

BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
of the
COLLIER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Collier County Growth Management Division
Conference Rooms 609 & 610
2800 North Horseshoe Drive
Naples, FL 34104
9:00 a.m.

May 21, 2019 Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

Mr. Bonness called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Roll Call

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

BPAC members made self-introductions and welcomed Larry Smith as a new BPAC member.

Members Present

Alan Musico, At-Large
Dayna Fendrick, At-Large
Andrea Halman, At-Large
Victor Ordija, At-Large
Joe Bonness, At-Large
Susan Sonnenschein, At-Large
David Driapsa, At-Large
Dr. Mort Friedman, At-Large
Larry Smith, At-Large

Members Absent

Reginald Wilson, At-Large
Anthony Matonti, At-Large

MPO Staff

Eric Ortman, MPO Senior Planner
Karen Intriago, MPO Administrative Assistant

Others Present

David Agacinski, FDOT
Victoria Peters, FDOT
Michelle Avola, NPC
Jim Wood, Kimberly-Horn

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Ortman noted that item 8C - reconfirming support for project priorities had inadvertently been left off the agenda but is in the packet.

Mr. Musico moved to approve the Agenda with the inclusion of 8C. Second by Mr. Ordija. Carried unanimously.

4. Approval of the April 16 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Halman moved to approve the April 16, 2019 minutes. Second by Mr. Musico. Carried unanimously.

5. Open to the Public for Comment on Items not on the Agenda

None.

6. Agency Updates

A. FDOT

Mr. Agacinski mentioned that the E-Grant Application process was expected to be completed before the end of the year. Noted that he had accepted another position within FDOT as a project manager; would remain as the bike ped coordinator until a replacement was hired.

Ms. Fendrick asked if the preferred alternative on SR29 might change due to public comment. Ms. Peters stated she would send the latest SR29 presentation to Mr. Ortman who will forward it to committee members. Mr. Agacinski noted that changes were being made to the Florida Design Manual; the changes are still in draft but may impact the SR29 project design.

B. MPO

None.

7. Committee Action

A. Endorse Call for Non- Motorized Projects – Application Forms, Process and Time Line

Mr. Ortman summarized the process and application forms that would be used in the upcoming call for non-motorized transportation projects. which were developed, reviewed and modified by a collaborative committee and MPO staff effort based on the recently adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. At the request of the committee, an additional question was added to allow applicants to provide supplemental information. The information will not be scored but may be used if two or more projects end up with the same score. Preliminary concept sheets are due by August 1st. Eligible projects from this step will complete a more detailed application. All three advisory committees and MPO staff will review and prioritize the eligible projects. After this review all applications will be sent to FDOT for further review. The Board must adopt a prioritized list of projects by June 2020.

Mr. Musico moved to approve the allocation process, forms and timeline for the call for non-motorized projects. Second by Ms. Halman. Carried unanimously.

B. Endorse Resolution Supporting Naples Pathways Coalition's Paradise Coast Trail Vision

Mr. Ortman introduced the item stating that the NPC has requested a MPO Resolution in support of the Paradise Coast Trail Vision. The Vision is in keeping with the intent of the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan; the map of the vision trail is included in the Plan. Staff is in favor of supporting the resolution. The Board has requested a presentation prior to taking any action.

Ms. Avola, NPC Director, gave a power point presentation on NPC's trail vision. Highlights included:

- Florida's unenviable position of being the state with the most bicycle and pedestrian fatalities
- Distracted driving has significantly increased
- Collier County lacks a connected multi-use pathway system
- Vision is in keeping with the intent of the MPO's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- Connected multi-use pathways systems are economic generators; provide added mobility choices and provide an opportunity for a healthier lifestyle

Mr. Musico and Mr. Ordija asked why the vision did not connect to Marco Island which has many daily riders. Mr. Bonness noted that the right-of-way along CR92 was not wide enough to allow for a shared use path, and that the Conservancy has expressed concerns over environmental impacts along 951 and 92. Ms. Fendrick noted that Everglades City was not even shown on the map and that SR29 already has many long-distance cyclists using it. Ms. Avola stated that NPC's long-term vision was to have an interconnected network throughout the County but that starting in an area without existing controversy would make it easier to get built. Mr. Musico asked where the funding would come from. Ms. Avola replied that the NPC was working on a public/private partnership for funding a feasibility study. Mr. Draipsa asked why the trail wasn't going through the Pelican Bay/Gulfshore area which is an underserved resort area with respect to bike/ped infrastructure.

Mr. Wood, Kimberly Horn, stated that the vision's alignment is in keeping with the Office of Greenways and Trails alignment. Noted that the map zoomed in on the trail vision hence the inadvertent exclusion of Everglades City. The next iteration will show Everglades City, the entirety of Marco Island, and will include an overlay of existing shared use paths and greenways. In response to Ms. Fendrick's question, Mr. Bonness noted that the east-west portion of the alignment was along the Golden Gate Canal. The right-of-way along the canal, while available, has a history of being used by residents for personal reasons.

Mr. Draipsa moved to endorse the resolution supporting Naples Pathways Coalition's Paradise Coast Trail Vision. Second by Ms. Sonnenschein. Carried by a 6-1 vote with 2 abstentions. Mr. Ordija was opposed unless Marco Island was included in the trail vision. Ms. Fendrick and Mr. Musico abstained.

Ms. Fendrick suggested that the NPC have a clear understanding of what the MPO expects from a feasibility study stating that the MPO had deemed the River of Grass Greenway feasibility study to be suspect due to it being done by an outside party. There was a lot of inuendo that certain things weren't done correctly; that there had not been government to government consultation which the ROGG group had understood to be done during the PE process not during the feasibility study.

Ms. Fendrick stated that what could be talked about for US41 and SR29 was fairly limited but that those roads were already being used by long-distance cyclists. Stated that she felt too much was being read into the Board decision to take the lines off the map. Frustrating that it seems that we cannot even talk about 41 or 29 without formal consultation with the Tribe. This is tying our hands in making decisions for these roads. Understood that consultation with the Tribe is required when FDOT is designing or studying a project but that should not prohibit us from talking about and considering options for future connections.

Mr. Draipsa asked who was driving the Paradise Coast Trail Vision. Mr. Ortman stated that the NPC is driving the process; staff is in support of the NPC vision; the vision is in concert with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, but the Board has the final say in all MPO matters. Mr. Draipsa asked what the committee's mission was in the larger context. Mr. Ortman stated the BPAC's mission was to work towards a safe and connected bicycle and pedestrian network throughout the county. Discussion followed on the vision of the NPC, the role of the MPO, and the distinction between the two. Ms. Sonnenschein noted that the NPC wanted to achieve their vision on a faster timetable than what would be possible through the MPO. Mr. Draipsa asked about smaller side-trails that might connect to the NPC's vision and how they would get built. Mr. Ortman noted that he had come onto the committee at the perfect time as a call for bicycle pedestrian projects was about to be issued. Discussion over the cost of building a trail followed. Mr. Musico pointed out that using a rough cost of \$500,000 per mile the NPC vision would far outstrip the amount of SU funds available.

C. Re- Endorse Updated 2018 Bicycle & Pedestrian Priorities for 2019

Mr. Ortman provided a brief history of the bike ped priority list. There has not been a call for bike ped projects for several years; each year the list has been updated to reflect changes in programming and

phasing. The committee is being asked to reaffirm what they have previously endorsed which has also been adopted by the Board. Mr. Ortman noted that the first 13 items on the list have been funded for construction. The 14th item, a shared use path on Immokalee has not received any funding. The County would like the project to remain on the list but delay programming any funding until other issues in the location of the project have been resolved. Mr. Musico noted that number 14 has a host of issues which is why it is last on the list; thinks it should not be on list; if the County wants to keep it they should resubmit an application.

Mr. Draipsa asked how number 14 differs from number 2. Mr. Musico stated that number 2 has already been programmed and funded. Discussion ensued on the merits of item 14 and whether it should stay on the list. Ms. Peters noted that LK Nandam [FDOT District 1 Secretary] had asked why it wasn't being funded if it was on the prioritized list. Mr. Ortman noted that TAC did not have a quorum but has previously endorsed the list. The CAC endorsed the entire list including the bike ped priorities.

Ms. Fendrick asked if the project were removed would the money be allocated to another bike ped project. Mr. Ortman said that the money had not been programmed so it would not automatically flow to a bike ped project. Mr. Ortman noted that if FDOT were to program the project they would first communicate with the County as to whether they still wanted the project.

Mr. Musico motioned to re-endorse items 1-13, not endorse item 14, and that item 14 be resubmitted if the County wants to keep the project. Second by Mr. Ordija. Motion failed by a 7:2 count with Mr. Musico and Mr. Ordija being in favor of the motion.

Mr. Draipsa motioned to endorse the bicycle pedestrian priorities as stated in the meeting packet (i.e., 1-14). Second by Ms. Fendrick.

Mr. Draipsa stated that Vanderbilt Drive (item 2) was one of the reasons for his rejoining the committee. There is an existing bike path coming from Bonita to VBR and Pelican Bay; Vanderbilt Drive is a missing link. It is loaded in the winter with cyclists and pedestrians. A bike path is highly warranted; Vanderbilt Drive [sidewalk] should be removed from the list.

Mr. Musico stated that it cannot be removed because it is already programmed. Ms. Peters noted that the Department has just experienced a similar situation on a sidewalk project in Naples which the City wants to cancel. In a discussion with Ms. McLaughlin and LK Nandam, the lesson learned was that before design starts a project needs to be vetted to see if there is any doubt on whether the project is still wanted. Perhaps every year, there should be a check-in to see if the project was still wanted. Mr. Draipsa stated that another sidewalk, while necessary, would be redundant but that a bike lane is absent and badly needed.

Mr. Draipsa motioned to amend his motion to remove item 2 from the list. Second by Ms. Sonnenschein.

Mr. Draipsa withdraws his original motion and his amendment to the motion. Second by Dr. Freidman.

Mr. Draipsa motioned to endorse bicycle pedestrian priorities numbers 1-13 except for number 2. Second by Ms. Sonnenschein. Motion passed by a 7:2 margin with Ms. Halman and Dr. Freidman being opposed.

Mr. Bonness stated that he would include the committee's discussion on item 2 in his chair report to the Board; committee members were welcome to come too. Reminded committee that they were advisory and that the Board has the final decision.

D. Endorse Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects in Draft FY2020 – FY2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Ortman stated that there was one addition to the TIP that the committee has not seen; FDOT has asked that the TIGER Grant that was awarded to Collier County for Immokalee be included in the TIP.

Mr. Musico motioned to endorse the TIP. Second by Ms. Fendrick.

Mr. Musico amended motion to include the TIP amendment to the TIP as amended by the TAC. Second by Ms. Fendrick.

Mr. Bonness called the vote asking for all those in favor. (More than enough ayes to endorse motion; Mr. Bonness did not call for all those opposed.)

Mr. Draipsa asked if the description for Item 2 could be modified to say bike path along the roadway. Mr. Ortman said it was a Board decision, but the committee's actions and intent were reported to the Board. Mr. Bonness stated that there had been a discussion but that when he called the vote he had neglected to call for any nays. Mr. Draipsa disagreed stating that he did not think there had been a discussion and thought therefore the vote should not stand. Mr. Bonness apologized saying that after Ms. Halman's comments he called for the vote thinking that the discussion was over. Mr. Bonness noted that the vote had already occurred but that Mr. Draipsa's objection would be noted in the BPAC Chair Report to the Board. Mr. Draipsa and Ms. Sonnenschein stated that their desire was to vote in the negative.

Mr. Ortman clarified that in the first vote Mr. Draipsa had motioned to endorse the 2019 bike ped priorities except for item 2 and item 14. The motion was seconded; the vote was in favor of the endorsement. Mr. Ortman noted that in June 2018, the Board had approved all 14 of the bike ped priorities. Mr. Ortman stated that the intent of the agenda item was simply to reconfirm the bike ped priorities. However, today's committee action was to approve number one and numbers three through 13 thereby eliminating items two and 14.

Mr. Ortman recapped Mr. Musico's motion which was seconded and passed which was to endorse the TIP amendment and the entire TIP which includes all 14 of the bike ped priorities which creates a contradiction with the committee's first vote. Mr. Musico stated that that was not what he intended his motion to be. The intent of his motion was to exclude item 2 and item 14.

Discussion over Robert's Rules followed and whether an item could be reintroduced. Mr. Ortman recapped the votes that had taken place noting that the county attorney would need to be consulted on whether Mr. Draipsa's and Ms. Sonnenschein's opposing votes could be included as they occurred after the vote. Mr. Ortman stated that Mr. Draipsa's objection had been noted and would be transmitted to the Board.

Mr. Draipsa voiced an objection to this stating that he would have requested a modification to the motion and then would have voted in the affirmative. Discussion followed over whether a project could be defunded after it was programmed. Mr. Agacinski said that there was a method that could be used to cancel a project, but it would have to be agreed upon by FDOT and the MPO Board.

Ms. Sonnenschein stated that a recommendation conveying the committee's intent should be made. Mr. Ortman stated that, contingent upon attorney approval, if it was the pleasure of the Chair and the committee a recommendation without a vote could be made to express the committee's intent. Mr. Ortman stated that it appeared that the intent of the motion makers was not accurately reflected in the motions.

Mr. Draipsa proposed recommending a change to item 2 by substituting bike lanes for the sidewalk. By a show of hands there were eight who approved of this recommendation with Ms. Halman not being in favor.

Mr. Musico recommended that item 14 be removed from the priority list and that an application be resubmitted in the upcoming call for projects. By a show of hands there were more opposing the recommendation than supporting it. Mr. Musico removed his recommendation.

8. Reports and Presentations (May Require Committee Action)

A. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Kick-off

Mr. Ortman noted that in the interest of time, that this item be dispensed with quickly as the committee was more likely to have things to say on the next two items. Mr. Ortman displayed the slide which asked what people wanted to see in the LRTP. Comments could be made now or in the next couple of weeks. Dr. Freidman suggested that this item be brought back at the next meeting.

B. Discuss Expanding Surface Transportation (SU) Project Priorities

Mr. Ortman asked if the committee was okay with skipping the introduction and getting right to the heart of the matter. Committee agreed. Occasionally, money accumulates in year one of the SU box funds; FDOT likes to see around \$300,000 in year one to cover cost overruns. This year, the amount in the first year had grown to almost \$2 million. A collaborative effort between FDOT, MPO member entities and MPO staff resulted in a plan to spend down the money by advancing multiple bicycle and pedestrian projects. Unfortunately, the increased work load resulting from this exceeded the staffing capacity of the entities who would be doing the designing and constructing. A tempered advanced schedule was developed and is reflected in the FDOT Tentative Work Program. This schedule still left approximately \$1 million in the SU box. While this was happening, Collier County needed approximately \$1 million for a safety project it was working on. The project had not been prioritized by the MPO so the SU box could not be used for it.

The Board has asked Ms. McLaughlin to develop a policy that would allow for the use of over-accumulated SU funds in the first year on additional project categories while maintaining the existing 40/40/20 split. The CAC thought that expanding the list of categories to ensure the spending of all SU dollars was a good idea and that safety projects could be the category added. The TAC had similar thoughts on the matter. The Board will address this matter at their June meeting but wanted to have advisory committee input. The committee discussed various categories and options including keeping the unfunded list; allowing borrowing/repaying between the current three categories; and a preference for use on safety projects. Dr. Freidman recommended that using the SU funds for safety projects was a good idea but that he recommended they be used for bicycle and pedestrian safety projects. The committee thought that this was a good idea.

C. Discuss Reconfirming Support for Project Priorities

Mr. Ortman introducing the subject stating that occasionally projects need to be cancelled. A recent example of this is the sidewalk project in Naples that was discussed earlier in the meeting. Mr. Draipsa suggested that contracts be written for a very specific part of the project thereby creating an effective go/no go check point. Mr. Bonness pointed out that this may not be a viable option, particularly when using state funding. The committee was in favor of having a check-in in the year prior to beginning to spend any money. Mr. Ortman noted that the TAC and CAC had discussed assessing penalties for cancelled projects but found that there were more cons than pros to this idea.

Mr. Musico recommended that if a member entity cancelled a project then they should not be able to reallocate it to another similar project within that entity. Mr. Ortman asked how the committee how it felt about if an agency cancels a project that the money cannot be used for another project for that same agency. Committee members were in support of this idea.

9. Member Comments

None. Mr. Ortman noted that the August agenda would include review of the project applications submitted and discussion of the LRTP.

10. Distribution Item

A. Revised February 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes

11. Next Meeting Date

August 20, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.

12. Adjournment

With no further comments or items to attend to, Mr. Bonness adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.