

**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 25, 2019 Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Ms. Lantz called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Mr. Ortman confirmed that a quorum was present.

TAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Don Scott, Lee County MPO
Lorraine Lantz, Collier County Transportation Planning, Chair
April Olson, Conservancy (*non-voting*)
Ute Vandersluis, City of Naples Airport Authority
Tim Brock, Everglades City
Omar DeLeon, PTNE
Andy Holland, City of Naples
Dan Hall, Collier County Traffic Operations

TAC MEMBERS ABSENT

Daniel Smith, City of Marco Island
Justin Lobb, Collier County Airport
Gregg Strakaluse, City of Naples
Sean McCabe, SWFRPC (*non-voting*)
Michelle Arnold, PTNE
Tim Pinter, City of Marco Island

MPO STAFF

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

FDOT

Victoria Peters, FDOT

OTHERS PRESENT

Wally Blain, Tindale Oliver Associates

3. Approval of the Agenda

Mr. DeLeon moved to approve the Agenda. Second by Mr. Holland. Carried unanimously.

4. Approval of January 28, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Holland moved to approve the January 28, 2019 Meeting Minutes. Second by Mr. Scott. Carried unanimously.

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

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters stated that the request for the misspelling of Jolley Bridge was submitted and the spelling has been corrected, it would be reflected in the adopted Work Program in July. Also, noted that MPO staff has submitted the congestion management project applications to FDOT for review. **Ms. McLaughlin** explained that these are the projects submitted and ranked by the Congestion Management Committee for SU funding in the new 5th year of the TIP -FY2025 and that the project priorities would come before the TAC and CAC for review prior to MPO Board action being taken.

B. MPO Executive Director

None.

7. Committee Action

A. Endorse Amendment to FY2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Ortman noted that FDOT has requested an amendment to FY2019- FY2023 TIP to ensure authorization of federal lands funds and planning consistency. The project is from the Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division of the Federal Highway Administration. The project is to rehabilitate Fritz Rd. in the Florida Panther National Wildlife Refuge at a cost of \$750,000. There was a 21- day public comment period from December 18, 2018 through January 8, 2019; no public comments were received.

Ms. Olson asked what will be rehabilitated on Fritz Rd. **Mr. Ortman** noted that he would get back to her with more information.

Mr. Brock moved to endorsed Amendment to FY2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Second by Mr. DeLeon. Carried unanimously.

B. Endorse Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan

Ms. McLaughlin noted that the appendices for the Plan may be viewed on the MPO website. Additional items added to the draft since the Committee's review last month include: Table of Contents, Executive Summary, additional maps, and adjusted text to reflect Committee comments. Several projects were added to the list of Prioritized Spine Trail Pathway Projects which is Table 10 on page 33; including the Wilson Road connection at the suggestion of County staff – an opportunity to influence the design for extending Wilson Road to connect to the new sports stadium; Golden Gate Parkway added as a Complete Streets project at the suggestion of Commissioner Saunders; and an Enhanced Facility on Lake Trafford Rd extending to the Lake, added at the request of the Immokalee CRA. This project requires additional study due to drainage concerns. Staff is still working on updated costs for Tables 13 and 14 on pages 47 & 48.. **Ms. McLaughlin** reported that the comments received from BPAC for the most part concerned minor corrections and typos. At the BPAC meeting, **Mr. Bonness** mentioned that a shared used path to Logan Blvd between Immokalee and Lee County should be added to the plan, staff is working on getting an accurate location to incorporate that path. The BPAC recommended a substantive change to the document to remove the SunTrail alignment shown in Rookery Bay due to environmental concerns raised by the Conservancy of Southwest Florida and to limit roadway footprints to existing pavement widths on the loop into Marco Island and pavement expansion on the parameters for the loop connection through Marco Island, Isle of Capri and Shell Island Road. There was general consensus that bike lanes could be added to San Marco Road and that the existing pathway on Goodland Road would be included in any modifications to the roadway the County has underway to address the drainage problems there.

Ms. Olson stated that the Conservancy is in support of a non-motorized regional trail system. While looking at the plan she noticed a few alignments for the Southwest Coast Connector that are of environmental concerns. These alignments could have a wetland and hydrologic impact and result in a

mangrove die-off. Ms. Olson stated that some of the trails that are of concern have mangroves on both sides and some of them are in the Deltona Settlement. The Deltona Settlement was agreed upon in the 1980s between the Deltona Corporation and multiple parties. This settlement prevents inappropriate development that would have long term, negative impacts to the environment. The Conservancy is one of five signatories on the settlement agreement. Ms. Olson noted that she spoke with Keith Laakkonen, the program administrator for Rookery Bay, and he mentioned that their management plan states that they don't allow bike paths and that he did not see that changing anytime soon. The Conservancy would like no increase of paved surfaces on Shell Road, Capri Road or Collier Boulevard. Noted that at the BPAC it was stated that the project on Collier Blvd. from San Marco Rd. to Fiddlers Creek will just be restriped in the existing roadway and the Conservancy would be okay with this project because this would not impact the mangroves. Ms. Olson stated that the Conservancy was working with the County on the raising of Goodland Road and noted that water needs to flow between each side of the road. If the path along Goodland was raised it could cause a mangrove die-off. Noted that if any modification is being considered on CR92, the Conservancy would like to look over the specifics of those improvements to make sure the mangroves are not impacted. The Conservancy would like these map segments to be modified before the Master Plan is endorsed.

Mr. Blain stated that at the BPAC a comment was made that they would like to see Everglades City included on the maps as an inset and that revision was made. The scoring on the local road projects has been updated to reflect additional points to a few of Marco Island projects that had already received an engineering review. Mr. Blain noted that the list for local roads opportunities are being defined by investigating where there are gaps next to schools, transit stops and lower income areas that need access to walking and biking opportunities. The Plan includes references and acknowledges the local planning that has been done throughout the community by different agencies. Public comments have been used as an overlay with the technical analysis and used to priorities projects and locations for improved bike/ped facilities on collector and arterials.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that the greenway identified on Figure 14: SunTrail Alignments and Spine Pathway Corridors, page 34, will remain on the Plan from Livingston Rd. to the Rich King Greenway which travels towards US41, at that point it will remain on US41 to Collier Blvd. and make a scenic loop through Marco Island. Noted that the Plan is recommending shoulders and for FDOT to take the lead on safety for US41 east and SR29. Ms. McLaughlin noted that staff is currently working on updating table 13 and 14 on page 47 and 48 to reflect more current cost estimates; noting that there is a great difference in cost between a bike/ped project incorporated in a roadway project and one that is added after the roadway is in place. The stand-alone, retrofitted project will be considerably more expensive than one that is embedded in a roadway project.

Ms. Lantz noted that most of the projects highlighted in the Priorities list in Table 9, page 31 will be expensive fixes and will require right-of- way, which makes those projects not the best fit for [SU] "Box" funding because they would take up a big portion of available funds.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that the project priority table reflects public comments combined with the technical analysis to reflect where the need was the greatest. The Plan is structured to provide flexibility to implementing agencies, which will allow each agency to choose from among the various priority lists [for collector and arterial roads] and local road priorities to bring forward projects for SU funding and have those projects implemented. The more expensive projects could tap into other sources of funds for implementation.

Ms. Lantz mentioned that she was pleased with the updated maps. Ms. Lantz questioned what Table 7, page 28 [Network Gaps – Facility Needs] is reflecting. **Mr. Blain** noted that Table 7 is showing the number of miles identified as having no facility at all or an insufficient facility (such as a paved shoulder or connector sidewalk instead of bike lanes and a shared use path) and of these, the miles of gaps that also meet the equity criterion or the safety criterion, or both criteria.

Ms. Lantz stated that the Plan states that the County will submit five projects, one for each Commission District, noting that on occasions the County will submit projects batched together [in a single district] to facilitate mobilization and for cost effectiveness. **Ms. McLaughlin** stated that the language was recommended by the County Transportation Planning manager, but it can be changed if needed. **Ms. Lantz** noted that the historical Plan had language that referenced that statement as a guideline and not necessarily a requirement. **Ms. McLaughlin** suggested checking in with County TransPlan to be sure, then letting her know if the language needs to be changed. Noted that the purpose of the Plan is to create a comprehensive approach that will lead to developing a continuous system that will start filling in gaps in the network.

Ms. Lantz mentioned that the Spine Trail Project Priorities identified in Table 10, page 33 will not be easy fixes due to some of them having potential issues. **Ms. McLaughlin** noted that the Plan is looking beyond the easy fixes and is taking a comprehensive approach that will take a lot of effort and finding different sources of funds; concurred that the SU “Box” is very limited; noted that MPO staff is hoping to partner with FDOT to address safety concerns and the Complete Streets approach.

Mr. Brock asked if there will be separated [shared use] paths on SR29. **Ms. Peter** noted that FDOT is aware that this is a desire and the need for safety and FDOT is looking into different alternatives while the PD&E is being conducted on SR29.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that FDOT has different guidance when it comes to installing facilities on different roads based on its Context Sensitive Classification system [Table 16 p55 of the Plan.] Staff is working with FDOT and letting them know what the Plan would like to see as reflected in the Design Guidelines Matrix [Table 17, 66]. FDOT noted that in a rural area they prefer wide shoulders instead of separated path. This has been the default compromise on a few state roads, due to the maintenance agreement.

Mr. Hall questioned on what basis the vehicle lane width dimensions on page 67 [Recommended High Speed roadway Cross-Sections] were recommended; having a 9’ foot dimension on roads with speeds of 40 miles or higher can be very dangerous and wouldn’t comply with FDOTs zero fatality goal.

Mr. Blain noted that the graphics should tie back to the design guidelines. These guidelines are based on the condition of the roadways and it builds off FDOTs Complete Streets guidelines. This will allow for guidance to determine the appropriate facilities for bicycle and pedestrian usage, as well as the speed and the volume of the roads.

Mr. Hall recommend that the dimensions be removed from the graphics. **Mr. Blain** noted that the dimensions will be removed, and the table will be updated to accurately reflect the conditions of the roads.

Under committee discussion it was determined to remove the reference to speed and lane-width dimensions on the sample cross sections.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that the Bike-Ped Master Plan will be updated to reflect the changes made to the SunTrail alignment, updated costs and the deletion of the dimension and reference to speed on the cross-sections. **Ms. McLaughlin** stated that staff would like to take the final changes to the Board in March and request approval of the Master Plan.

Ms. Lantz noted that this is the first time the Committee has seen the complete draft and work still needs to be finalized for the Plan to be a complete document.

Mr. Brock moved to Endorse the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan with the changes noted. Second by Mr. DeLeon. Motion carried by a 6-1 vote with Ms. Lantz voting against.

8. Reports and Presentations (May require committee action)

A. Status 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan – Contract, Funding and 2015 Base Year

Ms. McLaughlin stated that contract negotiations are nearing completion for the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Staff anticipated a cost on the order of \$351,000 based on discussions with other MPOs within District 1 and an understanding that the 2040 LRTP had cost on the order of \$300,000. Staff subsequently discovered that the actual cost of the 2040 LRTP totaled over \$600,000. The contract currently under negotiation will cost about \$492,000 to establish a basic plan covering all the required elements in the scope. The cost could go as high as \$590,000 to include optional tasks that would provide more flexibility in responding to public input. These options would be implemented contingent upon needing them as the plan unfurls, allowing staff to do additional data crunching and analyses. Ms. McLaughlin noted that the base amount of \$492,000 could be covered using PL funds made available due to the MPO not having to cover the cost of the D1 Travel Demand Model (\$30,000). The budget to cover optional services could come from tapping into SU box funds. Project number 4051061 in the Tentative Work Program had over a million in SU dollars in it when the Board reviewed the Work Program. The Board asked MPO staff to propose a spend down plan, so those funds would not be lost, FDOT and the County worked together and some of those funds were moved to the Pine Ridge Interchange study. Which left \$500,000 in FY2019/2020. MPO staff would like to use \$130,000 of these funds, but due to an FDOT Work Program rule, the MPO cannot tap into SU when carrying a balance greater than 20% of unspent PL funds. That is the situation the MPO is in, due to saving PL funds over the years to have sufficient budget to pay for the LRTP update. However, MPO staff is working with FDOT to develop a plan to spend down the PL funds to tap into SU funds when they are needed to complete the 2045 LRTP.

Ms. Peters noted that she has reviewed the contract as well as the options that have been discussed with MPO staff, as of now the MPO will be covered for the basics and more.

9. Member Comments

Mr. Hall noted that Collier County has completed the Logan extension and wanted to know when Lee County will finalize their section. **Mr. Scott** noted that he will obtain a time frame and get back to him.

Ms. Olson noted that the Conservancy will be hosting a fundraiser on March 7th.

Mr. Brock stated that Everglades City has been designated a Trail Town.

Mr. DeLeon stated that CAT conducted a BCC workshop with the Commissioners and had the opportunity to discuss what CAT has been up to; positive feedback and recommendations were received from the Commissioners.

Ms. Lantz asked if the SWFRPC member followed up on wanting to be a member on the Committee? **Ms. McLaughlin** noted that she reached out to the Director and asked if they were a voting member would they like to remain on the Committee and she stated that they will be willing to remain on the Committee as a voting member instead of a non-voting member.

10. Distribution Items

None.

11. Next Meeting Date

March 25, 2019 – 9:30 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments or items to attend to, Ms. Lantz adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.