

**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.**

**February 26, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Holland called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**TAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Holland, Chairman, City of Naples Planning  
Dan Hall, Collier County Traffic Operations  
Lorraine Lantz, Collier County Transportation Planning  
Gregg Strakaluse, City of Naples Streets and Stormwater  
Matthew Livinghouse, Collier Public Transit & Neighborhood Enhancement Division (PTNE) (Alternate)  
Tim Pinter, City of Marco Island  
Ute Vandersluis, City of Naples Airport Authority (Alternate)  
Daniel Smith, City of Marco Island Community Affairs  
Debra Brueggeman, Collier County Airport Authority (Alternate)

**TAC MEMBERS ABSENT**

David Ogilvie, Collier County School Board - *Non-voting*  
Don Scott, Lee County MPO

**MPO STAFF**

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

**FDOT**

Victoria Peters, FDOT District 1 Liaison

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Ned Baier, Jacobs Engineering  
Andrea Halman, Immokalee Citizen/BPAC Member  
Dave Rivera, City of Naples  
Bill Gramer, Jacobs Engineering  
Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

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

**Mr. Pinter:**                   **I move to approve the agenda.**

**Ms. Lantz:**                   **I second the motion.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4. Approval of January 29, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Holland entertained a motion to approve the January 29, 2018 meeting minutes.

**Mr. Strakaluse:**           **I move to approve the meeting minutes.**

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

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

None.

**6. Agency Updates**

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters stated that she had nothing new to report on however, she had been working on getting responses to questions from the committees last meeting. She stated, in response to a question from the previous meeting, that as of right now a letter would not be forth coming from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) stating that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will not be held to any punitive actions [resulting from adopting FDOT's Vision Zero Safety Performance Targets.]. Ms. Peters stated that as the department works through this first year with performance measures there should be more direction. Ms. Peters also stated that the interim numbers presented at the last meeting were correct but, FDOT was not putting weight on the interim numbers as they were moving towards Vision Zero. Ms. Peters addressed a question Ms. Lantz asked at the previous meeting concerning any work FDOT was doing at 951 & I-75 and possible impacts that may have to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) amendment. She stated that as of right now, there is an ongoing intersection [interchange] study on I-75 however, they have not found anything that would affect the amendment from moving forward. Ms. Peters also stated that Chris Simpron will be at the April MPO Board meeting on Marco Island, where there would be an opportunity to ask further questions.

B. MPO

Ms. McLaughlin stated that she received an email that morning about an extension of the deadline for the Federal Lands Access Program. She stated that she would forward this email to the committee. Ms. McLaughlin stated that FDOT did an Arterial Safety Study at Airport & US-41 to complete the Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Audit (2015), which FDOT will be presenting at the MPO Board's March meeting. She stated that she would send this out to the committee electronically as it may be of interest to many committee members, the City of Naples in particular.

**7. Committee Action**

A. Review and Endorse 2040 LRTP Amendment Cost Feasible and Needs Plan

Ms. Otero introduced Mr. Blain with Tindale Oliver. She stated that there is a tight timeline associated with this amendment however, the MPO was still on target to adopt the amendment by May. She stated that there have been additional changes since the last meeting and further changes since the agenda packets went out due to timing in coordination with Collier County staff.

Mr. Blain gave a Power Point presentation covering the updates since the committee's last meeting. The presentation covered an update to the Needs Modeling, ongoing coordination with Collier County Transportation Planning (CCTP) staff, cost estimate of the new needs, preliminary project scoring, and the projected schedule. The presentation can be made available to anyone who requests it. Mr. Blain stated that there have been a few corrections to the 2040 needs model based on comments from County staff. Corrections were made to accurately depict conditions on the following:

- SR 29 from I-75 to Immokalee
- Green Blvd from Santa Barbara Blvd to Sunshine Blvd
- Golden Gate Blvd from Everglades to Desoto Blvd

Mr. Blain stated that following the January committee meeting he's received new comments from Rural Lands West (RWL). Those comments have been considered and coordinated with County staff to include in the amendment. Mr. Blain stated that the packet contained 2 alternative networks. He explained that 2 variations of alternative 2 came out of the MPO's coordination with CCTP. Alternative 2a; which includes the Randall/S-Curve/Oil Well corridor, and alternative 3a which includes the Randall Blvd Extension/Oil Well Road corridor and removes the S-Curve. Mr. Blain explained that the County is conducting an ongoing study in the corridor which would determine if the S-curve would be a viable alternative. He stated that both alternatives do seem to adequately handle the traffic demand in the area. Mr. Blain then covered the cost of the additional needs stating that cost was derived using 2015 cost estimates to remain consistent with the 2040 LRTP. Mr. Blain also covered the project scoring and prioritization methodology used by the LRTP working group. He stated that the additional needs ranked between 27 and 63, out of 69 total. Mr. Blain then recapped the remaining schedule activity and opened the floor for questions from committee members.

Mr. Strakaluse asked if transportation impact fees would be used to offset the cost of the new needs. Mr. Blain stated that there would be an assumption about impact fees that would come into play as part of the County's review of the development plan; however, that was not added in and revenues were held constant for the amendment. He stated that the County would address this on a project by project basis.

Ms. Lantz stated that County staff has been coordinating with MPO staff and Tindale Oliver, and had asked for 2a and 3a alternatives. She stated that County staff wanted both alternatives shown as there was an ongoing study in the corridor.

Ms. Halman, public speaker, asked Mr. Blain if there would be any further consideration given to Immokalee Road as it was heavily used. She asked if anything would be done to alleviate the traffic. Mr. Blain stated that he doesn't know of anything currently planned on the north stretch of Immokalee Road. He stated that the County has pushed forward the Vanderbilt Beach extension which would help alleviate east/west travel. Ms. Halman stated that she was concerned that people would not use the extension but would continue traveling on Immokalee Road, which would not solve the congestion issue. Mr. Blain stated that Immokalee was already a 6-lane road and further capacity would be constrained. He stated that we should plan for alternative modes to address the demand through other means. Mr. Blain stated that this is probably something to bring up during the MPO's development of the 2045 LRTP.

Mr. Holland entertained a motion for endorsement of this item. Ms. McLaughlin stated that endorsement was not necessary for this item because no action was requested due to some of the information arriving in late.

B. Review & Endorse De-Ob of FY 18 PL Funds

Ms. Otero stated that the MPO was getting ready to close out the existing Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) agreement with FDOT. She stated that as part of the closeout, the MPO can choose to de-obligate funding to move funds to next year. Ms. Otero stated that if the funding was not de-obligated it would not be available in the following year. Ms. Otero stated that there may be tweaks to what was included in the committee's packets as staff was still coordinating with the County Grants Office. Ms. Otero stated that this would go to the MPO Board for adoption in April. She explained that there would be an additional \$6,000 de-obligated for the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) which will allow the deadline for the plan to be extended to the first quarter of next fiscal year. Ms. Otero stated that the total request is \$132,000 for de-obligation.

Mr. Strakaluse asked why \$15,000 was de-obligated under Congestion Management. Ms. Otero stated that this was done because the Congestion Management Process was updated in-house. She stated that the MPO was anticipating using the funds to help cover the cost of producing a Transportation Systems Performance Report in the following year.

Ms. Lantz asked why money was moved away from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) task. Ms. Otero stated that the TIP was done in-house this year which saved the MPO time and money. Ms. Lantz questioned whether more staff time was required as a result. Ms. McLaughlin stated that MPO staff spent more time last year trying to coordinate with DTS and resolve discrepancies between what the consultant produced and FDOT's snapshots than was spent this year building the TIP in-house.

Ms. Otero stated that the only other change she foresaw was adding funding to the regional coordination task within the coming months.

**Ms. Lantz: I move to endorse based off of whatever the Grants Office says, understanding that it may change based on Grants Office numbers.**

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

**Mr. Pinter: I oppose.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED 8:1.**

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

A. Review Draft 18/19-19/20 UPWP

Ms. Otero stated that this was a first draft of new Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). She stated that the new UPWP would become effective July 1, 2018 and go through June 30, 2020. Ms. Otero stated that most of the available funding for consultant services would be going to the 2045 LRTP. Other tasks include a Systems Performance Report, a Transit Development Plan (TDP) update, a Park and Ride Study, and a Transit Impact Analysis. Ms. Otero stated that this was a first look at the new UPWP and it would be coming back to the committee for another review. She also stated that a 21-day public comment period was necessary for this item, which will go for approval by the MPO Board in May.

Ms. Lantz stated that the MPO is currently understaffed and asked if Ms. McLaughlin was still holding a vacancy for a Planner. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the MPO has a great need for a GIS expert on staff and that she'd love to get a technical planner on board. She stated that the reason the position hasn't been filled is because the MPO's budget was very tight and a large chunk would be going to the 2045 LRTP. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the cost of filling the position with benefits leaves little to no funding available for consultant

services. Ms. Lantz questioned the item pertaining to hiring an Intern. Ms. McLaughlin explained that she has been approached by a graduate student in planning who is interested in interning for the MPO. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she was in early stages of asking County Human Resources (HR) what the process is to hire an intern over the summer. She stated that taking an intern on would give her a good sense of how much time the MPO would require for GIS services, whether another planner is needed full-time. Ms. McLaughlin stated that HR informed her the intern program with the County is geared to High School students and that she should consider the job banking program instead.

Ms. Lantz asked if the MPO was updating the functional classes as this was included on page 11 under task 2 data collection. Ms. McLaughlin stated that this was carried forward as a task that is typically in the UPWP, should instances come up where the MPO does have to look at the functional class. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she has no intention of updating functional class at this time, other than looking into the need for GIS data.

Ms. Lantz stated that under task 4, LRTP, the word “potential” was used for participation with Lee MPO in and origin / destination study and a potential Vulnerability Assessment. Ms. McLaughlin stated that as Lee MPO becomes more certain with their origin/ destination study then Collier MPO would take out the word potential. She stated that the Vulnerability Assessment topic would be discussed later in the agenda under the scope for the 2045 LRTP.

Ms. Lantz stated that she had other general comments and would forward those to Ms. Otero.

#### B. Review Draft Scope for 2045 LRTP

Ms. McLaughlin stated that the LRTP has many elements that were required and repeated every time an LRTP is updated. She stated that she referred to task orders written for the 2040 LRTP and a list of federal requirements along with comments received from the TAC, MPO Board, and updates from the FDOT concerning automated/connected vehicles as a starting point for drafting the Scope. Ms. McLaughlin explained that the draft Scope would go before the Board at their March meeting

Ms. McLaughlin focused on initiatives in the Scope for the 2045 LRTP that were not in the 2040 Plan.. She stated that two Board members previously expressed interest in doing a Vulnerability Assessment for the transportation system. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the Collier County Community Housing Plan had recommendations geared to transportation and this should be included in the LRTP. She also stated that the MPO’s Congestion Management Process (CMP) recommends scenario testing which would also be included. Ms. McLaughlin opened the floor for questions and comments.

Ms. Lantz expressed concern that the MPO would be overlapping with the County’s Vulnerability Assessment. There was a consensus amongst committee members that the MPO should only be incorporating this as a reference because conducting a Vulnerability Assessment would take a lot of time and funding. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the County’s study was still a long way out for completion (three years). She stated that Board members would like some acknowledgment of the vulnerability of our coastal resources included in the LRTP and therefore could not drop it out entirely. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she needed to know the committee’s priorities and thoughts before bringing this before the Board.

Discussion ensued amongst committee members. Members expressed concerns with the MPO taking this task on and expressed that it would be best for the MPO to integrate whatever the County was already doing for this. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she would convey this to the MPO Board. She stated that realistically this sort of study would consume the entire LRTP budget.

Mr. Strakaluse stated that the City of Naples was proceeding with a Storm Water Master Plan update which included a plan to address climate adaptation and impacts to City infrastructure, including roads and bridges. He stated that the Storm Water Master Plan would conclude in the summer and then the City would proceed with a plan for adaptation that would take approximately 2-years.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that she would convey to the Board that it may be best to wait for the next update of the LRTP (2050) to say very much about vulnerability assessments; this would allow for inclusion of information from the City of Naples and Collier County studies on the topic.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that this would come back to the committee in March with some clarification on these items. She stated that there was a public involvement portion to be done as well. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she'd like to re-emphasize the roles of the MPO's various advisory committees. She stated that she would not currently be proposing a stakeholder committee and that the major vetting and coordination would come from the TAC' with extensive public outreach and involvement. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the MPO was learning about what avenues achieved effective community comment.

Ms. Lantz pointed out a typo on page 3 where the document states "CTST", it should be "CMC." Ms. McLaughlin noted this.

Ms. Lantz asked for an explanation of how the TAC would meet for the LRTP since there would be no stakeholder group this time around. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she may have to ask the committee to have some extended meetings or special meetings. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she picked up the sense that the stakeholder group was not quite as inclusive of technical expertise as staff felt was needed, therefore, she believed this was a way to fix that issue. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the MPO has a robust Public Involvement Plan and if used well, along with innovations on reaching the public, it would serve its purpose.

Mr. Holland stated that there was a blank bullet at the top of page six. Ms. McLaughlin noted this.

### C. Review Draft Narrative & Project Sheets for FY 19-23 TIP

Mr. Ortman stated that staff was seeking the committee's review and comment on the item. He stated that this year the entire TIP was produced in-house. Mr. Ortman stated that Attachment 1 was the narrative, which included a new section for safety performance measures. He stated that there were several sections highlighted in yellow, indicating these were the sections that still needed to be updated. Mr. Ortman stated that Attachment 2 contained the project sheets. He stated that while these were in the same format, their order was changed to match that of the FDOT Work Program; alphabetically by street name/project name. Attachment 3 was a set of composite maps that were color coded for the types of project. Attachment 4 was a spreadsheet used internally that organized the projects into 10-different categories. Mr. Ortman stated that the project sheets were based on a November 27<sup>th</sup> snapshot from DOT and that there will be another snapshot released this week which is what the MPO would use to finalize the TIP. Mr. Ortman stated that this would come back before the committee at their following meeting. He asked the committee if the order of the project sheets worked for them and then opened the floor for comments and questions from the committee.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that the spreadsheet in Attachment 4 could be provided to the committee so that they can sort through projects in whatever manner they prefer.

Mr. Ortman stated that in prior renditions of the TIP the format for project sheets was different. He asked if the committee would like to maintain that order or the order presented in their packets.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that DTS had provided an interactive capability where you could search and an automatic report would be generated. She stated that while the MPO does not have that capability this year, FDOT already provides this capability in the form of an interactive map posted on its website.

Ms. Lantz asked if there was a shift away from DTS amongst other MPOs. Mr. Ortman stated that many MPOs have moved away from DTS this year. Ms. Peters stated that it seemed many MPOs were experiencing glitches with DTS. Ms. McLaughlin stated that FDOT has expressed to her that they are neutral about whether or not MPOs should use DTS. She stated that many MPOs were completing their TIPs in-house, including one MPO in particular that received acknowledgement from FHWA during their federal certification review for having an excellent TIP. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the decision seemed clear to her after this research.

Ms. McLaughlin stated that if the committee had no preference as to how project sheets were arranged, staff would go with their instincts and get feedback from the MPO Board. She stated that a few minor cleanups still needed to be done and that staff was updating the funding status of project priorities included in the TIP. Ms. McLaughlin stated that staff was coordinating with FDOT on whether the MPO can take the lead on the County-wide Strategic Highway Safety Plan. She stated that this may put the MPO out of compliance with a formula FDOT has developed and staff was still waiting to hear from FDOT about that. She stated that she did not anticipate major changes unless FDOT's snapshot vastly changed.

Ms. Peters stated that she had had several conversations with Alex [Gramovot] at FDOT, regarding the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) project. He informed her that all capital/non-capital projects using federal funds needed to be included in the TIP. Ms. McLaughlin pointed out that still left the question regarding the UPWP unanswered. Ms. Peters stated that FDOT was still working on the formula and she'd provide more information as it was given to her. Mr. Ortman stated that the only change [to the SHSP in the TIP] would involve the planning agency being either the MPO or Collier County. Ms. Peters stated that if a change to the planning agency needed to be made after adoption it would be considered a modification and not an amendment.

#### D. Review City of Naples & CC TMC Co-location study

Ms. McLaughlin stated that this was brought up from a Board member representing the City of Naples who participated in a tour of Collier County's Traffic Management Center (TMC). She stated that the Board remains interested in discussing this topic and Councilwoman Penniman requested that the co-location study report be brought before the Board. Ms. McLaughlin stated that the report was completed by FDOT at the request of the City of Naples to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of co-location. She stated that the report recommends co-location. Ms. McLaughlin then opened the floor for questions and comments.

Mr. Strakaluse thanked FDOT for conducting this study. He stated that both TMCs had different levels of service (LOS) to uphold for their individual communities. Mr. Strakaluse stated that having two separate facilities provides some redundancy which would be beneficial if something were to happen to one facility. He stated that the City of Naples wholeheartedly supports sharing of video and data and believes that's the way to go. Mr. Strakaluse stated that the City has been working with the County and FDOT to set up fiber connections between the entities. Mr. Strakaluse stated that the term co-location had varying interpretations. He stated that if this was a matter of putting a person from each entity in one room that would be fine, however, if it is indeed to consolidate both TMCs into just one, that is worrisome. Mr. Strakaluse stated that there are difficulties in consolidation in terms of ownership of equipment and operational procedures. He stated that the report discusses project constraints that would arise from co-location. Mr. Strakaluse stated that he understands that there may be some cost savings for FDOT in consolidating facilities however, the City of Naples mostly funds their own facility with tax dollars supplemented by the State. He stated that because of these

reasons the City of Naples believed it would be best to maintain separate TMCs. Mr. Strakaluse then introduced Mr. Dave Rivera.

Dave Rivera, Street & Traffic Operations Supervisor for the City of Naples, stated that the City is not in favor of co-location. He stated that this study had taken on many different forms and definitions. Mr. Rivera stated that co-locating in one facility outside of the City would decrease their level of service.

**Mr. Strakaluse:**                   **I introduce a motion, from a technical perspective, to move forward with sharing data and video but not necessarily endorse the co-location study on the technical reasons I've stated.**

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

Mr. Pinter asked what changed from the original application where the City of Naples seemed to support this. Mr. Strakaluse stated that the City put in this application for the study because there were many questions yet to be answered on the issue of co-location.

Mr. Holland called the motion to question.

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**9. Member Comments**

None.

**10. Distribution Items**

None.

**11. Next Meeting Date**

March 26, 2018 – 9:30 a.m. Growth Management Department – Conference Rooms 609/610

**12. Adjournment**

Mr. Holland entertained a motion for adjournment

**Mr. Smith:**                       **I move to adjourn.**

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:10 A.M.**