
- Per Chapter 2 – crashes are trending downward not upward. This is conflicting information.
- The methodology for identifying EJ areas can be found in appendix. This is key information that either should be provided or in the body of the text, not in an appendix.
- Third paragraph, what about the cities?
- Identification of Gaps and Needs on Collectors and Arterials
- First paragraph – County staff advised early on in this process that the inventory was incomplete. This plan continued forward and didn’t take a step back and make sure that the data they were working with was solid.
- Second paragraph – This would be a great place to have the map of the gaps, not buried someplace else.

Page 3

- First full paragraph – What is high crash? What were the screening criteria? Were these adopted by anyone? The last sentence is contrary to the tables in the contextual guidance.
- Second full paragraph – are these County roads only?
- Third full paragraph – why not the cities too and FDOT???
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Assessments along High Crash Corridors. Why are you only discussing bicycle RSA’s? Are you forgetting about pedestrians?
- Map 1 is supposed to be where EJ areas and crashes occur most often but when you look at map 1 at the back of the chapter it is only the map for the number of crashes. Is there a map combining the 2 factors? Should there be – is that the determination of Needs?
- Which map identifies high crash and EJ areas?
- Where is the list of gaps overlaid on high crash and EJ areas? Where is that map?
- “The complete list of gaps in infrastructure is the plan’s foundation...” This is not the statements that are being presented with the plan. All presentations indicate that only EJ is being considered, based on this statement the plan implies that the list of gaps is the foundation of the plan? Why was there so much analysis on crashes, I thought crashes and EJ were the basis of the priorities?
- What is meant by the sentence, “It should be noted that effort to identify MUP opportunities adjacent to County roads was by feedback and desktop review.”
- Is it policy to consider separated trails as the preferred facility and constructed where ROW allows?
- What are the 171 miles of bike needs and 185 miles of ped needs? Are they gaps, high crashes or EJ areas? Paragraph indicates they are just gaps. This is confusing.

- Map 2 – what are the needs? Legend shows red for no current bike lanes, brown for bike lane on 1 side, blue for bike lane on both sides – so the red is the need and the blue is the existing? The concern from the Seminole tribe was that the blue line that was on US41 for what was ROGG should be removed. Is that because it is not an existing facility – blue or should be red – or they want it off entirely? Very difficult to determine what the need really is – red lines? A list of the projects is necessary and a better legend. Previous E+C map (map #3, page???) indicated nothing for the ROGG. Very confusing.
- Map 3 – is this a needs map or a gap map? Same issue with the legend and hard to understand what the map is intended to show.
- What is the size of a shared use path?
- Text indicates that only a bike RSAs should be done, but table 1 on page 4 lists locations for Bike/Ped RSA corridors. Is there a typo or was the intent only to do Bike?
- This data correlates to crash data (map #1, page ???) – why are yellow areas (3-5 crashes) being considered and not only orange (6-10) and red areas (11-38).
- Any RSA should include coordination with the maintaining agency for the road being reviewed – not just the County.

#### Page 4

- Table 2 – how were the individual links determined?
- Tables 2 & 3 – need the lists with road name, from and to.
- Are there limits to the corridors in table 1? Are they the same as the ones on the prior list in Ch.2? What was the criteria for this list – High crash corridor – should that mean 3 crashes?
- Please explain the following sentence, “Given this constraint, the decision was made to apply the focus-area criteria of crash occurrence and EJ areas to the needs map to identify the projects that best satisfy the identified criteria.”
- How was the need in Map 4 and 5 developed? What is a high number of crashes (red) and how many EJ factors?
- Is Map 4 all the needs of the county? The entire plan has only a need for 7 miles of bike lanes and 1 mile of sidewalks? That does not seem like a lot of projects for a needs plan. Is there a reason to keep the needs small?
- Is Map 4 the top tier of needs because it is EJ plus Crash and Map 5 is a lower tier? The text is confusing when compared to the actual map and legend.
- What is the difference between map 4 and 6 and map 5 and 7?

#### Page 5

- Has there been considerable progress to building Tier 1 of all the walkability studies? The TIGER grant has made progress on the Immokalee Walkability Study – but are the others being completed?
- Suggesting that the County fund remaining Tier 1 projects in all walkability studies?
- Is the study recommending that the Tier 2 and 3 projects get funded by local groups – not the county? What agencies - CRAs, MSTUs, churches, clubs?
- What methodology was developed based on plan goals? Is that the criteria in the table? How was this developed? How are points allocated and distributed to projects? Is this in the Appendix? There is a matrix behind all the maps titled – Collier Bike and Ped Plan –

LOCAL ROAD opportunities DRAFT. Is that the tabulation of all the needs on local roads scored and ranked? Are those 75 projects all the local needs or is an example of what the appendix shows? Please explain how the points were allocated to the projects and how these few projects were chosen?

- If many local road projects were constructed and the needs plan needs to identify more projects, why are there only 75 on this list?
- The page moves away from the above questions to focus on gaps, transit and EJ areas. Was the table used at all? This is very confusing. Is Map 8 the needs list?

Page 6

- Map 9 is the EJ + Schools and Map 10 is the EJ + Schools + transit.... what are the needs? Are the needs the “127 miles of sidewalk that could be constructed that would facilitate access to schools and transit.” Is this the list of needs?
- Does Everglades have a Master Plan?
- Why were only 4 projects from the Marco Island Master List included but all projects on the Naples list were included?
- Immokalee is not a separate entity and therefore did not go through its own public engagement process and council input, so please remove them.
- References to Collier Ave. should be changed to Collier Blvd.
- Are there any tribal maps that should be considered?

Page 8

- Second bullet point – need to have a list and map.
- What is the difference between a greenway and a roadside trail? Is the word trail used interchangeably with path or sidewalk?
- When speaking about the canal system, it is assumed the discussion is related to a sidewalk or a greenway next to it and not a blue way on it or through it for kayaks....and other non-motorized transportation and recreation.
- Is it a policy to add connections between existing trails to widen the infrastructure and add a wide sidewalk or buffered bike lane?
- Last paragraph implies that the County staff made a decision about the plan. Either make it inclusive or all agencies and jurisdictions or limit it to the MPO made the decision...
- Last sentence is confusing. Is the point that there is a need to do more than add bike lanes and fill sidewalk gaps? There should be other policies, needs, areas to review in the plan but ultimately the statement is contradictory to what this plan should be doing – document the needs.

Page 9

- Forth bullet point – Is biking with 3 mile of transit stops the industry standards, does that take into consideration our climate? What about Collier’s TDP, does it have any information regarding this?
- Master Plan is suggesting doing additional studies and then the results of the studies be added to the list of projects. What list of projects? How will that be prioritized?

- Please clarify the statements in the Wiggins Pass Rd. study. “Wiggins Pass Rd is one of the few east-west access ways to the beach and is used extensively by pedestrian, bicyclists and cars.” Who else needs to use the road – does it need to be a complete street accessible to trucks, school buses, etc. Please clarify the issue. “West of US 41, Wiggins Pass Road has a four-foot sidewalk but no shoulders, which requires cars to either enter the oncoming lane of traffic or follow behind cyclists.” What is the issue here – need a share the road sign and a sharrow? did anyone substantiate if the sidewalk is indeed 4’ wide? If not, you might not want to put a width.
- Costs for adjustments during resurfacing should be looked at case by case.
- Do sidewalk gaps get filled during resurfacing?
- Forth bullet point – Is biking with 3 mile of transit stops the industry standards, does that take into consideration our climate? What about Collier’s TDP, does it have any information
- Statements about SRTS are inaccurate. Not just middle schools are eligible, and it is not limited to gaps in existing sidewalks.
- Are these the plan Needs =171 miles of bike needs and 185 miles of ped needs (referenced on page 3 chapter 6). Why is there such a gap between page 3 and page 10? Please have a Needs List, Map and other info. showing how this number was generated. Note – prior reference states bike needs – not bike lanes on collector roads and ped needs not sidewalks on collectors.
- The collector and arterial roads component does not include crashes or EJ – should it? Are they part of the criteria?
- Please explain the difference between sidewalks – local roads – schools + EJ = 146 and sidewalks – local roads – transit + EJ = 160. Is there overlap?

#### Page 11

- New Development – What about the Cities? They have new development too.
- Is this a list of funding sources meant to be a resource? Maybe that should be in the appendix.
- Has the MPO any experience with the Doppelt Family Trail Development Fund or the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation? Why were those grants highlighted in the plan?
- 

#### Page 12

- Why is there a focus box for the RWJ Foundation Grant for NJ? Recommend deleting the box.
- Does SRTS require a match?

#### Page 13

- Do these grants do not belong in the text do they even belong in an appendix? AARP Community Challenge Grant – meant for quick fixes – under 6 months from award to complete construction. This is not intended for a sidewalk but for a bench or maybe a bike rack.... shelters take more than 6 months!

- Some of these are good policies or goals
- Bullet #3 – coordination for enforcement must include sheriff's office, etc.
- Bullet #4 – Separated trails included in PD&E and design phases - should that policy be for new corridors not resurfacing projects? There is a big expectation for FDOT to add a bike lane and sidewalk for resurfacing projects. These sound like a policy not an implementation action. This was not discussed previously and may be an issue for FDOT (or for any implementation agency that is looking to comply with that). What about the maintenance ramifications?
- Bullet #5 – sounds like a disclosure – please clarify the implementation action intended here.
- Bullet #6 – What is the intent of this? Will the MPO be managing our resurfacing program? Will you be doing that with the cities as well? Do you have staff time to take on these additional tasks?
- Bullet #7 – was this intended to mean the Marco Island City Public Works Dept. or all agencies and jurisdictions?
- Bullet #8 – what does this mean? Immokalee is part of unincorporated Collier County. Clarify that a submission of projects to a list of projects to be prioritized means that the agency can submit projects not included in the Master Plan for prioritization? If the project does not have to be included in the Master Plan, why is the master plan being done?
- Bullet #9 - What is the bicycle and Trail Master Plan? Is that a typo and it means this plan or is it recommending completing an additional plan?
- Bullet #10 – why just the trail system and not the entire Master Plan or the bike and ped network/system?
- Bullet #12 – create a seamless and connected trail network – should that be bike ped network?

- Is training on the design manual to the MPO committees appropriate?

#### Local Road Opportunities Matrix

- List is confusing as to how it was generated, what is the methodology use to get onto this list and what is the criteria for the scoring? What does a 0 points allocation for high crash out of 15 mean? Is the scoring quantifiable/how was it scored and by whom?
- How were the criteria developed and why?
- Pedestrian & Bicycle Crashes (2011-2016) – Map 1 – Map needs to have more inserts and why isn't this in the safety section?
- Bike Lane Gaps (all needs on collector and arterial roads) – Map 2 – this is hard to read with existing and gaps identified. Perhaps you should remove the existing.
- Sidewalk gaps (all needs on collector and arterial roads) – Map 3 – there are areas on this map that are incorrect, that I noted in the initial stakeholder meeting.

- Bike Lane and Shared Use Path Gaps: Collectors and Arterials – Map 4 – this does not seem like that many “gaps”. Need a list of these projects and their scoring.
- Sidewalk & Shared Use Path Gaps: Collectors and Arterials – Map 5 – need a list of these projects and their scoring.
- Maps 4 & 5 – This is it, if we build these 2 maps, we have satisfied all of the needs for the MPO? Doesn’t seem realistic.
- Local Road Opportunities – Why aren’t the gaps identified in this list and scored along side the remainder of the projects.

#### Chapter 7, page 1

- Revise 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. Very confusing. First paragraph, I don’t think our Public Works Department has included bike lanes on roads because we don’t have a Public Works Department. This paragraph doesn’t address the numerous miles of pathways that the County has built in addition to on-road bike lanes.
- Paragraph 2 – very confusing – what is the quote trying to say, explain it or clarify it. Explain the “no way no how” rider, etc. Are these the generally accepted types of bicyclists? Is the Portland office of transportation in 2004 an authority on this?
- Was this spectrum used in any of the analysis in the Plan? Is the goal to get more users to move through the spectrum? Why is this discussed?

#### Page 2

- This seems geared towards getting more choice riders on bikes, the criteria in the plan seems to be crash data and EJ areas. EJ is not the recreational rider or the choice rider it is the transportation dependent. This seems to be a completely different approach. Why is it introduced at the end? Is it part of the criteria or just extra info that should be in an appendix.

#### Page 3

- Paved Shoulders – where are you recommending this? Is this part of the needs list – where/what the types of facilities should be? Need to think about permitting ramifications when adding shoulders during a resurfacing project. Depending upon the length of the project you could trigger SFWMD permits.

Pages 3 – 16 – every figure or table # is incorrect.

#### Page 4

- Rumble – Buffer Bike Lane – what is the BPAC’s take on this, in the past, they have not been in favor of the rumble strips. In fact, they have consistently asked FDOT to take them off U.S. 41.
- Bike Lanes – “This facility type should be considered during roadway resurfacing projects and can be used to make connections between trails. Bike lanes are not considered a preferred facility type for developing a community friendly trail system.” This seems contradictory or at minimum confusing. Please clarify.

Page 5

- References to Hernando and Citrus Counties – Typo – should say Collier.
- Is this a policy?
- Separated Bike Lanes – This encourages wrong way riding, which according to the MPO’s last safety analysis as well as the latest FDOT/MPO RSA (Airport and US 41) was a major contributor to bicycle crashes.
- An example of the green bike lane is Bayshore.

Page 6-12

- recommend toolbox be an appendix.

Page 6

- Two-Stage Queue Box – the graphic nor the explanation give me any more clarity about what this actually is.

Page 9

- 1<sup>st</sup> Bullet – Need to refer to FDOT policy regarding Road Diets and what should be looked at when contemplating.

Page 10

- Overpasses and Underpasses – where there any areas identified in the plan where this would be applicable?

Page 11

- Geometric Trail Design – this is too much detail for this plan.

Page 12

- Confirmation Signs – Please provide examples of each.
- Bicycle Facilities for Comfort and Safety – this is all well and good, the plan has lots of maps, but what do you really want?
- Last paragraph this is a policy that all roadway reconstruction projects have a separated trail facility added during design. Has anyone coordinated with the implementing agencies about this? Please define Trail.

Page 13

- Is this guidance part of how the needs were developed or how the policies were determined? Is this part of the policy for facility decisions and how they were ranked?
- Figure 19 – So bicycle facilities are dictated by the pedestrian volume? BTW, this contradicts your prior recommendations.



Page 14

- Highlighted rows are relevant to Collier County – what table is that referring to? How is this used? Please explain Table 1 – what SIS facility has a minimum of 65 MPH AND a 5' sidewalk? Is this I-75 – are there bike/ped facilities on it?

Page 15 & 16 – I don't know that these cross-sections add value. When are these applicable? No on-road facilities at all? Multi-use path on one side??? When did 15' become a standard for a multi-use pathway?

There should be a conclusion to the plan.