

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE of the
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MEETING MINUTES
January 24, 2022 2:00 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Mr. Gelfand called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Bates called the roll and confirmed a quorum was present.

CAC Members Present

Neal Gelfand
Karen Homiak
Dennis DiDonna
Rick Hart
Fred Sasser
Suzanne Szymanski

CAC Members Absent

Pam Brown
Robert Phelan
Katelyn Harrington
Josh Rincon

MPO Staff

Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director
Brandy Otero, Principal Planner
Scott Philips, Principal Planner
Danielle Bates, Administrative Assistant

Others Present

Victoria Peters, FDOT

3. Approval of the Agenda

Ms. Homiak moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Sasser seconded. Carried unanimously.

4. Approval of the November 29, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Homiak moved to approve the November 29, 2021 meeting minutes. Ms. Szymanski seconded. Carried unanimously.

5. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters: I received the applications for the next cycle of the draft tentative work program [2024-28]. The cycle starts over again each year, the tentative work program is approved annually by the governor and then sent to the MPOs, right now FDOT is doing constructability reviews for applications received for the upcoming cycle. The next draft tentative work program should come out in November.

- Deleted: gets
- Deleted: governor, and
- Deleted: sent
- Deleted: out
- Deleted: they're
- Deleted: , t

B. MPO Executive Director

None.

7. Committee Action

7.A. Endorse FY 21-22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment 4

Ms. Otero: Presented Executive Summary in the Agenda Packet.

Ms. Homiak moved to endorse FY 21-22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment 4. Ms. Szymanski seconded. Passed unanimously.

7.B. Endorse New Transit Priority

Ms. McLaughlin: Presented the Executive Summary. We have \$5 million in our SU box and we don't like to leave money on the table. This project has a history as it was initially funded as building rehab project in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). But after a deeper analysis and changes to the building code it made more sense to redevelop the entire building. We are bringing this item to the board on a technicality, since the funding being transferred is \$3 million we want to be transparent and take it through the committee process and to the Board for approval. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has endorsed the project. The next step if you agree with adding the project to the transit priority list is to endorse the TIP amendment.

- Deleted: history
- Deleted: a
- Deleted: a
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: but
- Deleted: means
- Deleted: build a new
- Deleted: its
- Deleted: o the committees
- Deleted: ly
- Deleted: did vote to endorse this
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: and
- Deleted: significant to
- Deleted: We
- Deleted: get
- Deleted: , funding
- Deleted: ies
- Deleted: demonstrates

Mr. Gelfand: What does SU stand for?

Ms. McLaughlin: SU is a federal funding category, it is the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. Urban, its funding provided to MPO areas with a population of 200,000 or more. The MPO receives certain allocations to program more assertively through our project priority process.

Ms. Homiak moved to endorse New Transit Priority. Mr. Sasser seconded. Passed unanimously.

7.C. Endorse Amendment 4 to the FY 2022–2026 TIP & Authorizing Resolution

Mr. Philips: Presented Executive Summary. Follows up 7.B. This item includes the draft resolution, signature page, the TIP page that shows the transfer, and FDOT letter requesting the action. This amendment was endorsed by the TAC.

Ms. Szymanski moved to endorse Amendment 4 to the FY 2022–2026 TIP & Authorizing Resolution. Mr. Hart seconded. Passed unanimously.

7.D. Review & Endorse Scope for 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Base Year Data Development

Ms. McLaughlin: Presented Executive Summary. The timeline for updating the LRTP occurs every 5 years, it is driven by FDOT’s process of developing a regional planning model. FDOT asked us to submit base year data by the beginning of June, we’ve been in communication with FDOT about the submittal date since we’re using the Collier Interactive Growth model (CIGM). The County is updating and calibrating the model to the 2020 census. We anticipate that the CIGM update will be done by June, and that the earliest we can provide the data to FDOT is July. The TAC voted to endorse this item. The hope is to use our general planning contract so we can begin data collection immediately. There’s a GIS component, and lots of data to gather from various agencies, like traffic counts. The details are in the attachment. The last LRTP initial draft was prepared in house, and it had to be cleaned up a lot by the vendor.

Ms. Szymanski: Last time there was lots of debate about data and where it came from. It’s more sensitive because Collier growth data is jumping the past 18 months we had a large influx of new residents. The last LRTP had a mechanism to recalculate for the planning horizon, will we start with 2020 data and include a mechanism to account for growth rates?

Ms. McLaughlin: It’s all estimated, the base year simply sets the starting point. Backing it up to 2019 is as good as we’ll get. Then we use the Bureau of Economic Research and Business Research (BEBR) projections, which is a credible source. It provides low, medium, and high population estimates. We use the medium population estimate. You may be remembering that the CIGM projects to build out, so we have a good sense of what to expect by using that, but we’re required to plan towards a reasonable population projections provided by widely accepted experts and are required to stop at 2050. There’s some judgement involved; we should have a consultant on board to do the analysis shortly.

Mr. Gelfand: Do we look backwards at how accurate the assessments were? A post analysis to see if data is reliable and valid?

Ms. McLaughlin: Depends, who you mean by we? I would say every entity that does projections, social economics, traffic, etc., they ask how close did we hit it? BEBR and the Census do. I did it for fun looking at the 2010 Census data, BEBR medium projections, the CIGM, and the 2020 Census data, it showed that the BEBR medium projection was very close. But who can predict what happened with COVID? If you update every 5 years, it’s gives us a chance to recalibrate.

Mr. Gelfand: If you plan, plan often.

Mr. Sasser: Under the model features there are three airports, but it doesn’t include Immokalee. I thought it was planned to expand for freight.

- Deleted: that because
- Deleted: and they’re
- Deleted: it
- Deleted: and that will be
- Deleted: in
- Deleted:
- Deleted: get
- Deleted: the
- Deleted: someone
- Deleted: can start on
- Deleted: ing information
- Deleted: L
- Deleted: we got the first draft
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: L
- Deleted: so
- Deleted: have
- Deleted: nother
- Deleted: have
- Deleted: , that
- Deleted: suggestions
- Deleted: go
- Deleted: with
- Deleted:
- Deleted: someone
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: from 2010 and
- Deleted: and what it projected and
- Deleted: what
- Deleted: G
- Deleted: told us
- Deleted: what
- Deleted: told us all for 2020
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: T

Ms. McLaughlin: Immokalee is one of the county airports, we will get data for all three county airports, Immokalee, Everglades City, and Marco Island, and we'll get data for the Naples airport. The handout you're referring to is from FDOT, we we'll let them know to include Immokalee.

Deleted: from the ... or all three of their ... county airports, Immokalee, Everglades City, and Marco Island, and we'll get data from the City of ... the Naples for their ... airport. The handout you're referring to is from FDOT, we we'll let them know to include add

Ms. Homiak moved to endorse Scope for 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Base Year Data Development. Ms. Szymanski seconded. Passed unanimously.

7.E. Review & Comment on Scope for 2050 LRTP

Ms. McLaughlin: Presented the Executive Summary. This is more complicated and far more reaching than the scope. This item is for the development of the entire 2050 LRTP. We're starting early because we learned that it takes about a year to get through the county's procurement process for a contract this large, and getting through reviews from FDOT, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and committees and the Board as well. We developed a draft scope of work building on the 2045 LRTP scope and filling in gaps and things we didn't get right last time, and we are introducing language we anticipate will be included in the current federal transportation bill. It's very lengthy and detailed, last time we didn't specify certain items and they did not get done, that's how contract scopes work with vendors. The TAC did endorse the item. We need data early in the process to develop the model, describe needs to develop cost feasible estimates, while specifying that we want the vendor to use as much of the existing plan as possible and not recreate everything—we paid a lot for the 2045 LRTP and only certain things have changed since it was adopted. Vendors like to brand and start over with new charts and graphics, some of those items do not need to change or be updated. There is also a number of public meetings included in the scope, including regional meetings. The TAC and CAC drove the public involvement process and we anticipate working with these committees to lead that process again. We're including time to meet with the tribes, and to hold six public outreach meetings. We're not asking for your endorsement at this time; you may want to spend time to review the scope and ask questions at the next CAC meeting. The TAC provided comments and asked us to emphasize transit in the modeling phase, which we will do. We will bring this item back to the February TAC and CAC meetings to begin the year-long procurement process.

Deleted: doing it ... starting early because we learned that it takes about a year to get through the county's procurement process for a contract this large, and getting through reviews from FDOT, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and committees and the Board as well. We developed put together ... draft scope of work building on the 2045 LRTP scope and filling in gaps and things we didn't get right last time, and we are beginning to ... introducing e ... language we anticipate will be included in the coming out of the ... current federal transportation bill. It's very lengthy and detailed, last time is ... e didn't specify certain items; ... and they it ... id n't ... ot get done, that's how contract scopes work with contract with ... vendors. The TAC did endorse the item. Highlights include: have to point out this is not sequential but they have to have a team working on things simultaneously, we ... e need data early in the process info up front early ... o develop the model, go through the modeling process, ... describing ... needs to develop cost feasible estimates, while specifying that we want the vendor to use as much of the existing plan as possible and not recreate everything—we paid a lot for the 2045 LRTP and only certain things have changed since it was adopted. , v ... vendors like to brand and start over with new charts and graphics, some of those items do not need to at doesn't ... hange or be updated. There is are ... Iso a number of extensive ... ublic meetings included in the scope, including regional meetings. The TAC and CAC drove the public involvement process this last item ... nd we anticipate doing ... orking with these committees it ... o lead that process again. We're including building in ... ime to meet with the tribes, and to hold six 6 general ... ublic outreach meetings. We're not asking for your endorsement at this time; you may want to spend time to review the scope and ask questions at the next CAC meeting next time. ... The TAC provided gave us some ... omments and ... sked us to emphasize transits ... in the modeling phase, ... which we will do. We will so, and ... ring this item come ... ack to the February TAC and CAC meetings at the February meetings to begin the year-

Mr. Gelfand: Is this sort of thing going to bid or using the former vendor?

Ms. McLaughlin: We must follow the county's procurement requirements and use an open-ended procurement process for federal grant money. We work closely with county procurement office, and we also coordinate with county grants office to make sure we are meeting all the procurement requirements. This projected costs is around \$900,000, that cost is above the amount that could be considered to use an expedited process. The base year data collection will use our general planning contract.

Deleted: from everyone ... nd to follow ... se an open-ended procurement process for federal grant money. We work closely with county procurement office, and we also have to coordinate with county grants office to make sure we are meeting ... all the procurement requirements. correct laws. This projected costs is so much, maybe ... round \$900,000, that cost it ... s beyond ... ove the amount that what ... be considered to use an expedited process. The base year data collection will use uses a

Mr. Gelfand: Does working on a prior plan give them a leg up for the next one?

Ms. Otero: Only on the basis that they could put together a better proposal. When you put out request for professional services, each consultant will prepare and submit a proposal to the MPO, and the selection committee will review it. Consultant proposals are evaluated by what is submitted, and not past knowledge or experience. The scores are based on the evaluation, and references provided in the proposal.

Deleted: of these ... onsultants ... will prepare and submit a proposal to the MPO, and the selection committee will review it. You have to use the ... onsultant proposals are evaluated by what is submitted, and not past knowledge or experience. The s, and you s ... ores are based on the evaluation at ... and based on what they put for

If the consultant puts together a great team and has a good proposal it should help, if they don't sell it in the proposal, well then no, they must show you the work they are proposing to do.

Mr. DiDonna: When we hire the consultant will they tell us what they need, or we tell them? Is it based on data?

Ms. Otero: The scope is us telling them you're giving us this, everything is based on data and modeling.

Ms. McLaughlin: As we move from a needs plan - driven by data on population where are we growing, can roads and transit handle it, or is it weak and congested, however that's not the only factor. One must also focus on the cost feasible plan, take in project evaluation metrics, goals and objectives, practical needs, and other things that are difficult to quantify like preservation of the environment, enhancing connectivity, and promoting transportation travel options. Another factor is addressing public comments and CAC and TAC comments. It's often difficult to consider or add something to the plan that we did not include with the initial scope, Some items in the plan, did not come from technical staff or consultant, rather they were included, because of committees like the CAC and TAC. There's an art to this and collaboration is fundamental to the process. Funding costs are high and planning so far out is difficult, and regulations guiding the process are huge. It's true that the plan is data driven, and we're evaluated on that, but there's still a human element, what do people want and value?

Mr. DiDonna mentioned his concern that the Railroad has not been purchased due to rising costs. Additionally, he advocated for a bypass like the Sawgrass Expressway. **Ms. McLaughlin** discussed the lack of funding and regulations that restrict planning efforts. Additionally, she discussed that planning for matters of convenience often fall short of the mark when evaluating against other projects that address larger issues such as system failures in congestion management and major safety issues. **Mr. DiDonna** inquired about a sales tax increase or using impact fees from the Naples One Project. **Ms. Homiak** added that these issues must go through the Planning Commission and that occasionally the BEBR numbers are wrong such as in 2007/2008. **Ms. McLaughlin** clarified that this would be a County issue not an MPO issue.

8. Reports and Presentation (May require Committee Action)

8.A. Draft Project Sheets FY23-27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Philips: Presented Executive Summary. This is the initial draft of the TIP project sheets; they were developed using FDOT's draft tentative work program issued in November. We're trying to get ahead of the game and are asking you review them and share comments with Scott or Anne.

Ms. Szymanski: Where do we go to find more project details?

Mr. Philips: We try to include as much detail in the that in project descriptions. However, we are limited to what we are provided by FDOT.

Deleted: y

Deleted: ve

Deleted: what

Deleted: people

Deleted: are

Deleted: going to

Deleted: —

Deleted: —

Deleted: matric

Deleted: is

Deleted: all the

Deleted: hard and discouraging process

Deleted: then

Deleted: didn't make the way in

Deleted: things

Deleted: did make it in

Deleted: n't

Deleted: the

Deleted: and

Deleted: some things are in

Deleted: yours

Deleted: ,

Deleted: high and

Deleted: is so

Deleted: long range

Deleted: it has to be

Deleted: plus laws that

Deleted: abilities,

Deleted: and

Deleted: lose to

Commented [B1]: This is from the notes, it's a long tangent so I cut a lot but if you want more its in here

Deleted: : aswe move from needs plan, well driven by data population where are we growing can roads and transit handle it or are you weak, congestion maps, that's not only factor as you most to cost feasible, take in project eval

Formatted

Deleted: sheets,

Deleted: it was

Deleted: the

Deleted: s

Deleted: .

Ms. Peters: The TIP is built using the tentative work program. It feeds from project priorities. I can give more information from the application. If it's programmed for design and construction, we'll tell you, if they've already been designed, we have a better idea of what's happening. The projects in the TIP came through the committees, but we can dig for more information.

Deleted: from

Deleted: construction

Deleted: They

Mr. Sasser: Send queries through the MPO?

Ms. Peters: It's good to copy the MPO, they should know too, because all projects come through them.

Deleted: s

Deleted: Next year the projects will be projects that I've seen since I've been here.

Mr. Philips: Programming must be identical to the STIP, as part of the federal review. In programming you want to provide a broad spectrum in the project description, things often change so you want leverage and leeway to adjust for changes that otherwise would slow down project delivery.

Deleted: It

Deleted: reflect

Deleted: lly

Deleted: a

Deleted: own

Mr. Gelfand: Did someone ask for the sidewalk project on Vanderbilt Drive? How does it get started, approved by community? Part of deal with developer? Is there a history that would be useful?

Ms. Otero: The projects go through a prioritization process, bike-pedestrian projects go through BPAC, and are usually submitted by the County and sometimes the cities. They're evaluated and ranked, then provided to the advisory committees and MPO Board for additional evaluation prior to approval. Once they are approved by the committees, the MPO Board and FDOT, they are then eligible to be programmed in the TIP. The vetting process is very thorough.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: then they through the

Deleted: , and through FDOT. Once they're in

Deleted: they've been

Deleted: hly vetted

9. Member Comments

Ms. Szymanski: Has there been planning for the US 41 and Davis triangle, the intersection is a mess?

Ms. Otero: That's a CRA issue not the MPO.

Ms. Lantz: They came in and it fell apart. If the project comes back, it has to go through the Planning Commission, then the Board of County Commissioners. There will be a traffic impact statement. It involves the Planning Commission, Comprehensive Planning, and Zoning. If it's approved by them, then it's in line with the LRTP. They're allowed to bring the project back to the Commission and they have to pay impact fees etc. If they're vested they can do it, that's why the county looks after it and make changes.

Deleted: y

Deleted: in

Deleted: er

Deleted: inline

Deleted: ,

Ms. McLaughlin: It's all restricted by laws.

Ms. Homiak: For 30 years it's been redone, this is the best it's ever worked.

10. Distribution Items

None.

11. Next Meeting Date

February 28, 2022– 2 p.m. – in person

Meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

