

Mr. Musico: **I second the motion.**

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approval of the February 20, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Bonness entertained a motion for approval of the February 20, 2018 Meeting Minutes.

Ms. Halman: **I move to approve the minutes.**

Dr. Friedman: **I second the motion.**

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Open to the Public for Comment on Items not on the Agenda

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Mr. Agacinski stated that a FDOT resurfacing project on SR951 from the Judge Jolly Bridge to Fiddlers Creek would include six-foot buffered bike lanes which will improve bicycle safety. Mr. Agacinski stated that FDOT would like to continue the buffered bike lanes from Fiddlers Creek to US41 when a future project is done on that stretch of 951. Mr. Ortman stated that construction is scheduled for FY19. Mr. Musico added that a significant number of people bicycle between Marco Island and Fiddler's Creek.

Mr. Agacinski that the Smart Growth America recently released a report, the "Best Complete Street Initiatives of 2017" in which the Florida Department of Transportation Design Manual was listed as one of the top twelve complete street initiatives in the country.

B. MPO

Mr. Ortman stated that today would be Ms. Gonzalez's last meeting with the BPAC as she had taken another position with the County. Mr. Ortman thanked Ms. Gonzalez for her contributions to the MPO, and her work ethic and lively personality.

C. Collier County

Ms. Lantz stated that Collier County was awarded a TIGER grant for the Immokalee Complete Streets Project. The project would include sidewalks, bike lanes, transit facilities, bus shelters, drainage and lighting. The project area includes the triangle bordered by SR29 and New Market Road. The award amount is \$13.1 million with a 20 percent County match making the total amount roughly \$16 million.

Ms. Lantz updated the Committee on the County's Pine Ridge Road Corridor Congestion Study stating that the Board of County Commissioners approved staff's recommendation to begin design of a Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI) at the intersection of Pine Ridge Road and Livingston Road. Ms. Lantz stated that at the intersections of Pine Ridge Road at Whipoorwill Road and at I-75 the County was working with FDOT to consider a County recommendation for a Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) at I-75. Ms. Lantz stated that there are DDIs that are fully operational in the state of Florida.

Mr. Adams asked about the redesign of the I-75 Davis Boulevard interchange. Ms. Lantz stated that FDOT was working on the design of the project. Mr. Ortman stated that construction was programmed for FY23.

D. City of Naples

E. City of Marco Island

No updates were provided from the City of Naples or the City of Marco Island.

7. Committee Action

A. Endorsement of FY2019 – FY2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Ortman stated that the Committee had seen a draft of the TIP at the December meeting and that no comments had been received. The TAC and CAC had also seen the draft TIP and had not made any comments. The Board had seen the draft in March and only had a couple of minor comments.

Mr. Ortman stated that draft TIP had been developed from a November snapshot with the understanding that FDOT would release a final snapshot in March that MPOs should use to develop their TIPs. FDOT had stated that there would only be minor changes between the two snapshots.

Mr. Ortman summarized the changes between the two snapshots. Three projects had increased in funding with a net increase of \$765,000; this was the only change in funding between the two snapshots. Mr. Ortman stated the draft TIP had added five projects; all were included in both FDOT snapshots; four of the project were added to the TIP so that the TIP and the FDOT Work Program would match each other, the fifth project was added to correct a staff omission from an earlier draft of the TIP. Mr. Ortman stated that these changes were included in Attachment 2 as were several administrative changes and changes to prior and future project costs which do not have any impact on funding.

Mr. Ortman stated both the TAC and CAC had endorsed the TIP with two conditions. The first was to remove the Regional Non-motorized Transportation System Map as both committees believed it no longer served its original purpose and that it did not help the County in ongoing negotiations with FDOT on maintenance responsibilities for pathways along state roads. There was a brief discussion on the removal of the map. Ms. Lantz further explained the County's reasoning stating the ongoing negotiations with FDOT on pathway maintenance responsibility; and stating that the map was still in existence for the MPO until such time as the Board takes action. The second condition was to include editorial comments and corrections from Ms. Lantz.

The draft TIP is out for public comments until May 9th. The Board will approve the TIP on June 8 with consideration of all comments received. To date there have been no public comments. Mr. Ortman stated that staff had done the TIP in-house this year as opposed to using a consultant, DTS; and had done it for less money and in less time.

Mr. Musico: I move to approve the TIP.

Dr. Friedman: I second the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Reports and Presentations (May Require Committee Action)

A. Update on the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan

Mr. Ortman updated the Committee on the work to date for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan. (The power point presentation is available on the MPO website colliermpo.com.) Mr. Ortman stated that all the public and committee input, County documents, the previous walkable community studies and Comprehensive Pathways Plan, current facilities inventory, and current crash and Environmental Justice (EJ) data had been used to begin to shape the Plan's criteria, project selection process and other recommendations.

Mr. Ortman stated that more than 600 comments had been received and that safety had emerged as the most important issue to the public and that one of the draft recommendations of the plan would be that additional Road Safety Audits (RSA) be done for areas where there appeared to be crash issues and that the MPO fund projects recommended by these RSAs. Increased connectivity received the second most comments; local road needs and multi-use pathways/greenways also received numerous public comments. As a result of public input, instead of creating a single master list of priorities it was being recommended that local roads, arterials and collectors, and greenways be treated as separate categories as they serve significantly different functions.

Mr. Ortman stated the plan would like to suggest that when any roadway project is done including stormwater improvements that bicycle and pedestrian improvements be included to the extent feasible. Mr. Musico suggested that cost alone should not be the determining factor in whether or not to include bicycle or pedestrian improvements. Discussion ensued over the extent to which the plan could suggest such improvements. Mr. Ortman stated that while this may be a good idea, the plan may not have the ability to be that prescriptive. Ms. Lantz stated that roadways budgets were set by agencies other than the MPO.

Mr. Ortman referenced a slide that showed the public outreach conducted for the plan and that more than 600+ comments had been received which could be broken into four general categories: safety, connectivity, multi-use paths and greenways, and local needs. Large intersections, driver behavior and speed of traffic, lack of lighting, gaps in the network and a lack of facilities were among the safety comments received. Connectivity comments focused on connecting existing facilities before building new ones, and better east-west connections. More interconnected multi-use paths/greenways and local sidewalks filled out the general tone of the comments.

The existing documents and data and public comments were used to develop a strategy to identify needs centered around safety, equity, transit stops, connectivity, local roads, greenways and completing gaps. Mr. Ortman stated that Local road recommendations were pulled from the Tier 1 recommendations of the Walkability Studies; the Golden Gate Tier 1 recommendations will be added once that study is complete. Mr. Ortman described how the criteria were used to develop draft lists of potential projects.

Mr. Ortman stated that there has been significant public input on the need for sidewalks on local roads. As a starting point the consultant has applied the criteria included as Attachment 2 to the Tier 1 recommendations from the three completed walkability studies and will add the Golden Gate City study once complete. The result of this initial application of criteria is shown in Attachment 1. Discussion ensued over whether to include population density as a criterion. There was a general consensus amongst committee members that population density should be considered as a criterion. Mr. Ortman stated that including population density as a criterion would be re-evaluated. Further discussion followed on how many points should be awarded for community support. Mr. Musico stated that some events are attended by relatively large groups. Mr. Othman stated that a lack of community support does not necessarily imply the lack of a need or of potential use. Mr. Adams stated that socio-economic condition and cultural influences way result in greater or lesser areas of public involvement. Mr. Ortman stated that community support would be looked at further.

Mr. Ortman stated that the consultant, and MPO and County staff had started to work on developing potential policy language that could be used by jurisdictions in helping to shape bicycle and pedestrian improvements in future new and redevelopment. Ms. Halman asked where education and enforcement fit in. Mr. Ortman stated that research has shown that education and enforcement are two proven mechanisms that can increase bicycle and pedestrian safety; the plan will include education and enforcement. Mr. Agacinski stated that occasionally there were High Visibility Enforcement Grants offered and that may be another potential funding avenue. Mr. Ortman stated that the plan was trying to identify other area of funding beyond the traditional box funds.

Dr. Friedman asked if the plan was considering a program such as City Bikes where bikes were made available free of charge for people to “rent”. Mr. Ortman stated that this was something that could be included in the plan as another suggestion but that it would likely be beyond the reach of the MPO to implement. Discussion ensued over the potential pros and cons of such a program.

Mr. Musico stated that another potential funding source the plan may wish to look to would be the Long Range Transportation Plan where projects could include bicycle and pedestrian facilities that perhaps it would be better to wait until the larger project was done which could include bicycle and pedestrian facilities instead of using box funds. Mr. Bonness stated that although resurfacing project may be another opportunity to get facilities included, sometimes the project can get reclassified so that bike and ped facilities are no longer eligible for the project.

Ms. Fendrick asked if the County’s resurfacing maintenance schedule could be reviewed so that perhaps the MPO and the County could work together with sufficient lead time to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities in some resurfacing projects. Mr. Adams suggested that the MPO see if someone from the maintenance department could attend a BPAC meeting where some of the details of a potential effort could be discussed. The committee thought that this was a worthwhile effort to pursue.

Mr. Ortman thanked the Committee for their valuable input. He stated that there would be a stakeholder meeting on May 21; the next time the BPAC would see the plan it would be a draft plan. Dr. Friedman asked if the Congestion Management Committee should be one the stakeholder group. Mr. Ortman stated that the County Traffic Operations department was on the stakeholder group

Mr. Musico asked if the plan will address how it should be used with respect to priorities and implementation. Mr. Ortman stated that the plan will include suggestions as to how it may be implemented but the plan could not be prescriptive for other agencies. Mr. Musico asked how a call for projects might be handled; would the plan be given to FDOT for them to pick from; would be Board members each select a project; or would some other method be used? Mr. Ortman stated that the details for this were still be worked out. One option being considered would be, for example, that the plan equally prioritizes 20 projects on arterials/collectors but allows the BPAC or the County or some other group to do the actual ranking within this list of 20. Local knowledge and changing circumstances may yield a better list than having the plan prioritize the projects in a vacuum.

Ms. Fendrick asked if expanding the call for projects beyond the pathways box had been considered. Mr. Ortman stated that that has not yet been considered as the next call for projects would be in 2020 which would allow ample time to consider this. In addition, many of the currently funded priorities have only been funded for preliminary engineering and would need to be funded for construction in the coming years.

Mr. Ortman stated that a draft plan would be developed during the summer and that the draft plan would be brought to the committees and Board in the fall with adoption scheduled for October. There would also be a second public open house scheduled for late August. Mr. Bonness stated that there one public speaker for this item, Dennis DiDonna.

Mr. DiDonna, stated that he came to speak about Wiggins Pass Road. Mr. DiDonna stated that five new 20-story high rise buildings were being planned near the corner of Vanderbilt Drive and Wiggins Pass Road; a

150,000 square-foot shopping center at the intersection of Wiggins Pass and US 41; and a 60,000 square-foot shopping center near the intersection of US41 and Old US41. Mr. DiDonna stated that this development would add a lot of traffic to Wiggins Pass Road that has two 12-foot lanes, a 4-foot macadam sidewalk and no bicycle facilities.

Mr. DiDonna stated that when cars pass bicycles and allow three-feet of space they are forced to cross the double yellow line into oncoming traffic because there are no bike paths on Wiggins Pass. A pedestrian was recently killed walking when two cars collided and hit the pedestrian. Mr. DiDonna stated that work on Vanderbilt Drive was just completed which included bike lanes that are already getting significant use. If bike lanes are added to Wiggins Pass, people will use them.

Mr. DiDonna stated that he, along with a group of other people, is also working with the County to advance the construction of Veterans Memorial Boulevard which would connect Vanderbilt Drive to Livingston Road. Mr. DiDonna stated that during season it would take up to five traffic signal cycles for him to be able to make a left-turn from 41 onto Immokalee Road. He concluded by thanking the Committee for letting him speak and that he understood that there were limited dollars and needs throughout the County. Mr. DiDonna stated his wish that installing bicycle lanes on Wiggins Pass Road would become part of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan.

Ms. Fendrick asked if the Wikimap was still active on the website. Mr. Ortman stated that it was still active and that he and Mr. DiDonna had had several conversations and that Wiggins Pass had been identified as a need based on comments from multiple residents in the area. Dr. Friedman stated that this was evidence of continued short-sightedness on the part of the County for not have infrastructure installed before development occurred.

Mr. Bonness stated that the need for bike lanes on Wiggins Pass has been recognized for years and that the sidewalk is sometimes under water during the rainy season. Mr. DiDonna stated that the sidewalk is not wide enough for cyclists and walkers to use at the same time.

B. Update on the Golden Gate City Walkable Community Study

Mr. Ned Baier, Jacobs Engineering, introduced himself stating that the Board was due to adopt the plan in June. A second public meeting would be held this Thursday from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m. at the Golden Gate Community Center. (The power point used for the presentation is available at colliermmpo.com or by calling the MPO office at 239-252-5874.)

Mr. Baier described Golden Gate City as a four-square mile area with a young diverse population of 29,000, nine schools, 400 intersections and 76 miles of roads. Jacobs Engineering spent three days in the community meeting with citizens, stakeholders and performing multiple walking and biking audits. Mr. Baier described the Level of Service (LOS) grades, and the criteria used to determine them, for areas within the community. Most of the side roads do not have sidewalks whereas the main roads do have sidewalks. Mr. Baier noted that Golden Gate City has an unusually high number of people who walk and bike and that more than one-third of the total Collier Area Transit ridership comes from the community.

Mr. Baier noted that most of the highest priorities, Tier 1, were around the schools. Recommendations were divided into three tiers which roughly correspond to short, mid and long time frames. Mr. Baier described some relatively easy short-term fixes such as completing sidewalk gaps, providing mid-block crossings and painting intersection crosswalks.

Mr. Baier stated that mid-term recommendations included road diets, sharrows, mini-circles at intersections and home streets. Long-term recommendations include. Longer term recommendations include enhanced transit stops, consideration of roundabouts and mid-block HAWK signals. Ms. Otero stated that most of the recommendations coming from the plan would require additional study,

C. Update on the 2040 LRTP Amendment

Mr. Ortman stated that due to the time, the Committee would need to move quickly through this item. Mr. Ortman stated that an amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan was being considered as a result of the Rural Lands West development. A public meeting was held for the amendment; a fact sheet used for the meeting is included as Attachment 1. Attachment 2 is public review summary report for the amendment. Highpoints of the summary report include the statement that the Randall Boulevard Oil Well Road corridor is still being studied. Within the study area is the “S-curve” alignment which has generated significant comment both for and against. The report also includes recommendations to add two projects to the Cost Feasible Plan. The projects are to extend Vanderbilt Beach Road from 8th Street 11th Street and extend Randall Boulevard from 8th Street to Everglades Boulevard. The public comment for the amendment is currently open and will close on the 23rd.

9. **Member Comments**

None.

10. **Distribution Items**

- A. 2018 Bicycle and Pedestrian Priorities
- B. Update on the FY2019-FY2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Ortman stated that this is the same list that has been used in recent years and that the list now shows that 13 of the projects have received funding. The list includes the phase and programmed funding amounts; five of the projects are funded for construction, the other eight for preliminary engineering in FY2023. These eight projects still need to be funded for construction which may consume future box funds.

Mr. Ortman stated that the second distribution item was an update on the amendment to the Unified Planning and Work Program. The amendment includes a de-obligation of \$177,000. The biggest impact to the BPAC is the extension of the deadline for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan until October 30th.

11. **Next Meeting Date**

The May BPAC meeting is being combined with a stakeholder group meeting for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan to be held on May 21st at 10:30 a.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting for the BPAC will be on August 21st at 9:00 a.m.

12. **Adjournment**

With no further business to attend to, Mr. Bonness entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Dr. Friedman: I move to adjourn.

Mr. Bonness: I second the motion.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.