

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Wednesday, April 07, 2010 - 1:30 P.M.
Martin County Administration Building
Capital Projects Conference Room, 2nd Floor
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 223-7983

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Sam Amerson called the meeting to order at 1:30pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Joe Capra, Chairman (arrived at 1:35pm)

Sam Amerson, Vice-Chair

Mike Moon

Mark Cocco

Dan Hudson

Don Donaldson

Lisa Dykstra for Gustavo Schmidt/Chon Wong, FDOT

Kim DeLaney (arrived at 1:35pm)

John Fanticola for Barbara Timmerman

Samantha Horowitz for Nikki van Vonno

Rogelio Gonzalez

Members Excused:

Jeff Newell

Arlene Tanis, FDOT

Bruce Offord

Members Not In Attendance:

None

Staff in Attendance:

Mary Beth Beltran, Acting MPO Administrator

Boyd Lawrence, Planner II

Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II

A quorum was present for this committee.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

**Mr. Mike Moon moved to approve the Agenda. Seconded by Ms. Samantha Horowitz.
Motion carried unanimously.**

4. APPROVE MINUTES:

* January 06, 2010 – Regular TAC Meeting

Mr. Mike Moon made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Samantha Horowitz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Draft UPWP FY 2010/11 – 2011/12

MEMO: temp10CACa04.01

Ms. Beth Beltran, Acting MPO Administrator, said that funding to be received by an MPO is awarded in accordance with a distribution formula developed by FDOT and approved by FHWA. The funding received by an MPO may be expended only in accordance with an approved UPWP. Ms. Beltran stated that the DRAFT UPWP was submitted to FDOT for review by the established March 15th deadline. The document was being submitted to the MPO's CAC and TAC for review and comments on April 7, 2010, and to the BPAC on April 12, 2010. FDOT has until April 15th to comment on the DRAFT. This DRAFT will also be discussed with the MPO Policy Board on April 19, 2010. A Notice of Public Hearing that this document is available for comment was published in the Stuart News on March 14th advising that a Public Hearing on the document will be held at the April 19th MPO Policy Board meeting before it is considered for adoption at its May 3rd meeting.

Ms. Beltran stated that the FY 2010/11-2011/12 UPWP is a two-year UPWP. The UPWP included the completion of the 2035 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) by February of 2011, reflected in Task 5.6 2035 RLRTP. Ms. Beltran pointed out some other projects in the FY 2010/11-2011/12 UPWP such as the Bicycle Master Plan (Task 5.10), the completion of the Congestion Management Plan (Task 5.11), and the work effort associated with the Regional Transit Organization (Tasks 5.2 and 5.8). The new, two-year UPWP will also support continuity of MPO activities.

Mr. Moon moved approval of the DRAFT FY 2010/11-2011/12 Martin MPO UPWP to the Martin MPO Policy Board. Motion seconded by Ms. Horowitz. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Draft RTO Interlocal Agreement

MEMO: temp10CACa04.02

Ms. Beltran introduced this Item and provided some background. She said that the Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) / St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Joint Policy Board completed a Regional Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update 2010-2019 in September, 2009. Part of that work effort included a Transit Authority Action Plan that recommends the formation of a Regional Transit Organization (RTO) by the year 2010. An RTO will serve as a working group that will provide a forum to address the operational, financial, planning, and organization issues related to the provision of public transit in Martin and St. Lucie counties.

Ms. Beltran continued to say that at the February 18, 2010, Joint Martin MPO / St. Lucie TPO meeting, the Joint Policy Board approved the composition of an RTO, made up of the following members: one representative from the Martin County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC); one representative from the St. Lucie County BOCC; one elected representative from each of the cities of Stuart, Port St. Lucie, and Fort Pierce; one elected representative from the Town of Sewall's Point; one representative from the

Economic Council of Martin County, Inc.; one representative from the Economic Development Council of St. Lucie County, Inc.; and one representative from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)-District IV. Ms. Beltran said that the inclusion of an FDOT representative in the board composition was significant because, if these efforts were to progress, FDOT would be a potential funding source. The RTO could eventually lead to the creation of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA).

Ms. Beltran stated that Martin County and St. Lucie County will have *equal* representation on the RTO Board, and each member entity is to appoint one alternate member to serve in the absence of the regular voting member. If the regular voting member is an elected official, his/her alternate must also be an elected official.

Ms. Beltran said that the Joint Martin MPO / St. Lucie TPO Policy Board directed Staff to present a Draft Interlocal Agreement to the individual MPO and TPO Boards for review at their next meetings. The Draft is also to be sent to the respective Counties and Municipalities, and is to be brought back before the Joint Martin MPO / St. Lucie TPO Policy Board at its next meeting on June 17, 2010.

Mr. Amerson asked how the results of the transit issues discussed by the RTO would be conveyed to the MPO Committees. Ms. Beltran replied that the information could be brought to the Committees and to the MPO. She added that Indian River County and Palm Beach County would be considered in the RTO formation, if not as members of the board, as members of its Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Don Donaldson stated that this subject was about transit *operation* and *implementation*, and not about transit planning like the MPO is. The RTO would be the prelude group that would discuss the possible creation of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA). The RTA would be a complete separate organization; therefore, there would be no reason it would have to come to the MPO at all. Mr. Amerson asked if they would be a legal entity. Mr. Donaldson replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Beltran said that the RTO Interlocal Agreement would be brought to the local individual jurisdictions for their review after the document was submitted to the MPO Committees and to the MPO Policy Board, before the next Joint MPO/TPO Board in June 17th. Mr. Donaldson assented and added that ultimately, the jurisdictions would have control over this agreement; the MPO was facilitating its discussion.

Mr. Joe Capra moved approval of the DRAFT RTO Interlocal Agreement to the Martin MPO Policy Board. Seconded by Mr. Moon. The motion passed with Mr. Mathes opposing.

C. State Road 76 PD&E – Project Alternatives

MEMO: temp10CACa04.03

Mr. Boyd Lawrence, Martin MPO Planner II, introduced this Item and provided background. He stated that improving State Road 76 (a/k/a Kanner Highway) has been a priority of the MPO for approximately 10 years and has been the #2 priority for the past two years. FDOT has provided funding for the Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) study of this facility for the segment beginning west of CR 711 (Pratt Whitney

Road) to east of Cove Road. Mr. Lawrence said that the SR 76 PD&E is currently in the Project Alternatives Development stage. FDOT and American Consulting will be presenting the Project Alternatives today, during the April 7th CAC and TAC meetings, and the April 12th BPAC meeting. A Public Workshop will be held at the Wolf Technology Center at Indian River College in Stuart on April 13th at 5:00pm. A final meeting on the SR 76 PD&E Project Alternatives will be presented to the MPO Board on May 3, 2010. Mr. Lawrence introduced Mr. Jeff Novotny with American Consulting who proceeded to discuss his PowerPoint presentation (copy on file).

Mr. Novotny showed the PD&E study that would be presented at the upcoming public workshop. He discussed the study timeline, the existing roadway typical sections, and presented the Interchange Modification Report. The Interchange Modification Report contained the project's alternatives identified in its first-level screening. Mr. Novotny stated that eight alternatives were considered and were shortlisted to the following:

- Alternative 3: Eastbound to Northbound Flyover
- Alternative 8A: Eastbound to Northbound Teardrop Loop Ramp
- Alternative 8B: Eastbound to Northbound Loop Ramp

Mr. Novotny discussed the cost involved with each alternative, and stated that the "No-Build" option is also being considered. In addition, he spoke about the possibility of the reconfiguration of the existing loop ramp in the northwest quadrant of the Interchange.

Mr. Novotny mentioned three possible Park-and-Ride lot sites as well. Mr. Novotny stated that more information on this project may be obtained at www.sr76martin.com. All comments posted through this website would generate an email to the project Staff.

Mr. Capra asked if Alternative 8A would have the least right-of-way (ROW) cost. Mr. Novotny replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Capra stated that he would not be supportive of Alternative 3 with the flyover. He also commented that it would seem very difficult to tighten the existing loop ramp on the northwest quadrant of the Interchange (going southbound on I-95) more than it already is. Mr. Donaldson stated that he was also concerned about the tightness of that loop ramp radius.

Mr. Moon suggested that Site Alternative 3 for the Park-n-Ride would be the most convenient one since the users would be available to park before getting to the I-95 ramps.

Vice-Chair Amerson inquired about having bike lanes on a road with 45mph traffic. Mr. Novotny replied that the bike lanes were according to standard. Mr. Donaldson added that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) is advocating that roadway projects would include bike lanes whenever possible.

Ms. Beltran quoted the motion approved by the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC): Moved approval that Alternative 8A and Alternative 8B would supersede Alternative 3. Ms. Beltran said that the CAC also had asked about the relocation of the traffic signals. Mr. Erik Ferguson from Martin Engineering responded that there were no issues with the

relocation of the traffic signals during this project. Mr. Novotny concurred with Mr. Ferguson's reply and added that realigning the ramps will result in better operation of the traffic signals.

Vice-Chair Amerson stated that the TAC was also supportive of Alternative 8A.

Mr. Donaldson stated that he would also support 8A but he was concerned about tightening the loop ramp further. He would support the general layout but not the specific details as presented. The radius of the ramp is a concern.

Mr. Capra moved to support the road project including bike lanes in Alternative 8A as this alternative presented less interference with the existing hotel in the area, keeping the traffic signalization, support having the Park-n-Ride on Site #3, and having DOT cooperating with the County's interim plan. Mr. Moon seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Novotny repeated that there will be a Public Workshop to be held at the Wolf Technology Center at Indian River College in Stuart on April 13th from 5:00pm to 7:00pm.

D. Congestion Management Process (CMP) Scope

MEMO: temp10CACa04.04

Mr. Lawrence introduced this Item and provided background. He stated that the Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a systematic approach that provides for the safe and effective management and operation of new and existing transportation facilities through the use of demand reduction and operational management strategies. The CMP is required to be developed and implemented as an integral part of the metropolitan planning process in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), which are urbanized areas with a population over 200,000 or any area where designation as a TMA has been requested. Martin County is part of the St. Lucie TMA.

Mr. Lawrence stated that the most recent major update of the CMP was completed for the Martin MPO by Tindale-Oliver in April of 2005. The primary strategy from the 2005 CMS report recommended a series of intersection improvements that could be constructed to address congestion. The report also recommended that the MPO consider the future development of an Intelligent Traffic System (ITS) to monitor traffic and coordinate traffic control signals to improve the flow of traffic on the major arterial roadways. The Martin County ITS system is referred to as the Automated Traffic Management System (ATMS).

Mr. Lawrence continued to say that in late 2009, MPO Staff initiated a Request-for-Proposal (RFP) for a consultant to update the Congestion Management Process for the Martin MPO in 2010. The consultant selected by the RFP selection committee was Kimley-Horn. Kimley-Horn has submitted the Scope of Services to complete the Martin MPO CMP update (copy on file). The Scope reflects some input provided by Martin MPO Staff to focus on alternative strategies such as transit improvements, demand management, and technology improvements. In addition, Kimley-Horn was asked to provide additional CMP analysis of the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) districts

of Martin County and the City of Stuart based on the future land use policy of those areas.

[There was an EVACUATION NOTICE issued for the building. The meeting was paused until the drill was finalized. The meeting reconvened approximately 20 minutes later, at 2:37 pm.]

Mr. Hudson asked how much of the CMP was in the CRA. Mr. Donaldson replied that the CMP would mostly affect the areas outside the CRA because traffic would likely be shifted to those other venues outside of the CRA.

Mr. Ferguson added that the CMP was looking at other performance measures for alternate modes of transportation in addition to evaluating intersections, whereas the CMS only evaluated intersections.

Mr. Capra recommended that the ITS improvements be promoted as much as possible.

Mr. Lawrence said that the Project Management Advisory Committee that would overview the CMP will meet three times, per stipulations on the scope. Mr. Moon asked about the composition of this committee. Members suggested that the TAC could serve as the advisory committee

Mr. Moon moved approval of the CMP Scope as recommended by Staff and that the TAC group would be the advisory committee for the CMP. Seconded by Mr. Capra. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Indian Street Bridge Update

MEMO: temp10CACa04.05

Ms. Beltran introduced this Item. Ms. Beltran said that the update of the project will be made by Quest Corporation of America. Ms. Beltran informed that Quest will be holding a Public Information Meeting at the Palm City Community Center on Thursday, April 29, 2010, 5:00pm-7:00pm, but before the public meeting, they would provide the MPO Board the status of the report as well as receive comments and answer questions that Board members may have. Quest must go through the MPO advisory committee process: CAC, TAC and BPAC; before reporting to the MPO Policy Board.

Ms. Beltran said that the project limits begin at the Florida Turnpike intersection in Palm City and proceed east to Willoughby Boulevard in Stuart. The segment of the project in Palm City from Mapp Road to St. Lucie Shores Drive is identified as Segment 2. The Martin MPO Policy Board endorsed Alternative 2A of Segment 2, which is a four-lane divided highway with wide buffers and a sidewalk located at the back of the roadside swale, prior to the Public Hearing in November, 2003. Ms. Beltran continued to say that during the Public Hearing process over 1,500 stakeholders participated and over 75% supported Alternative 2A in Segment 2 from Mapp Road to St. Lucie Shores Drive (copy of the approved Typical Section on file).

Ms. Beltran introduced Ms. Kim Holland, Consultant Manager, and Ms. Beth Zsoka from Quest Corporation of America, the Public Information Officer for the Indian Street

Bridge Project. Ms. Beltran stated that the PowerPoint presentation would include a slide that shows the sidewalk of Segment 2 relocated from the back of the roadside swale to the front of the swale between the curb and the swale. Ms. Beltran said that it is the opinion of the Martin County Engineering Staff that the project would need to go through the public participation process again in order for the sidewalks to be relocated.

Ms. Holland and Ms. Zsoka proceeded with the PowerPoint presentation on the status of the project (copy on file) and stated that information was available at www.indianstreetbridge.com.

Mr. Capra asked if the lighting fixtures on the west side of the bridge were consistent with the Palm City CRA plan and the lighting fixture on the east side of the bridge was consistent with that of Indian Street. Mr. Donaldson stated that a lot of the decorative lighting received a lot of damage during bad weather, therefore, they have chosen a green color lighting system that is resilient, maintainable, and cost efficient. Ms. Holland replied that the intent is that the lighting fixtures would match throughout the entire two miles of the project. In listening to Mr. Capra, Mr. Donaldson suggested reviewing the lighting to be used on the east side of the bridge going into SR 76, and perhaps matching it to the current Indian Street standard.

Mr. Kevin Freeman, County Community Development Director, stated that his department deferred on this issue to the Engineering Department in terms of the maintenance cost but as a CRA they would be in favor of the more decorative lighting.

Mr. Capra asked if there would be any solar power used for the lighting. Mr. Amerson asked if there would be any LED used for this purpose. Ms. Holland replied that the lighting system will be lit the traditional way; solar power presents maintenance issues and LED was not part of the standard yet.

Mr. Freeman stated that the CRA has recommended that ideas be pulled from their plan when designing the landing point of the bridge for the City of Stuart, and to present the design to their NAC for approval.

Mr. Capra said that this bridge will be a very significant bridge. Mr. Capra suggested that this bridge would have something like a "Welcome to..." sign or something nice to look at as boater go by. Ms. Holland said that this idea would be up to the County. The County will own and operate this bridge.

Mr. Freeman stated that the main issue under discussion is the location of the sidewalk. He stated that the relocation of the sidewalk was against the public outreach and the recommendations of the public, also against the CRA vision plan. He expressed big concerns about this change. Ms. Holland provided some history of how this change took place. She stated that in the 2004 PD&E Study the sidewalk was at the rear of the property line, in 2008 the landscape architect of their team held several coordination meetings with Martin County Engineering, and it was requested to move the sidewalk to the front, behind the curb. The reason was for safety reasons; there were concerns that there could be tunneling or hiding places in the landscaping on the back of the property lines. In 2009 the typical section was adjusted and the typical section was signed by

FHWA. The changed sidewalk was presented at the January 2009 Public Information Workshop. Ms. Holland said that there were no public comments at that time or oppositions to the new location of the sidewalk. Mr. Freeman asked what Martin County Engineering or CRA Departments had to say about that. Ms. Terry Rauth, Martin County Deputy Engineer, and Mr. Donaldson responded that they were not really looking at the sidewalk location during the January 2009 Public Workshop as they were trying to get the project going; therefore, Engineering has requested that Quest come before you today and reflect the changed typical and get your feedback.

Mr. Freeman stated that without the public scrutinizing this sidewalk change, the CRA could not support it without full citizen involvement. Ms. Holland replied that around one thousand letters have been sent to the citizens on this regard and there will be more opportunities to gather the public input during the upcoming Public Information Meeting at the Palm City Community Center on Thursday, April 29, 2010.

Mr. Hudson asked why the location changed. Ms. Holland replied that the change took place in 2008 for safety reasons. She stated that there were concerns about tunneling and hiding places due to the landscape buffer that is going to be planted at the right-of-way to shield those neighborhood homes. Mr. Hudson asked if this decision was based on community input. Ms. Holland replied that the decision was based on conversations with Martin County Engineering. Mr. Donaldson responded that he thought that it was an FDOT design team change. Ms. Rauth added that she was part of the conversations and that the biggest concern County Field Operations Department had was not the location of the sidewalks but what kind of vegetation was going to be planted and whether or not they would have room for their maintenance equipment.

Ms. Beltran mentioned that the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) members expressed preference for having trees between the road and the sidewalk as opposed to having the sidewalk against the road. In addition, the CAC had a comment related to the electrical box and stated that they do not wish to have the FP&L electrical box out in the open and to do a better job camouflaging any electric box. Mr. Amerson concurred with the electrical box suggestion.

6. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None

7. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None

8. COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC

None

9. NOTES

Ms. Kim DeLaney, Growth Management Coordinator from the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC), provided an update on the FEC/Amtrak project. She said that this project along with three others were submitted to compete for the first round of high speed rail funding. High speed intercity passenger rail funding was awarded in December

2009. Ms. DeLaney stated that there has been a lot of interest on the part of local governments, the MPOs and other agencies. A second application for this source of funding is due in July 2010. The pertinent agencies, including Martin County and the TCRPC, have all requested that FDOT be formally committed to this project and to program all the funds in the Five-Year Work Program, so that not only this application will be more competitive for its review in July but if an additional application has to be submitted, we could show a strong commitment to the project.

Ms. DeLaney stated that the March 26th Amtrak/FEC Corridor Coalition Kickoff Meeting at the City Hall; Cocoa, FL had great attendance and showed evident enthusiasm about the project. There were a few outstanding issues, the biggest one being the liability and indemnification issue. Amtrak was very clear and stated that without a legislative change in decision of the liability relationship, Amtrak would not be partnering with the State to submit the application. At the March 26th workshop Secretary of Transportation Stephanie C. Kopelousos was also very clear stating that the reason why this project has moved along the way it has was because of continued dialogue with elected officials in Tallahassee and Washington. TCRPC has received one hundred and thirty four resolutions and letters of support from many agencies and organizations.

Mr. Donaldson asked if FDOT supported the liability issue change; because he has heard that there was a difference of opinion between FDOT and Amtrak. Ms. DeLaney replied in the affirmative and added that this difference was made very clear at the workshop. She said that FDOT made statements that indicated that the liability concerns that Amtrak has raised do not apply to the FEC corridor and they only apply to the SunRail corridor. However, Amtrak has suggested that this was not entirely the story, and claims that the Northwood Crossover portion of the track does have an implication to the FEC corridor, and beyond that, Amtrak leadership has said that they cannot solve the liability issue, and cannot partner with the State for new service until then.

The MPOAC voted unanimously supporting a legislative remedy to solve this liability issue. Mr. Donaldson suggested that we need a legislative remedy that FDOT would also support or at least not object to. Ms. DeLaney concurred and added that at the MPOAC meeting it was suggested that the issue requires a statewide remedy. She said that this issue will be included as an agenda item in the next TCRPC meeting, and that there is more information available on their website: www.tcrpc.org.

Mr. Donaldson asked to let the TAC know should there be any bill that TCRPC will be endorsing as the appropriate solution for the problem. Ms. DeLaney stated that Commissioner Smith has been very engaged and has been generating dialogue to solve this issue.

Mr. Capra stated that the Amtrak and the High Speed Rail are two separate efforts and two separate applications, and that the public must realize they are separate. Ms. DeLaney agreed and added that these two projects have complete different features. She offered TCRPC resources in an effort to help educate the public on this regard, and she mentioned that the upcoming workshops would also help educate the community.

Mr. Capra asked if the application cycle for Enhancement Projects was already opened. Mr. Lawrence replied in the affirmative. Mr. Capra asked if funding was Federal or State. Ms. Beltran replied that they were Federal funds.

10. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Vice-Chair Amerson entertained a motion for adjournment. Moved by Mr. Moon. Seconded by Mr. Don Donaldson. The meeting was adjourned at 3:37pm.

Recorded and Prepared by:



Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II

May 05, 2010

Date

Approved by:



Sam Amerson for:
Joe Capra, TAC Chairman

5/05/10

Date