

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE of the
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MEETING MINUTES
February 28, 2022 9:30 a.m.**

1. Call to Order

Ms. Lantz called the meeting to order at 9:31 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 Brock, Everglades City

Michelle Arnold, Collier County Public Transit and Neighborhood Enhancement (PTNE)

Ute Vandersluis, Naples Airport Authority

Allison Bickett, Vice Chair, City of Naples

Don Scott, Lee County MPO

Dave Rivera, City of Naples

TAC Members Absent

Dan Hall, Collier County Traffic Operations

Tim Pinter, City of Marco Island

Andrew Bennett, Collier County Airport Authority

Daniel Smith, City of Marco Island

Margaret Wuerstle, Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council

MPO Staff

Anne McLaughlin, Executive Director

Brandy Otero, Principal Planner

Scott Philips, Principal Planner

Danielle Bates, Administrative Assistant

Others Present

Victoria Peters, FDOT

Bill Gramer, Jacobs Engineering

Steve Ludwinski, Corradino Group

3. Approval of the Agenda

Ms. Arnold moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Brock seconded. Carried unanimously.

4. Approval of the January 24, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Arnold moved to approve the January 24, 2022 meeting minutes. Ms. Bickett seconded. Carried unanimously.

5. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Ms. Peters: As of this morning, we were advised the Work Program development is going to the Legislature. There was a snapshot taken February 15th that was the TIP download file and another more accurate one will be taken on April 11th. Bessie Reina with FDOT’s Planning Studio is hosting a workshop focusing on safe speeds and counter measures to address speeding challenges. Safe speeds are one of the five elements in the Safe Systems Approach to drive down fatalities and serious injuries. It will be a hybrid format allowing participation in person or online and is targeted towards elected officials and local staff from planning, engineering, and public works.

B. MPO Executive Director

None.

7. Committee Action

7.A. Endorse 2050 LRTP Scope

Ms. McLaughlin: Presented the Executive Summary and pointed out revisions in response to comments from last month’s meetings. The scope is more explicit about transit in the LRTP. Page 4, item 5A now includes adding transit facilities and routes in the existing network. Page 5 item C includes language about network alternatives and how each step factors into transit. There are adjustments to the deliverables for social and economic data and the transit system. The next steps after reviewing are extensive. We are asking for endorsement now but there is a good chance there may be revisions along the way, such as technical revisions as we adjust to new information from FDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or related to procurement process, as we find out if we have flexibility with language. We’ll be working through that with procurement. The plan is to come back if there is a substantive change to seek re-endorsement.

Ms. Otero: Regarding the procurement process, the timeline is about a full year before we could get an award. Once we have an approved scope of services, we’ll transmit it to FDOT and FHWA to review and concurrently we go to procurement to begin the solicitation request. Procurement said that is quicker now, it can be done in a few weeks. Grantor review time and procurement workload could change timeline. We’re looking for MPO Board adoption by February 2023. It is better to get the scope in early

instead of waiting until the last minute. We are required to submit the entire Request for Professional Services (RPS) packet to FDOT and FHWA before it is advertised and they have to review the final contract. Grants office also reviews and adds clauses. Probably 11 months if everything goes well, with a clean and short selection committee.

Ms. Lantz: On page 3 the goals and objectives section had a couple bullets about waiting for directives on areas of emphasis and expectations, is that one of those options discussed last time, if you get a letter late can you get it in? Is there leeway?

Ms. McLaughlin: We're hoping we can work through having options in the contract, it's something we were able to do last time.

Ms. Peters: I will emphasize that the planning emphasis areas are needed now.

Mr. Scott: FHWA has said anything we sent in the last letters is still there, so you can take out the parenthesis and leave "letters" plural.

Ms. Lantz: On page 4, 5B has to do a lot with the County Interactive Growth Model (CIGM), were you anticipating that they would work with that consultant, as a subconsultant or work together?

Ms. McLaughlin: In order to work with CIGM the consultant team will have to have on their team Metro Forecasting Models (MFM). The RFP references MFM as having proprietary management of the CIGM, so consultants that pay attention will know they need to include MFM.

Mr. Scott: What if it turns into an exclusive thing?

Ms. McLaughlin: That's a problem I haven't anticipated.

Mr. Brock: Is there prequalification for consultant?

Ms. McLaughlin: We will put together a point system for how they are rated. It's been a couple years so it's hard to recall what criteria we used last time but the rating criteria is something we will work through with County procurement.

Ms. Peters: When you say you can't require bidders to include a specific subcontractor on their team, is there a clause that's missing? Why can't you?

Ms. McLaughlin: It's more of a grant issue, when we use federal funds, we have never gotten approval for any sole sourcing.

Ms. Peters: I didn't know that moved into that sole sourcing area.

Ms. McLaughlin: It's a grey area.

Mr. Brock: Do you have what you're going to provide to the consultant?

Ms. McLaughlin: That's part of the packet we develop with Procurement. We will emphasize the existing 2045 LRTP and tech memos and data we want to use as our starting point. We want them to build on that not start over from scratch. We want to be efficient with public funds. It will probably be in our packet, depending on Procurement, we'll include the documents or have links to them on the MPO's website.

Mr. Scott: FDOT recently sent format templates, rolled up sections from Central Office, interaction between FHWA and FDOT, there could be a requirement to make the new LRTP look like that.

Ms. McLaughlin: We looked those over and thought the 2045 LRTP was very close to meeting the templates already. Don't know whether the templates are advisory or compulsory. We would pass along any FDOT guidance we receive.

Ms. Arnold moved to endorse 2050 LRTP Scope and to move forward allowing for provisions and changes. Ms. Vandersluis seconded. Carried unanimously.

7.B. Review and comment on Draft UPWP (new 2-year)

Ms. Otero: This is the new Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) the MPO is required to develop and submit every two years which serves as resource and budget tool. It runs from July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2024. It will focus mostly on documents feeding into the LRTP, address results of the 2020 Census and the continued completion of the Congestion Management Process update. The development of the 2050 LRTP includes the Transportation System Performance Report, Transit Development, Plan Local Road Safety Plan, and other studies. There are several corrections to tables due to formula and carryover errors that will be updated. There are a couple things different about this UPWP, the funding available for the 2-year period—excluding the soft match—uses the Consolidated Planning Grant which combined 5305 allocations and PL [Planning] funding. Major difference in funding. Thought we were receiving approximately \$900,000 in SU funding but were informed that number will change to \$700,000 probably. There is some cushion built in for salaries, as the budget guidance hasn't told us what to do and this will allow for changes in salary.

Ms. Peters: For SU funding, it won't come all at once the first year, SU and PL funds are under a difference phase, when you see what's in the box or on a project, the spending authority is not the same as what you put it in the UPWP. The Department pulls together special budget and applies it in the whole district, this will be less because the district only gets a certain amount. Money will come, more in the second year and in next UPWP as we secure more budget for it. The first year of next UPWP is critical for the LRTP. The project was \$900,000 but Work Program said they can supply \$700,000.

Mr. Scott: Thought it was referencing 5305. PL changed, but 5305 has not, that's an amendment for later.

Ms. Peters: The Work Program group knows this is important and are working with Central Office about budget.

Ms. Lantz: You used \$900,000 in the allocation and now are being told to go down to \$700,000.

Ms. Otero: We will reduce funding for first two years, and add more in the 3rd year, reducing money allocated, the money will still be there, but it will come in the 3rd year. We do need it in that year to close out the LRTP.

Ms. Lantz: Will you have some funds encumbered?

Ms. Otero: I need money in the bank, a Notice to Proceed on certain tasks, then will move forward on the other projects.

Ms. Peters: They can do it in chunks, and they know the money has to start rolling in July, it will be piecemealed out to balance the budget.

Mr. Brock: SU versus PL money, is it back to where it needs to be on projects?

Ms. Otero: SU is usually spent on projects, for the MPO Board this is a planning priority, in the past we could bank some PL money, but FDOT does not want us to do that. They make us spend down all the PL money and that doesn't leave us money to complete the LRTP. The Board making this a priority allows us to use SU funds.

Mr. Brock: Will this continue?

Ms. Peters: They are aware of the 20/80 rule. Once you prioritize the project if you fall under the rule it offers an exception to the rule. FDOT realizes for the MPOs this is a big discussion on how to fund the LRTP. If it is not addressed the FDOT liaisons will go to Tallahassee [Central Office] and bring it up again, to a task force or something. It has to be addressed.

Mr. Brock: SU is for projects, not planning.

Mr. Scott: It came up for a vote at MPOAC to do major LRTP updates every 10 years [instead of every 5.] There wasn't consensus.

Ms. Otero: A draft of the UPWP has to go to FDOT by March 15 for review.

Ms. Lantz: On page 24, on delivery dates task, the CIGM target date is March 2021, should it be March 2023?

Ms. Otero: Yes March 2023, correction noted. We need to receive all comments within the next week.

Mr. Scott moved to endorse draft UPWP with comments as necessary. Mr. Brock seconded. Passed unanimously.

8. Reports and Presentation (May require Committee Action)

9. Member Comments

Ms. Bickett: The City presented to City Council the Bike Ped Master Plan and the Bike Loop update was well received. We're gathering public comments and working on a Bike Loop map, some ideas for Fleischman Rd. There were couple of meetings in March, and it's going back to City Council for the April workshop and hopefully we can move forward so the projects can get on the [priority] list.

Mr. Scott: What is the loop?

Ms. Bickett: Naples Pathway Coalition's [Paradise Coast] Trail [Feasibility Study] ties into the [Gordon River] Greenway. We're hoping to promote this in the City, coordinating with NPC's consultants too. The maps will identify it, it's entirely within the City, with an extension of the trail in city limits that comes up by the zoo. Key points are to incorporate additional wayfinding signage. We don't have bike lanes for the whole loop but we're looking at infrastructure and community support.

Mr. Scott: SUN Trail always wants to go to the water.

Ms. Bickett: It may have signage for the beach and parks, and parking may be available to park and ride [to the beach].

Mr. Brock: Have you looked at the Office of Greenways and Trails to become an official Trail City? There are resources in that office, it's an application process, but it's worthwhile to get that designation.

Ms. Bickett: We will take a look at it.

Mr. Scott: We got our numbers late last week, from Mark [Reichert], to MPOAC. Lee is getting \$2.5 million more than before from the formula, \$2.5 million per year, 1/3 each. Collier is getting \$1.4 million per year over 5 years. We've heard a push to get rid of the gas tax and heard from Washington to get rid of federal gas tax too. There was discussion that they have tiers of projects, tier 1 has \$9 million. Costs estimates going up.

Ms. Otero: It's not the windfall we expected.

Mr. Scott: It's better than getting less but it's not covering everything. We were the lowest per capita state.

Mr. Brock: Is that split up [between several funding sources]?

Mr. Scott: Yes. Carbon Reduction is \$360,000.

Ms. Peters: Does that funding have to go to carbon reduction projects?

Mr. Scott: It can be used for sidewalks and stuff like that we're assuming.

Mr. Philips: 50% can go to non-carbon reduction based on federal rules, and discretionary funds.

Mr. Scott: It is \$1.128 million for carbon reduction but it costs \$1 million for half a mile of sidewalks.

Ms. Peters: additional announcement - Jennifer Marshall was the Head of the Environmental Office in District 1. Now she is in Central Office, so Abra Horne is her replacement in District 1.

10. Distribution Items

(None)

11. Next Meeting Date

March 28, 2022– 9:30 a.m. – in person

Ms. Lantz adjourned the meeting at 10:22 a.m.