

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**

Wednesday, May 05, 2010 - 9:00 A.M.
Martin County Administration Building
Commission Chambers
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 223-7983

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Sheila Kurtz called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Sheila Kurtz, Vice-Chair
Joseph DeFronzo
Alex Trovato
Mark Mathes
Trent Steele (arrived at 9:07 a.m.)
Albert Zilg

Members Excused:

Jody Ianuzzi

Members Not In Attendance:

Toby Overdorf, Chairman
Barbara Kauffman
Julie Preast
Kevin Trepanier (Ex-Officio, St. Lucie TPO CAC)

Staff in Attendance:

Mary Beth Beltran, MPO/Transit Planning Manager
Boyd Lawrence, Planner II
Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II

A quorum was present for this committee.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Mr. Mark Mathes moved to approve the Agenda. Seconded by Mr. Alex Trovato. Motion carried unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES:

* April 07, 2010 – Regular CAC Meeting

Mr. Mathes made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Albert Zilg seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

A. **Draft TIP FY 2011 – 2015**

MEMO: temp10CACa05.01

Ms. Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator, provided background. She said that the TIP is updated annually. It is approved by the MPO and, pursuant to federal and state regulatory requirements, reflects “a staged, multiyear, intermodal program of transportation projects consistent with the long-range transportation plan.” All transportation projects proposed to be implemented through federal or state transportation funding over the coming five fiscal years are contained in the TIP. Major projects were guided by the list of project priorities approved by the MPO Policy Board on September 21, 2009 and provided to FDOT District Four on September 28, 2009. Ms. Beltran stated that reasonable opportunity for the public to comment on the TIP must be provided. The DRAFT TIP has been available for public comment since April 30, 2010. A notice of the June 21, 2010, Public Hearing on the Final TIP at MPO Policy Board meeting was published in the Stuart News on Sunday, May 2, 2010 and will be published again on June 6, 2010 (copy of the notice on file). Ms. Beltran stated that the April 28, 2010 version of the DRAFT TIP was compiled from project and funding data contained in the April 14, 2010 FDOT Tentative Work Program based on the Revenue Estimating Conferences of February 25th and March 9th. The information contained in the TIP is based on the latest data received from FDOT.

Mr. Boyd Lawrence, Martin MPO Planner II, added that MPO Staff has been advised from FDOT District Four that additional changes to the Tentative Work Program may be forthcoming after April 30th, which may cause some revisions of this DRAFT TIP. He said that any additional TIP updates may be monitored via our website www.martinmpo.com.

Ms. Lawrence talked about the County’s Information Technology Systems (ITS) Department and their efforts to create an interactive Geographic Information Systems (GIS) map on their website, where the public would be able to access a map that would list County projects, including the projects listed on the TIP. The intent is to create an effective and user-friendly method that would provide immediate project information to the users. Vice-Chair Kurtz asked when the interactive map would be completed. Mr. Lawrence responded that it is expected to be finished by June 21st. Staff would try to present a static version of this map on the next CAC meeting on June 02nd.

[Mr. Trent Steele joined the meeting.]

Mr. Trovato concurred that adding maps to the TIP would be helpful.

Mr. Mathes moved Staff recommendation to approve the DRAFT FY 2010/11-2011/12 Martin MPO UPWP to the Martin MPO Policy Board.

Mr. Zilg asked about the tables on page 16. He asked why the wastewater plant site was part of the MPO criteria. Mr. Lawrence replied that the tables depicted were from the City of Stuart CIP and they have all of their projects grouped together. Mr. Zilg suggested that Staff should only list transportation projects. Mr. Lawrence said that he

would separate the projects.

The motion on the floor was seconded by Mr. Joseph DeFronzo. The motion carried unanimously.

B. FY 2011 TE Applications for FY 2014 Funding

MEMO: temp10CACa05.02

Mr. Lawrence introduced this Item and provided some background. Transportation Enhancements (TE) projects are federally funded community-based projects that expand travel choices and enhance the transportation experience by improving the cultural, historic, aesthetic and environmental aspects of our transportation infrastructure. He said that two representatives to the applications were in attendance to answer any questions Members may have. Mr. Lawrence introduced Mr. Edward Erfurt, Urban Designer from the County's Community Development Department for the Rio CRA application; and Ms. Teresa Lamar-Sarno, CRA Coordinator from the City of Stuart for the City of Stuart CRA application.

Mr. Lawrence stated that a total of three applications were submitted to MPO Staff by the April 27th deadline. The first application was received from Martin County for sidewalks and landscaping improvements in the Rio CRA District. A second application was received from the City of Stuart CRA for sidewalk improvements and a pedestrian kiosk at MLK Park. There have been discussions to combine the Rio and the Stuart applications because there are areas for potential connectivity, and because the Stuart application may fall below the \$200,000 threshold. A third application was received from Martin County for the construction of bike lanes along Dixie Highway from Cove Road to the FEC rail line near the Seabranck Park entrance. Because of the limitation of TE funds this year, consideration should be given for the need to request local fund contributions to this year's project applications. Mr. Lawrence provided a brief presentation prior to the discussion and ranking of the applications received.

Vice-Chair Kurtz asked if there would be TE funds in the amount of \$347,000 to expend this year. Mr. Lawrence responded in the affirmative. Mr. Mathes asked what the status of last year's unexpended TE funds was. Mr. Lawrence replied that he did not have a status on the Jensen Beach Causeway project from FDOT yet. Mr. Lawrence said that the Jensen Beach Causeway project is last year's eligible project for TE funding, left unfunded. He said that he would follow up with an email requesting further information on the status of this project. Vice-Chair Kurtz said that it would have been helpful to know the status of the Jensen Beach Causeway project prior to deciding the ranking of the project applications presented for this year. Mr. Mathes asked what the MPO's policy was regarding the unfunded prioritized projects from prior years; do applications automatically roll forward into the next year or do the applications need to be resubmitted? Mr. Lawrence stated that in the past, FDOT would move up unfunded projects automatically. Ms. Beltran suggested including last year's project in the proposed project priority list. This would ensure the consideration of pre-prioritized projects, should funds become available. Mr. Mathes concurred. He added that, unfunded pre-prioritized projects should be reconsidered to see how they would relate to the new proposed projects list.

Vice-Chair Kurtz asked if there has been any local matching funds designated for the proposed projects. Mr. Lawrence responded that there are no local contributions identified as of yet.

Mr. Trovato commented on the Martin County – Rio CRA application. He asked if curb and gutter was included in the cost of the project. Mr. Erfurt responded that the proposed sidewalk in this area would be a continuation of the existing sidewalks in this community. The project does not include curbing, but it does include street trees. Mr. Erfurt stated that the landscaping cost is included in the overall \$32/linear footage.

[The session was interrupted by some minor audio intrusion.]

Mr. Erfurt discussed the Rio CRA application further. This sidewalk/landscaping project encompasses three links in an intermodal system of transportation that is partially in place and/or planned for the Rio CRA:

1. Alice Street connection to City of Stuart
2. Loop #1 connecting tow longtime neighborhoods to CR 707 via Sumner Avenue, St. Lucie Boulevard and Kubin Avenue
3. Loop #2 connecting two more longtime neighborhoods to CR 707 via Rhodes Avenue, River Court, Waveland Avenue, and Elizabeth Avenue.

Mr. Mathes stated that the project's intent is to make it safer for kids to walk to the bus stops. Mr. Erfurt stated that sidewalks in this particular neighborhood is within the Community Redevelopment Area; and, under their Comprehensive Plan policies, it is the goal to do complete streets in these neighborhoods and complete a walkable sidewalk network. Mr. Trovato asked if there would be any intent to include curbing with the sidewalk. Mr. Erfurt responded that none would be considered at this time.

Vice-Chair Kurtz moved on to the discussion of the next application: MLK Park Restrooms and Kiosk, Stuart Sidewalk Connectivity project, from the City of Stuart CRA. Mr. Lawrence stated that the application reflected two different sections:

1. Martin Luther King, Jr. Park restrooms, kiosk, and bike rack
2. Sidewalk improvements along SR 707 northbound from Wright Boulevard to Green River Parkway.

Mr. Mathes expressed disappointment to learn that there was a separate application for sidewalk improvements toward the Green River Parkway, that apparently was not included in the budget of the Green River Parkway project that is currently underway. Ms. Lamar-Sarno responded that, at the time they were finalizing this applicatio , for both the kiosk and the sidewalk, it was presumed that there would be some monies available in the Public Enhancement fund to supplement it. However, since that point, they found out that there was no money left. Mr. Lawrence added that the proposed area is about 1,800 feet.

Mr. Trovato requested clarification on the connectivity the sidewalk project intends to achieve. Ms. Lamar-Sarno responded that at the time the project application was submitted, they were awaiting determination of whether or not there will be enough right-of-way (ROW) from Fern Street to Wright Boulevard. Currently the sidewalk ends at

Fern Street from the Roosevelt Bridge. Ms. Lamar-Sarno said that after the application was turned in by the established deadline, it was determined that there was not enough ROW; therefore, the proposed sidewalk connection between Fern Street to Wright Boulevard will not be considered. Ms. Lamar-Sarno said that, at this time, the connection the City of Stuart CRA is requesting is between Wright Boulevard and Green River Parkway along SR 707. Mr. Mathes asked if the proposed area of 1,800 feet has been adjusted to reflect this change of plans. Ms. Lamar-Sarno responded that the 1,800 feet area is from Wright Boulevard to Green River Parkway.

Ms. Lamar-Sarno proceeded to discuss the second section of the City of Stuart CRA application. She stated that the proposed project is to build a public restroom facility and a multi-panel educational kiosk with bicycle rack at a location to be determined at Martin Luther King, Jr. Park at the corner of Park Avenue, Florida Street and Church Street in East Stuart.

Mr. Mathes stated that this would be an opportunity to request the applicant, the City of Stuart CRA, to separate the two sections of their application to provide greater flexibility in allocating funds. He also commented that the two projects on this application might not have the same priority on the ranking list.

Mr. Lawrence stated that initially there was a consideration to combine the Rio and the City of Stuart applications because of the Alice Street connection; however, by presenting the City of Stuart with its two sections together as it currently has, helps them achieve the \$200,000 threshold. This minimum amount is one of FDOT requirements for TE funds applicants.

Mr. Mathes had a question regarding the third TE application submitted: Dixie Highway (A1A) paved shoulders project, submitted by Martin County. This project includes the addition of five-foot wide paved shoulders on 8,000 linear footage of an existing County roadway from Cove Road to RR Crossing, to serve as on-road bike lanes on Dixie Highway. Mr. Mathes asked if there were going to be any sidewalks included in this application. Mr. Lawrence responded that not on this application; however, there was a different ARRA funded project that would supplement connection with the Seabranh Greenway bike and pedestrian multiuse path along this stretch.

Vice-Chair Kurtz proposed moving on to the ranking of the three applications proposed. A discussion ensued among the Members, expressing their preferences, and more details of the projects were discussed.

Mr. Trovato asked if there would be any sidewalk to cross the Haney Creek located on the western side of Alice Street. Mr. Mathes asked if any of the applicants have allocated funds to provide a pedestrian crossing of this creek. Mr. Lawrence stated that none of them has; Rio CRA's application goes up to but not including that point, and the City of Stuart application has not estimated it. Mr. Mathes said that if the cost of putting a sidewalk across the Haney Creek is added to the "Sidewalk Improvement" section of the City of Stuart CRA application, and put it together with the "Alice Street connection to City of Stuart" section of the Rio CRA application, it would reach the \$200,000 minimum requirement, and we could have it as a stand-alone project. Mr. Mathes was

very pleased with the possibility of merging these three small sections into one application. He said that connectivity along this stretch is important for many reasons: it is a high traffic road, it provides regional connection, it has safety concerns, and it connects with several parks in the area. He saw a lot of potential in this suggestion.

Mr. Mathes asked how the ranking of the projects would relate to last year's unfunded projects. Ms. Beltran responded that last year's projects were listed on page eight of the TIP, on the previous agenda Item discussed. The last project on the list is the Jensen Beach Causeway (East) – Landscaping. Mr. Lawrence added that there would be landscaping planted in the median where it currently has asphalt. The project would have safety benefits by providing this traffic-calming feature. Mr. Mathes suggested including this project in the priority list as well.

Members continued to express their preferences. Mr. Trent Steele favored projects that would address the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Vice-Chair Kurtz was interested in addressing the bathroom facility needs in the East Stuart area.

Ms. Lamar-Sarno stated that there was another connectivity project discussed but they were unable to submit it due to time constraints. The project would include a sidewalk on the south side of Florida Street, crossing Dixie Highway and over the RR Crossing.

Mr. Lawrence mentioned some other funding sources that would be available and urged the Members to think about possible projects that could benefit from funds such as:

- Sidewalk, Bike, Shelter Box Fund
 - \$200,000 annual allocation to Martin MPO
 - Projects are prioritized in September
- DEP Greenways & Trails Grant
 - Application Cycle ends in March
 - Jonathon Dickinson Greenway as a potential project
- Safe Routes to School
 - Application Cycle ends in April
 - Fund pedestrian improvements within 2 mile radius of K – 8
 - Need School Board support and user/benefit data.
 - Port Salerno and Indiantown areas

Mr. Mathes asked both Ms. Lamar-Sarno and Mr. Erfurt if they would be willing to reorganize their application in the way it has been discussed, and separate the projects' sections presented. Mr. Erfurt answered that they would be happy to.

Mr. Mathes made a motion recommending the following projects in order of priority:

- 1. The “Sidewalk improvements along SR 707 northbound from Wright Boulevard to Green River Parkway” section of the City of Stuart CRA application, and the “Alice Street connection to City of Stuart” section of the Martin County – Rio CRA application including the portion of Haney Creek, should be combined in to a single application, along with the necessary creek pedestrian crossing.**

2. **The bike lanes (paved shoulders) project on Dixie Highway (A1A) from Cove Road to Seabranh (RR Crossing).**
3. **The remaining two separate portions of the Martin County – Rio CRA application for sidewalks that would provide access to the bus stops:**
 - a. **Loop #1 connecting two longtime neighborhoods to CR 707 via Sumner Avenue, St. Lucie Boulevard and Kubin Avenue, and**
 - b. **Loop #2 connecting two more longtime neighborhoods to CR 707 via Rhodes Avenue, River Court, Waveland Avenue, and Elizabeth Avenue.**
4. **The remaining City of Stuart CRA application project, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Park restrooms, kiosk, and bike rack**
5. **Last year’s unfunded landscape project along the Jensen Beach Causeway.**

Seconded by Mr. Trovato. There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Steele thanked MPO Staff and Mr. Erfurt on their efforts for the parking add-on to the Bridge Road project. Mr. Steele left the meeting to attend a previous engagement (10:00am).

Ms. Beltran asked if there was a need to call roll for the vote on the previous two Items. Mr. Mathes replied that, according to Robert’s Rules, when there is no opposition from any of the Members, the motions would pass.

C. Rail Corridor Study

MEMO: temp10CACa05.03

Ms. Beltran introduced this Item and provided background. She stated that at the December 21, 2009, meeting, the MPO Board approved an Interlocal Agreement between the Martin MPO and the St. Lucie TPO for a Premium Transit/Rail Corridor Study. The MPO Board authorized Staff to work with the St. Lucie TPO to “piggyback” on the existing St. Lucie’s rail corridor study contract with Tindale-Oliver & Associates (TOA) to ensure consistency in study content and regional perspective. Ms. Beltran said that this study would evaluate the feasibility of premium transit and passenger rail on the three major north-south corridors in Martin County: US1, I-95, and the Florida East Coast (FEC) Rail Corridor. Ms. Beltran introduced the Tindale-Oliver & Associates’ Project Team of Mr. Joel Rey and Mr. Asela Silva who would make a presentation on the existing and future conditions, as well as the methodology and measures for the Corridor Feasibility Assessment Process.

Mr. Rey proceeded with his presentation and distributed a PowerPoint handout to the Members (copy on file).

Mr. Rey stated that the project scope is:

- Review plans and technologies available. Mr. Rey stated that they have taken into consideration the adopted 2030 RL RTP, as well as the recently completed Regional TDP for their analysis, among other local and regional plans, State policies and federal documents. As for the premium transit technologies

available, Mr. Rey mentioned the enhanced express bus, the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), light rail, commuter rail, and heavy rail.

- Identify existing and future conditions. Mr. Rey spoke about transit services and facilities, land use, population and employment, and travel patterns, among other conditions, such as roadway conditions, trip generators, bike and pedestrian facilities, rail facilities, rail and water crossings, environmental features, and funding sources. Mr. Rey stated that these conditions have been assessed and documented on TOA's first technical memorandum.
- Conduct feasibility assessment (ongoing)
- Prepare action plan (ongoing)

Mr. Rey stated that the upcoming activities would be to prepare alternatives that would combine *corridors* with *modes* with *timeframes*, in order to create a matrix of these three variables. The matrix could then be fed into a feasibility assessment process. From there, TOA would then have recommended alternatives for the near-term, mid-term, and long-term; which may only be for one of the corridors, or for two or more of them, and it might involve multiple modes. After this process, an action plan will be prepared to structure land development regulations, comp plans amendments, and so forth, to get to that point that would support the modes aspired to.

Mr. Rey said that in order to accomplish all of this, TOA would review all of the transit modes mentioned before (the premium transit technologies), select all the applicable technologies for the corridors and timeframes, and develop those alternatives. The next step would be to conduct a feasibility assessment that would be documented on the next technical memorandum. The feasibility assessment has four primary criteria: 1) ridership potential, 2) transit-supportive land use, 3) economic development potential along that corridor due to the application of a particular type of technology, and 4) funding potential for that mode or modes. Once the recommended alternatives are determined, then, TOA will develop those in terms of an action plan. TOA would also estimate the probable cost and first year of operating cost for those implementations, and include them in the action plan along with the responsible parties who would ensure that all of the actions should be taking place in the general timeframe for each.

Mr. Rey informed that the second technical memorandum is due at the end May of 2010, and it would include the feasibility assessment along with the draft recommended alternatives, and the action plan to achieve those. The draft complete report will be then prepared for July of 2010. The draft report presentations will take place during August and September of 2010, and the final report is due by September of 2010.

Mr. Albert Zilg asked if TOA has analyzed other regions that have conducted a similar transit study. Mr. Rey replied in the affirmative, and stated that they have not only tried to match similar characteristics in areas within the United States but also around the world. Mr. Zilg suggested looking into the Sunnyvale area in San Francisco, California. Mr. Zilg said that they have done a great job with their transit modes and it is almost like looking twenty years into the future of how our area could turn out.

Vice-Chair Kurtz asked if the models would be considering above ground tracks. Mr. Rey replied that they are only looking at a mode that could make use of the existing track.

Mr. Rey said that we must first analyze if the region has the land use and the density to consider and support any such additions. Mr. Mathes concurred and he commented that Martin County does not have near the necessary land use nor the density to support those types of services, or the funding that would go into it. Mr. Rey added that, in their report, TOA has listed recommended *densities* in the action plan that are typically associated with a *certain modal* technology. Mr. Mathes commented that modeling should have some sense of reality. Mr. Rey concurred. Ms. Beltran said that a similar approach is being use in the 2035 RL RTP plan, where numbers that are more realistic would be implemented.

Mr. Zilg asked how TOA defines a corridor. Mr. Rey responded that for this study they were assigned three corridors:

1. the US1 corridor: 24.5 miles with four to six lanes
2. the I-95 corridor: 25.2 miles with six lanes
3. the FEC Rail corridor: 25 miles with 1 track owned by FEC Railway LLC

Mr. Zilg commented that perhaps analyzing all FDOT District Four would be a better approach, as it pertains to requesting funds from the Fed. Mr. Rey responded that, for certain modal technology such as heavy rail and the commuter rail, the bigger region approach could be considered; however, for some of the small-scale modes, a smaller region approach must be used. Mr. Zilg suggested dealing with the bigger region approach in phases. Mr. Rey replied that working in phases is a good technique. Mr. Trovato concurred that the analysis of a smaller scale region would be more accurate for corridors such as US1. He said that in Martin County, along US1, modes that would be useful on the north end of this corridor might not have the same use on the south end of it. The north portion of US1 is highly congested, whereas the southern portion is less congested. Mr. Rey agreed that one segment could have many different elements throughout. Mr. Rey said that the mode must make sense for internal connectivity, for accessibility within the County, and for serving multiple purposes. Mr. Zilg concurred. Mr. Trovato stated that the mode or modes recommended must have a local benefit for the community. Mr. Rey was in accordance.

Mr. Zilg asked if drawbridges would be addressed in the plan. Mr. Rey responded that, from the transit perspective, they would try to avoid them whenever possible.

Mr. Rey thanked the Members for their interest in the discussion.

D. Annual Election of Officers

MEMO: temp10CACa05.04

Ms. Beltran introduced this Item and provided background. She stated that according to the MPO bylaws (copy on file), Section 1.03 COMMITTEES, B. (2) states, "Officers - A Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected at the first meeting of the Calendar year. Ms. Beltran explained that because the MPO Director position was in transition, the election of officers was delayed. Ms. Beltran stated that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman will serve through the 2010 Calendar year.

Mr. Mathes nominated Ms. Sheila Kurtz for the Chair position. Ms. Beltran said that the current Chair Toby Overdorf has not attended any of the meeting held during this fiscal

year. Mr. DeFronzo asked if we were making a change based on Mr. Overdorf's lack of attendance. Mr. Mathes responded that he was nominating Ms. Kurtz because she conducted the meetings wonderfully.

Mr. Mathes made a motion to nominate Vice-Chair Sheila Kurtz for the Chair position of the CAC. Vice-Chair Kurtz accepted the nomination. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zilg. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Kurtz nominated Mr. DeFronzo for the Vice Chair position of the CAC. Mr. DeFronzo accepted the nomination. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mathes. The motion carried unanimously.

6. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Going back to the TE projects subject, Vice-Chair DeFronzo asked if construction funding was received for the Seabranh Multipath Trail project for this year. Mr. Lawrence responded in the affirmative. Mr. Lawrence said that ARRA funds were received for FY 2010. The preliminary construction phase is already underway.

Mr. Zilg asked what the status of the bus shelters was. Ms. Beltran said that the Federal Transit Administration in Atlanta reviewed the application and they have placed a request for additional information. Staff is currently working on the additional information requested. Mr. Lawrence stated the more detailed estimates of cost would be provided, as well as further information for additional sites that have been added to the application. The other sites considered are Port Salerno and Rio. Mr. Zilg stated that he would like the bus shelters project started so that users may find some comfort while waiting for their buses during the hot summer days.

Mr. Mathes asked about the premium transit study discussed in Item C. He wondered if studies like this were showing in the TIP, and how Staff keeps track of these useful studies. Ms. Beltran responded that they would not be included as part of the TIP but as part of the UPWP. This particular Premium Transit Corridor Feasibility Assessment is a planning study funded by FHWA, Federal Highway planning funds, and it was initiated by St. Lucie County. In this particular case, the MPO Board authorized Staff to work with St. Lucie TPO to "piggyback" on St. Lucie's rail corridor study contract with TOA. Mr. Mathes wanted to ensure that Members would be informed before hand when a study is going to be planned or initiated. He suggested that Members should have a say on how the monies are expended with this kind of planning, versus getting the information of the studies after the fact.

7. COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC

None

8. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None

9. NOTES

None

10. NEXT MEETING

June 02, 2010


11. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Vice-Chair Kurtz entertained a motion for adjournment. Moved by Mr. Trovato. Seconded by Mr. Zilg. The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am.

Recorded and Prepared by:



Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II



Date

Approved by:



Sheila Kurtz, CAC Chair



Date