

COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) BOARD MEETING

**City of Marco Island
Marco Island Community Meeting Room
51 Bald Eagle Drive
9:00 a.m.
April 13, 2018
Meeting Minutes**

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

Members Present

Commissioner William L. McDaniel, Jr., Collier County BCC District 5, Chair
Commissioner Donna Fiala, Collier County BCC District 1
Commissioner Andy Solis, Collier County BCC District 2
Commissioner Burt Saunders, Collier County BCC District 3
Commissioner Penny Taylor, Collier County BCC District 4
Councilman Joe Batte, City of Marco Island
Councilwoman Elaine Middelstaedt, City of Everglades City

Members Absent

Councilwoman Linda Penniman, City of Naples, Vice-Chair
Councilman Reg Buxton, City of Naples

MPO Staff

Anne McLaughlin, MPO Executive Director
Brandy Otero, MPO Senior Planner
Eric Ortman, MPO Senior Planner
Gabrielle Gonzalez, MPO Administrative Secretary

FDOT

L.K. Nandam, District One Secretary
Lawrence Massey, FDOT
Victoria Peters, District 1 Liaison
Ryan Lazenby, Engineer of Record, SR 82
Zach Burch, PIO

Others Present

Thaddeus Cohen, Collier County, Growth Management Department Head
Amy Patterson, Collier County, Capital Project Planning, Impact Fees and Program Management
Trinity Scott, Collier County, Transportation Planning
Lorraine Lantz, Collier County, Transportation Planning
Adam Ahmad, Jacobs Engineering
Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver
Vito J. Congine, Jr
Rae Ann Burton
Vicki Standen
David Standen

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner McDaniel led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Approval of the Agenda, Previous Minutes, and Consent Items

A. March 9, 2018 MPO Board Meeting Minutes

Commissioner McDaniel entertained a motion for approval of the agenda and March 9 minutes, there being no items on Consent.

Commissioner Taylor:	Move to approve.
Commissioner Solis:	Second.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

There were no public speakers.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters thanked Councilman Batte for hosting the meeting in Marco Island and introduced Ryan Lazenby, Engineer of Record for SR 82. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is working with Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) on getting roads closed and opening them again as quickly as possible regarding local brush fires that have been occurring.

Mr. Lazenby provided an update on SR 82. [Presentation available on request.] He explained that starting at SR 29 up to Gator Slough, the segment is about 3.2 miles and includes a round-about at SR29. It is a 4-lane section that is expandable to 6 lanes if traffic ever warrants it. The permitting accommodates the 6-lane section. There is a 5' sidewalk shown on the north side of the roadway and a 10' asphalt path on the southside. He stated that FDOT is going to final plans in July of this year for an April 2019 letting so sometime next summer we should be beginning construction. That project will cost approximately \$28.5 million for construction. The adjacent segment of SR 82 runs from the Hendry County Line to Gator Slough, approximately 4 miles. FDOT is currently in the process of design and will move to Right-Of-Way (ROW) acquisition this July, primarily to take care of some drainage issues. The project estimate is \$36.7 million. The project is a little longer and also has two structures to provide animal crossings. It is funded for construction in fiscal year 2023, which means it will be in production that spring. He explained that the timing is determined by the ROW acquisition. In response to a question from Commissioner Taylor, Mr. Lazenby clarified that a portion of SR 82 does go through Hendry County before entering Lee County and that section (#5 on the map) is complete except for the trail, which FDOT has just let for construction [items 3 & 4 on the map.]

Commissioner McDaniel noted his familiarity with this section of SR 82 which is in an extremely rural part of the county although right at the county line, Lehigh Acres subdivision which is fairly dense, at 6 units per acre, and growing. He asked if there any latitude to appropriate funding for ROW without the expense of building the bike path today because there is no one living out there to use sidewalks and bike paths and the like at this stage. Can that be adapted to the construction plans to not expend those funds?

Mr. Lazenby responded that if that is something the MPO wants FDOT to look into, they will, but since they are going to final plans in July, he would probably keep the berm the path will be on because it would take longer and cost more to remove it at this time, but not construct the actual asphalt itself. That way the MPO can come back in the future and construct the trail if it wants to.

Commissioner McDaniel responded that the MPO definitely wants to construct the pathway when it's warranted. He asked if FDOT had an estimated cost for constructing the trail? Mr. Lazenby responded that he would need to get the answer when he's back in the office. Commissioner McDaniel noted that he would like to have this discussed at a future MPO meeting.

Secretary Nandam stated that FDOT will definitely come back with cost estimates at the next meeting. He explained that the Board may want to consider that a master plan was developed calling for a trail along SR 82 into Immokalee. He suggested that the Board talk about the goal of that particular trail and if it make more sense to build it now or later. He added that it was supposed to be a linear park type of trail rather than a transportation trail.

Commissioner McDaniel responded that he would like to talk about it at the next meeting.

Commissioner Fiala inquired whether a date had been set yet for repairing the lights on the [Judge Jolley] Bridge [to Marco Island].

Ms. Peters responded that the FDOT maintenance team is looking into it and conducted some emergency repairs. FDOT is working with FEMA on replacement. Ms. Peters will look into the status and report back to Commissioner Fiala and Councilman Batte.

Councilman Batte asked whether FDOT is still on target for paving SR 951 from the bridge to US 41 this summer. Ms. Peters responded yes.

B. MPO Executive Director

Ms. McLaughlin thanked Ms. Peters for assisting with preparing the application packet to submit to the Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC) which is now prescreening freight projects submitted by the MPOs and prioritizing them for consideration by FDOT at the district level. Each MPO was allowed to submit up to 3 projects. Staff focused on SR29, requesting construction funds for freight trucking purposes. Ms. McLaughlin will provide updates on the status at future Board meetings.

7. Committee Chair Reports

A. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

The CAC Chair was not in attendance to provide a report. Ms. McLaughlin noted that the CAC Chair report is included in the meeting packet.

B. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Ms. McLaughlin noted that the TAC Chair report is included in the meeting packet. Items that may be of particular interest to the Board include the status of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which was endorsed by the TAC [and CAC] but has been distributed for the required 21-day public comment period and therefore not on this MPO agenda for final approval. As a condition for endorsing the TIP, the Lee MPO Executive Director [Don Scott] requested that the Regional Nonmotorized Transportation map be removed,

because he is no longer recommending that the Lee County MPO Board adopt the map. Lee County MPO staff is finding that when pathway projects are identified as “regional” on a map, FDOT requires local maintenance of the facility. Collier County staff acknowledged that they have the same concern. The Collier MPO will need to have follow-up discussions at another meeting because the Board has adopted the [Joint Regional] map, but now Lee County MPO will not. Perhaps the broader issue of trail maintenance can be a discussion item at the next Board meeting, and FDOT can explain its position at that time.

C. Congestion Management Committee (CMC)

The CMC Chair was not in attendance to provide the report. Ms. McLaughlin noted that the report is in the meeting packet.

Chairman McDaniel entertained a motion to accept the reports.

Commissioner Taylor: Move to approve.
Commissioner Fiala: Second.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Regular Board Action (Roll Call Required)

None.

9. Regular Board Action (No Roll Call)

A. Approve Amendment to the FY 16/17-17/18 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Ms. Otero explained that the FY 16/17 – 17/18 UPWP identified the MPO budget and tasks over 2-year period which comes to a close at the end of June 2018. In order for the remaining fund balance to be immediately available for spending in FY 2019, the MPO must de-obligate the estimated amount we want to be available in the next year of the UPWP. The documentation provided in the agenda packet identifies the breakdown of the \$177,000 requested for de-obligation. The agenda packet also includes the amended UPWP pages with revisions noted in strikethrough/underline. Revisions include extending the contract for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan into the next fiscal year; extending the completion date of Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP) to the next fiscal year and revisions to the soft match total amount. The amended MPO Agreement and Resolution are in the packet. The amended UPWP was posted for the required 21-day public comment period. No public comments were received for this item.

Chairman McDaniel entertained a motion to approve the amendment to the FY 16/17-17/18 UPWP.

Commissioner Solis: Move to approve.
Commissioner Taylor: Second.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Presentations (May Require Board Action)

A. Revised Interchange Access Request (IAR) Federal-Approval Process Presentation - FDOT

Secretary Nandam introduced Chris Simpron, Model, Level of Service (LOS) & District Interchange Review Coordinator. Mr. Simpron explained that the new, revised User's Guide results from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) having made a change to interchange justification process. A copy of Mr. Sempron's presentation on FDOT's Interchange Access Request User's Guide is included in the agenda packet. To recap briefly – all new interchange proposals require an Interchange Justification Report (IJR) that addresses FHWA's first two policy points:

- The request does not have a significant adverse impact on the operation and safety of the freeway system.
- The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Approval of an IJR does not guarantee a project's construction.

A Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study will be required to address the remaining six FHWA policy points, leading to approval under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The remaining six policy points are:

- The existing roadway network cannot be improved to handle the current and/or future traffic demand. (PD&E)
- The request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management alternatives. (PD&E)
- The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. (PD&E and NEPA)
- The proposed modification lies within the context of a long-range system or network Plan (NEPA)
- Appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvements. (NEPA)
- The proposal does not have any fatal environmental flaws. (NEPA)

Commissioner Taylor questioned whether there had been a duplication of reporting and analysis which made the process cumbersome.

Mr. Massey responded that PD&E is the stage at which you investigate all preliminary issues to design the project, including environmental concerns, traffic, other issues and the purpose and need for the interchange.

Commissioner Taylor explained that her understanding was that there was a duplication of efforts in the former policy.

Mr. Massey responded that FHWA determined that the PD&E research was effectively required twice under the old system – once as part of the Interchange Justification Report (IJR) and again several years after completion of the IJAR. FHWA decided to remove the six policy points from the initial IJAR process and place them in the subsequent PD&E phase instead, to avoid the duplication. However, this in effect has actually complicated the process because you really don't know if you will need an interchange until the PD&E process is completed.

Commissioner McDaniel expressed appreciation for Mr. Simpron's thorough presentation, saying it had been most informative.

B. Review and Comment on Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Amendment

Ms. Otero introduced the consultant, Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver, noting that there were three public speakers registered to speak on this item.

Mr. Blain's presentation is included in the agenda packet. He provided an overview of the public meeting held on March 15th and comments received to-date; reviewed the process followed to reallocate 2040 socioeconomic data and re-assessed the 2040 Needs transportation network; compared the cost of the two viable options for addressing the need; and explained project scoring and prioritization and suggested changes to the Cost Feasible Plan.

The two alternatives reviewed for the Needs Network involved providing an S-Curve connection between Randall and Oil Well west of Everglades Blvd versus connecting the two arterials by extending Randall to Oil Well east of Big Cypress Parkway. The amendment to the needs network includes adding Big Cypress Parkway at 2 lanes and extending Vanderbilt Beach Road and Golden Gate Blvd to Big Cypress Parkway. The addition of these components to the Needs Network adds between \$144 -\$146 million in total cost. The cost differential between the two alternatives is approximately \$2 million.

Public comments have primarily reflected opposition to the S-Curve Alignment in the County's ongoing Randall/Oil Well Corridor Study. Concerns were also expressed regarding the alignment of the Vanderbilt Beach Road Extension, the use of Impact Fees and required developer contributions, and the loss of wildlife habitat and other environmental concerns.

Referring to the slide showing the additional costs identified for the Needs Network, Commissioner McDaniel asked MPO staff to confirm that the MPO Board would not be voting on anything today. Ms. Otero responded in the affirmative and stated that the report in draft form is posted for public comment. The final will come before the Board in May.

Mr. Blain observed that the MPO hired Tindale Oliver to analyze the impact of the Rural Lands West proposed master plan development on the 2040 LRTP Needs and Cost Feasible networks, and that similar conversations were held with the Board in 2015 during the adoption of the 2040 LRTP. He stated that the amendment incorporates the information coming from the RLW master plan while remaining consistent with the 2040 LRTP control totals for county-wide growth and consistent with methodologies used to determine needs, costs, and priorities. The result is identifying that there are needs to address the additional traffic concerns. He reiterated that socioeconomic data was not pulled from designated high growth areas as part of the reallocation, and that the projected growth within the RLW master plan was capped at 80%. Tindale Oliver then developed a revised needs network and came up with 2 alternatives based on the County's ongoing Randall/Oil Well study, which will ultimately go back to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for approval. That study will look deeply into costs of the two alternatives and since the details are not yet available, Tindale Oliver has provided a conservatively high estimate in anticipation of the more detailed costs coming in within range of, but lower than the planning level estimates.

Mr. Blain responded that the primary factors that dictate how costs are estimated are the current market and recent unit cost per mile and FHWA requirement to determine probable future costs – Year of Expenditure – and factor in inflation.

Commissioner McDaniel commented that the slide showing total 2040 Cost Feasible Plan costs in billions of dollars is daunting, and possibly misleading in that the total costs could be misread as the net increase to the needs plan. He recommended segregating those out, specifying the proposed amendments and the cost associated with the amendment.

Mr. Blain agreed that the slide shows cumulative numbers rather than additive, and continued with the presentation. He explained that the needs must be prioritized because revenues are insufficient to address all of them. He stated that based on the evaluation criteria used in developing the 2040 LRTP, the new projects rank 27-63 out of 69. He added that when the 2040 LRTP was brought to the MPO Board in 2015, the decision was made to remove the widening of Randall Blvd. from 8th Street to Oil Well Rd./Everglades Blvd. and the

extension of Vanderbilt Beach Rd. from 8th to Desoto. The Board asked for the widening of Wilson Blvd between Golden Gate Blvd and Immokalee Road and the extension of Little League Road from SR 82 to Westclox to be added in the place of the removed projects. He stated that the revenue left was put into a local improvement box.

Commissioner McDaniel asked if there was a need to take Vanderbilt Beach Road to Desoto Blvd. now. Mr. Blain responded that further refinements will come through the design process, but as part of this process it is being shown as a need. Mr. Blain continued with the presentation and summarized project updates.

Mr. Blain reported that County staff recommends adding design/mitigation cost for the Randall Blvd Corridor from 8th St to Everglades Blvd in FY 2021-2025; retaining the Local Improvements Box funds of \$122 million identified in the 2040 LRTP. With cost savings anticipated on the Vanderbilt Beach Road extension, the Cost Feasible Plan would have a \$3.5 million positive balance in County revenues.

Mr. Blain concluded his presentation by summarizing public comments received through the public meeting and the 21-day public comment period and providing the remaining project schedule.

Rae Anne Burton, residing at 2530 31st Ave NE, spoke first. Ms. Burton stated that she represented neighbors that could not come and speak themselves because they are working. She distributed hard copies of a petition with 28 signatures to MPO Board members [copies available on request]. Ms. Burton stated that the S-curve will spoil the natural environment and destroy the community. She stated that there is no need for the S-curve, and private property cannot be taken without a valid public purpose, without violating homeowners constitutional rights. She urged the Board to not build any roads crossing dead-end streets, specifically 27th, 29th and 31st. The homeowners of these dead-end streets believe the S-curve is not necessary. She requested that roads that are in place be enhanced and widened. She asked the Board to allow homeowners who would be impacted by the S-curve to live our American dreams where we are and how we are now.

Vicky Standen, residing at 2405 33rd Ave NE, spoke in opposition to the S-curve proposal in the study area. Ms. Standen commented that it sounds like the Board will be voting on the LRTP amendment without a decision having been made regarding the Randall Blvd/Oil Well study area. The S-curve is getting a great deal of attention. She stated that Consulting engineers present at the public meeting [on the LRTP amendment] last month had very detailed plans about how this will be constructed and the fact sheets in the agenda packet state that the S-curve was adopted and may be a 6-lane road, but that is incorrect. She stated that the S-curve was removed from the 2040 LRTP. She commented that according to the required roadway design, which is 4-lanes wide, it would create a large footprint and be raised above all adjacent residential property, causing noise, speed and the disappearance of dead-end streets. She explained that one by one, with each decision the Board makes, it changes the landscape of Golden Gate Estates and that each time the Board votes, it changes the character of her community. She stated that they don't want to be the suburbs. She added that they want convenience and solutions to the traffic problems, but Everglades and Randall can handle the load. She urged the Board to do it right and commented that one vote is not about one road – it's about the dynamics of Golden Gate Estates.

Vito Congine, residing at 2894 31st Ave NE, spoke last, stating that residents have attended each public event where the S-curve has been brought up, having something put upon them that nobody in the neighborhood wants. He stated that the S-curve will bring additional traffic down individual streets, causing everything from speeding to accidents to property damage. He stated that residents already have constant damage of properties, and don't need additional damage. RLW is very important to Collier County; however, the best way to do this, in the resident's opinion, is to widen Randall Blvd. He explained that the widening makes sense, and the easements are already in place to allow for expansion. He felt that RLW is controversial as there is an exponential amount of homes proposed. He stated that residents don't want to see an end to our dead-end street and they don't want the S-curve. He concluded by stating that it doesn't accomplish what he believes the Board of County Commissioners are trying to accomplish.

Commissioner Taylor stated that clarity needs to be provided regarding the fact sheet and the adopted plan. Chairman McDaniel stated that when information provided by staff is being interpreted, staff should be given the opportunity to clarify.

Mr. Blain stated that the 2040 plan process included an evaluation of growth, a assessment of needs, and a determination of what is cost feasible. He added that when the Board was taking action to approve the plan in 2015, they were looking at approving the final step, the Cost Feasible Plan. The decision/discussion was about removing the S-Curve from the Cost Feasible plan, not backing it up and taking it out of the needs. There was still an identification of needs in the corridor, that from a financially feasible perspective was showing that the next step was to conduct a corridor study an evaluation of what should be the preferred alignment. He stated that what was approved in the LRTP still had the need of the S-Curve shown, but funding for the project was removed.

Commissioner Saunders asked what the alternative to the S-Curve is and why is it needed. Mr. Blain responded that when the LRTP was adopted, in 2010 for the horizon year of 2035, it included the extension of Randall to Oil Well Road. When the 2040 Plan was being developed the S-Curve was introduced. He stated that up to the adoption of the 2040 plan, the alternative was continuing to widen Randall and to continue to widen at an angle to Oil Well Road.

Commissioner Saunders asked if staff had any more information on the S-Curve and added that he has an issue with running a major road through a neighborhood.

Ms. Scott reported that County staff is working with Jacobs Engineering to look at multiple alternatives and the S-curve is not the only alternative. Also being considered are - the widening of Everglades and Randall, or just Randall on its own. She explained that there are multiple iterations. She stated that staff is preparing for a public information meeting which will be scheduled in May before school gets out. Staff will present alternatives in a public workshop to get public comment, then review the feedback received and look at narrowing down to an alternative that we think will work and then take that back out to the public and ultimately to the Board of County Commissioners for approval of an alignment. She added that public input has been taken into consideration throughout the study, including all the comments the MPO has received as part of this amendment.

Commissioner Sanders noted that he appreciates staff looking at all alternatives, noting that a sales tax on services is coming up in a couple of weeks and if that is approved by the voters it may provide more flexibility regarding improvements to Randall and Oil Well Road and perhaps help avoid negative impacts on that neighborhood.

Commissioner McDaniel commented that it's the Board's duty to explore all of these alternatives, even if we don't like some of them, and eliminate those that are less feasible from a cost and impact standpoint.

Commissioner Taylor asked who brought the S-Curve forward. Mr. Blain responded that he first saw the S-curve in maps distributed at the LRTP working group convened to develop the 2040 LRTP.

Commissioner McDaniel recalled that the MPO suggested the S-curve. The issue is with Oil Well and the intersection of Oil Well with Immokalee Rd, which is imminently going to fail. He stated that the County doesn't have capacity at that intersection to expand or enhance it, due to development already in place when Oil Well reduces down from 6 lanes to 4, creating a bottleneck.

Commissioner Taylor observed that when a 6-lane road goes through a neighborhood, it ceases to be a neighborhood street and asked what evaluation criteria was applied in developing the Needs Network. She

asked what the criteria was that was used to evaluate projects. Mr. Blain stated that there were six criteria used to evaluate projects, including safety, freight route, and wildlife impact. There are regional criteria that are prescribed by FHWA as planning factors that must be evaluated. Commissioner Taylor asked if the list of criteria includes smart growth and walkable/bike-able aspects.

Mr. Blain responded that based on anticipated growth, the transportation system needed for growth is evaluated. He explained that the smart growth principles happen at an earlier stage when scenarios for growth are considered.

Commissioner Taylor noted that [former FDOT District 1] Secretary Hattaway promoted Complete Streets to a great extent and asked if it remains a priority for FDOT to create a mode of transportation which keeps the neighborhood at the top.

Secretary Nandam responded, from FDOT's perspective, we begin with the LRTP which identifies lines on the map; then we get into the PD&E process which looks at multiple factors, including the factors Commissioner Taylor mentioned. He explained that the next step is to move to the design phase, where there is even more detail on what that facility looks like.

Chairman McDaniel stated that no vote was necessary today. He reminded everyone that this would be brought up for approval at the May meeting.

C. Review and Comment on Draft Policy on Reprogramming Unobligated SU Funds

Ms. McLaughlin presented the draft policy on reprogramming unobligated Surface Transportation – Urban (SU) funds, reminding the Board that she had introduced the topic at the March meeting and was directed to come back with a draft policy, which is on page 124 of the agenda packet. The draft policy has been reviewed and endorsed by the TAC and CAC. With Board direction, Ms. McLaughlin will work with the County Attorney's Office to develop a resolution adopting the policy. The proposed policy considers three factors: 1) FDOT recommends the project be considered for additional funding, 2) the project is either programmed and underway in the fiscal year the SU funds are available or is on a list of prioritized projects waiting for funding; and 3) the designated entity is prepared to meet FDOT's internal deadlines. The standard review process will be followed if timing permits; if not, projects will come straight to the Board for action, possibly as walk-on items if necessary. The main thing is that it is the Board's decision

Commissioner Solis:

Move to direct staff to bring this forward as a formal policy.

Councilwoman Middelstaedt:

Second.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether there would be a dollar amount put on it, stating he would support leaving it open.

11. Member Comments

Commissioner Taylor announced a workshop on BCC for Blue Zones in May. She stated that it will be interesting as we're talking about the development in the eastern portions of the County and as we plan for 2040, it would be helpful to understand what other areas may be doing and what the best practices are moving forward and not build as we've always built. The workshop will introduce planning concepts that are not new and have had success.

Councilman Batte remarked that it had been a pleasure to host the meeting.

12. Distribution Items

A. Golden Gate City Walkable Community Study Public Meeting Announcement

13. Next Meeting Date

A. Regular Meeting – May 11, 2018 – 9:00 a.m. Board of County Commissioners Chambers

14. Adjourn

With no further comments Commissioner McDaniel adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:43 a.m.