

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE of the  
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**January 24, 2022 9:30 a.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

**Ms. Lantz** called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**TAC Members Present**

Lorraine Lantz, Chair, Collier County Transportation Planning

Tim Pinter, Vice-Chair, City of Marco Island

Don Scott, Lee County MPO

Michelle Arnold, Collier County PTNE

Ute Vandersluis, Naples Airport Authority

Dave Rivera, City of Naples (alternate) [arrived item 5]

Allison Bickett, City of Naples [arrived item 7a]

**TAC Members Absent**

Dan Hall, Collier County Traffic Operations

Margaret Wuerstle, Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

Andy Holland, City of Naples

John Kasten, Collier County School District

Tim Brock, Everglades City

Daniel Smith, City of Marco Island

Andrew Bennett, Collier County Airport Authority

**MPO Staff**

Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director

Brandy Otero, Principal Planner

Scott Philips, Principal Planner

Danielle Bates, Administrative Assistant

**Others Present**

Victoria Peters, FDOT

Steve Ludwinski, Corradino Group

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

*Ms. Arnold moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Vandersluis seconded. Carried unanimously.*

**4. Approval of the November 29, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

*Mr. Scott moved to approve the November 29, 2022 meeting minutes. Ms. Arnold seconded. Carried unanimously.*

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

None.

**6. Agency Updates**

**A. FDOT**

**Ms. McLaughlin for Ms. Peters:** FDOT requests that those who submitted projects, enter them into the GAP system to start the constructability review process. There will be GAP training soon.

Members asked about who submits these, if something can be provided in writing and when the training is. Staff answered that the agency submits the projects, the training is January 25 at 10 am and Victoria can send something in writing.

**B. MPO Executive Director**

None.

**7. Committee Action**

**7.A. Elect Chair, Vice Chair**

*Ms. Arnold moved to elect Ms. Lantz as Chair. Mr. Pinter seconded. Carried unanimously.*

**Mr. Pinter:** I will not be able to serve as Vice Chair.

*Ms. Arnold moved to elect Ms. Bickett as Chair. Ms. Lantz seconded. Carried unanimously.*

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

**Ms. Otero:** The main purpose is to recognize the Regional Fare and Services transit planning study on behalf of the Collier County Public Transportation and Neighborhood Enhancement (PTNE) Division. We also reallocated funding within tasks throughout the document. The agenda packet includes an updated appendix for FTA 5305 forms, changes are shown in strikethrough underline and a clean copy.

**Ms. Lantz** asked for clarification on the scope and funding for the 2050 LRTP. **Ms. Otero** clarified that we're just preparing the data collection and scope and no more funding is needed at this time.

*Mr. Scott moved to endorse FY 21-22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment 4. Mr. Pinter seconded. Passed unanimously.*

#### **7.C. Endorse New Transit Priority**

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Presented the Executive Summary. This is a request for the committee to endorse adding the reconstruction of a maintenance building to the 2021 transit priority list. The MPO's Surface Transportation – Urban (SU) FY2022 funds (aka “box”) contains about \$5 million; this would transfer \$3 million to transit. The project was included in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), a former TIP as a rehabilitation project programmed for \$11.275 million in FY 21. It was determined that the building needs to be reconstructed. We are taking this to the Board because we have not previously asked them to prioritize the project for SU funding, and \$3 million is a large amount of money. If the priority is approved, the next step is amending the FY 22-26 TIP to transfer the \$3 million to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) side.

**Mr. Pinter** asked how the price went from \$11 million to \$17 million. **Ms. Arnold** responded that originally it was going to be a rehabilitation project and now it is a total reconstruction project.

*Mr. Pinter moved to endorse New Transit Priority. Mr. Scott seconded. Passed unanimously.*

#### **7.D. Endorse Amendment 4 to the FY 2022–2026 TIP & Authorizing Resolution**

**Mr. Philips:** This is an amendment to the TIP to transfer \$3 million in SU funds to FTA. The packet includes the draft authorizing resolution, TIP page reflecting the transfer and a letter from FDOT requesting the transfer.

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

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

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We're requesting review, comments and hopefully endorsement for the base year data development. The timeline for development is driven by the FDOT District 1 planning model. FDOT requested all MPOs submit base year data by the end of June 2022 originally, after a presentation at a conference, it moved to the beginning of June 2022. Due to the short turnaround, we intend to do the scope as a work order under the General Planning Contract (GPC). Key components of the scope are listed in the Executive Summary. Items 1-6 are familiar from the last LRTP update. Staff can use assistance with the GIS component, and the County is in the process of recalibrating the County Interactive Growth Model (CIGM) to the 2020 census and expects to finish by the end of June. There may need to be some adjustments to back the data up to 2019. We won't be able to deliver by the end of June, the earliest would be sometime in July. The attached checklist identifies the data requested and data sources.

**Mr. Scott:** Can you choose which vendor you want to work with under the GPC?

**Ms. Otero:** We can do "direct select" if the next contractor on the General Planning Contract cannot perform the task. The GPC stipulates a rotation structure - we're required to go to the next consultant on the list and we have to use them if they can do the task. The next firm in the rotation is Stantec.

**Ms. Peters:** "Direct select," what is that?

**Ms. Otero:** The GPC has 5 vendors pre-approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FDOT: Tindale Oliver, Stantec, Jacobs, Capital, and T.Y. Lin. Task orders are issued to the next vendor on the list. If the next vendor is unable to perform a particular task, then we could select another vendor.

**Mr. Peters:** You can go out of order?

**Ms. Otero:** Yes, but we have to provide a reason.

**Mr. Arnold:** The data year is limited to 2019?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** When FDOT first announced the base year, the takeaway was social economic data would be based on the 2020 Census, but traffic and employment data would be based on 2019 conditions due to the effect of COVID and how it altered driving patterns. It's a little less clear to me given the final checklist whether FDOT intends to take population back to 2019. Mr. Scott if you have different read, please speak up.

**Mr. Scott:** They want everything in 2019 – all the data.

**Mr. Rivera:** Who do we send the data to?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Depends on the outcome of the task order – the vendor may make the request or the MPO may.

**Ms. Peters:** FDOT will take the data when they get it.

*Ms. Arnold moved to endorse the Scope for 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Base Year Data Development. Mr. Rivera seconded. Passed unanimously.*

#### **7.F. Review & Comment on Scope for 2050 LRTP**

**Ms. Lantz:** This is not just data but the whole LRTP?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** This is the whole LRTP, but we are not asking to endorse it yet. This is just to review and comment on the scope. Presented the Executive Summary. The County's procurement process takes at least a year, including the MPO's process going through the advisory committees, FDOT, FTA, and FHWA. The scope is written based on the 2045 LRTP development process, with additional information about funding sources and terminology from the new Federal appropriations bill, but it's challenging to scope the project so far in advance of receiving explicit instructions from FDOT and FTA. Highlights include pointing out that the process of developing an LRTP is not sequential – the consultant has to have a team working on multiple components simultaneously. We specify that we need to receive deliverables such as revenue projections up front, early in the process, in order to go through the modeling process, in order to go from identifying needs to determining what is cost feasible. The scope specifies that we want the vendor to use as much of existing LRTP document as possible and not recreate the elements that don't change. The scope calls for extensive public meetings, including regional meetings with Lee MPO. The TAC and CAC led the development of the 2045 LRTP and we anticipate the committees will do so again. We're building in time to meet with the tribes, and calling for six public meetings. The scope adds an element related to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). The MPO and local governments will be eligible for competing grants in major categories such as Infrastructure Resiliency, Transportation Equity, Vision Zero Action Plan for Bicyclists and Pedestrians, and Safe Streets & Roadways for All. The LRTP needs to address those categories even though we have yet to receive any guidance

about what that will entail. Additionally, the scope spells out the importance of working with County and localities to develop the revenue projections and the cost feasible plan. The previous consultant didn't realize how much work it could be.

**Ms. Arnold:** Is the map series information in a shareable format?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Yes. We have GIS shape files. It's time-consuming working with FDOT's modeling team. The model development schedule starts with developing the existing and committed network, then analyzing it against the projected 2050 social economic conditions using the CIGM to test alternative roadway networks. The CIGM factors in population and development data based on existing zoning and master plans and projects going through development review; the base data includes the cities as well as the county. The CIGM is a powerful methodology. We have to cap the population projection to the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBER) small, medium or high projections. We usually use the medium projection.

**Ms. Arnold:** How is transit treated within the modeling?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** It is like what you saw last time with the 2045 LRTP. We can put in transit routes and ridership information and the model can see whether that has a significant effect on congestion. What we learned with an independent study that looked at transit is that what you have to do and commit to in order to get to minor changes in traffic projections are beyond what we can affect, but they will be modeled.

**Ms. Arnold:** I didn't see that.

**McLaughlin:** We can call it out in the scope.

**Mr. Scott:** It depends on how far out the project is, the Transit Development Plan (TDP) may be a start.

**Ms. Arnold:** Whoever reads scope, we want them to know they'll have to look at transit.

**Ms. Lantz:** Where is the TDP-major update referenced in the scope? How will the two plans be coordinated?

**Ms. Arnold:** I was going to ask too; lessons were learned coordinating with that project.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** The scope references incorporating the TDP update and extending it out 10 years. We haven't gotten to when the TDP update is due versus when the LRTP update is

due. FDOT began encouraging coordinating the two plans for the 2045 LRTP, so it's up to staff to stay in sync.

**Ms. Arnold:** Part of issue is the contractor planning out that far.

**Ms. Otero:** That is included in this scope - they are responsible to look out to 2050. As far as the TDP, we're working on the timeline for the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). As part of the overall budget, we will look at how the two documents line up. We are aware that we need to make them coincide and budget for them both at the same time.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We're spelling things out in detail because so much became items of contention last time. We've learned it's difficult with the procurement process to make adjustments - the scope of work you start with is what you finish with even if the whole world changes in the interim. We're aware of changes in the federal appropriation bill. We mention plans we have to coordinate with the development of the LRTP, like the Bike-Ped Master Plan update. We spell out that the consultant needs to use FDOT's costing tools unless more specific information is known. We mention discretionary grants on page 6, transit needs, extending the needs analysis in the TDP to address years 10-20, the requirement to include airport master plans - all of that came into play during the development of the 2045 LRTP. The cost feasible plan is what comes out of all the analysis. We look at revenues and the project evaluation matrix and public input, all the advisory committee, technical staff, and MPO Board input. Another thing we learned is the consultant must include a table of the current TIP in its entirety. The system performance report we can do in-house with data provided by FDOT. The scope is specific on when draft chapters are due. We didn't see chapters until the last 3-4 months during the development of the 2045 LRTP.

**Mr. Scott:** Goals, objectives, planning emphasis, emerging mobility only mentioned here, what are you planning on doing?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We don't know yet, they're new buzzwords coming from FDOT.

**Ms. Peters:** I don't know either.

**Mr. Scott:** Last time we did AV (Automated Vehicle) modeling; Orlando is studying electric vehicles, flying vehicles. The issue with these types of things are how we take them into account. Hopefully mobility on demand is showing benefits in Bonita Springs by then.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We will probably receive clarifications and instructions when there are 6 months to finish the plan.

**Ms. Arnold:** Would it help to have a clause that provides for changes? Did you talk to procurement to add language for modifications as needed and rules changes?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We will have that conversation, there's a possibility of amending if the cost doesn't go over a certain percentage.

**Ms. Peters:** Last LRTP, what you did to provide for after 2045? It was approved in December, but you could still communicate with the vendor for last minute changes, is that included?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** That's included.

**Ms. Peters:** We have people brought on board looking for consistency, they're looking at all MPOs in District 1. They're another set of eyes but sometimes it comes after or when the plan is about to be approved.

**Ms. Lantz:** At minimum, that's helpful. You may have to have an additional option to include anything that changes so there's some wiggle room. From the County perspective, we use the LRTP's cost estimates for our budget estimates and they're very low at this point. It's a concern that you use FDOT's costing tool - it's not the best. Other agencies are having issues.

**Mr. Scott:** If you look at FDOT's website, they have a mechanism to keep up with cost changes, the costing tool is higher than the per mile cost, but that might be old. I'm thinking we need to put more contingency based on what's going on now.

**Ms. Peters:** Work program costs are going up fast, there's been a lot of moving around funds and projects, but we've experienced a lot of phone calls for bids regarding the cost. They may ask to keep more of a buffer in the SU box because of this.

**Mr. Scott:** This is a bid versus an increase in cost issue, it's delayed when you see it.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** We don't need approval yet, but any additional comments are appreciated. It's beginning to sound like we can come back in February for endorsement to include changes pertaining to your comments and meet with procurement to see about the clauses.

## **8. Reports and Presentation (May require Committee Action)**

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



**Mr. Philips:** This is the initial draft of the TIP pages. It was developed using the draft tentative work program released in November and we anticipate the revised work program to be delivered soon, hopefully without a lot of changes. There are projects for transit, highways, bike-ped, aviation, etc. Please review and give comments to me or Ms. McLaughlin. We're bringing forward a draft of the whole TIP in a couple months.

**Mr. Scott:** Are you supposed to have something that says Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)?

**Mr. Philips:** I'm not sure we captured all the SIS references we need to, but we will.

**Mr. Scott:** Pine Ridge Road at I-75 didn't have it. This is way ahead of Lee MPO.

## 9. Member Comments

**Ms. Peters:** Anne sent your [bike/ped priority] project applications to me in November so I could upload them into GAP on your behalf, but that is a conflict of interest, so the County and municipalities need to upload them into GAP. Let me know if I can help.

Members discussed whether or not they've used GAP. Mike Tisch will submit for the County and Ms. Peters will need to contact the BPAC volunteers.

**Mr. Pinter** asked for something in writing discussing this change and **Ms. Peters** agreed to send something.

**Ms. Peters:** Be on the lookout for vetting questions on constructability. It will go back and forth until everyone is at a happy place. They do their own cost estimate.

**Ms. Lantz:** What is the deadline for uploading?

**Ms. Peters:** It passed last week, but they all made it to me so it's okay. I'll get it rolling, I have them and I will move them into the 4P group. They [4P group] don't go into the GAP system.

**Mr. Scott:** Is everyone submitting now? It used to be different times across the state.

**Ms. Peters:** Your priority list isn't due until June so if we can get them uploaded by end of next week, we're fine. I am moving forward with them; they're using it to track Transportation Alternative (TA) eligibility. Central Office asked to track who is receiving TA funds and if we are short on TA funds. I'm in charge of approval and reviews.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** I'm wondering if Central Office is misunderstanding timelines. They're treating it like it's a real submittal for programming when the projects haven't been

approved by Board yet. In a letter from Wayne Gaither, we had until February to submit priority lists, so there must be some confusion.

**Ms. Peters:** It was Central Office that said that. I just wanted to get you updated; you're ahead of the curve, there are ones going in now in Lee County. Looking at the system, no one is aware of the deadline, moving forward the deadline isn't until February. In the past I've still taken late applications. I'm not going to say no, I look at the priority project list, and fund and program them. This is a new process. Lots of people had questions about the GAP system, it will take practice.

**Ms. Bickett:** Circling back to the discussion on cost estimates, can you expand on what you're working on? Projects are scheduled for 2023 but pricing is way off now, when do you expect to hear about that?

**Ms. Peters:** The applications are vetted and go through constructability review, then that cost estimate is put in the draft tentative work program. Sometimes it is more. The 4P group doesn't look at projects already in the work program. The projects coming in 2023 may be going up but we're not reviewing the cost estimate. If they are cost estimated and get higher bids, contact Ms. McLaughlin or Ms. Peters if they are MPO priorities. Lots of times projects are adjusted if a project cost goes up. The MPO has money in the SU box. Anne has the authority to review requests for more funding and take them to the Board, and I'll program more money when the MPO approves. If you know you need more money, come back to us, FDOT doesn't look at Local Agency Program (LAP) projects; municipalities have to come back after bidding, usually it's not much, around \$100,000-130,000.

**Ms. Bickett:** When we put these together five years ago, we didn't expect them to go up so much, we put in a buffer but not this much.

**Ms. Peters:** Usually we don't keep a lot in the SU box like \$400,000-500,000 but now the MPO is going to need to keep more.

**Mr. Scott:** We'll hear about more money from the new bills. They said check back at the end of summer and we may have more money.

**Ms. Peters:** There are also updates in May and June. On July 1 the legislature approves the budget, and the money moves forward. There's some money in the SU box. We'll get a letter and find out about deadlines. I'll send a spreadsheet with the applications that asked for TA funds, how much they requested, and how much they got. They want to know if there are enough funds to cover needs.

**Mr. Scott:** Why not ask us? I'd rather use TA money and save SU money.

**Ms. Peters:** The coder immediately uses TA money because it's constrained. They use TA funds first because SU funds can be used anywhere. FHWA would like to see it, but they don't track it, FDOT asked for traffic management with core applications and TA applications. Eventually all the applications will go in GAP.

Members discussed the resignations of FDOT Secretary Kevin Thibault and City of Naples Streets and Stormwater Director Greg Strakaluse, as they accepted roles as CEO of the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority and City of Bakersfield California Public Works Director respectively.

**Mr. Rivera:** Andy Holland is filling Gregg Strakaluse's role and Allison Bickett is second in command. [Ms. Bickett clarified she is not yet officially the Deputy Director]

**Ms. Bickett:** We are hoping to take the Bike-Ped Master Plan to Naples City Council in February. The request of the City Council was to obtain input and do outreach to residents to get feedback in March. Then we'll be able to get stakeholder input, and hopefully the master plan will be updated in April or May. It will be put in budget in summer. We are moving forward with the recommendation to do a wider pathway on South Gulf Drive. We will need easements. There is meeting for the Paradise Coast Trail on January 26.

**Ms. Arnold:** We have gone through the procurement process for ITS to replace electronics on buses. As a part of that we solicited for signal priority and need to coordinate with the City of Naples.

**Mr. Pinter:** We have three bike-ped projects this summer, 2 out of the 3 got additional funding because the bids came in \$50,000 and \$45,000 higher. Costs were 12% over the previous year.

## **10. Distribution Items**

## **11. Next Meeting Date**

*February 28, 2022– 9:30 a.m. – in person*

***Ms. Lantz adjourned the meeting at 10:58 a.m.***