

MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
JOINT CITIZEN and TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(Joint CAC & TAC)

Friday, September 17, 2010 - 9:30 A.M.

Martin County Airport – Witham Field
Maintenance Building Conference Room
1895 Flying Fortress Way, Stuart, FL
(772) 221-1498
www.martinmpo.com

1. CALL TO ORDER – 9:30 A.M.

Mr. Sam Amerson served as the Chairman and called the meeting to order at 9:35 A.M.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Citizen Advisory Committee

Sheila Kurtz, Chairwoman

Amy Eason

Barbara Timmerman (for Barbara Kauffman)

Mark Mathes (arrived at 10:03am)

Julie Preast

Kevin Trepanier – Ex-Officio, St. Lucie CAC

Technical Advisory Committee

Sam Amerson, Chairman

Samantha Horowitz, Vice-Chair

Joe Capra

Stuart Trent

Dan Hudson

Don Donaldson

Shi-Chiang Li and Lisa Dykstra for Gustavo Schmidt, FDOT

John Fanticola for Barbara Timmerman (arrived at 9:38am)

Rogelio Gonzalez, Ex-Officio St. Lucie TAC (arrived at 10:20am)

Excused Members:

Joseph DeFronzo, Vice-Chair - CAC

Alex Trovato - CAC

Jody Ianuzzi - CAC

Trent Steele - CAC

Albert Zilg - CAC

Michael Moon - TAC

Arlene Tanis, FDOT Representative – TAC

Mark Cocco - TAC

Bruce Offord - TAC

Kim DeLaney - TAC

Members Not In Attendance:

None

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Claudette Mahan, Associate Transit Planner
Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II

A quorum was present for both committees.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Chairman Amerson informed that there is an additional Item to the agenda, the List of Project Priorities. Ms. Julie Preast made a motion to approve the Agenda with the additional Item. Seconded by Mr. Joe Capra. Motion carried unanimously.

4. AGENDA ITEMS

A. STATE ROAD 76 PD&E UPDATE

MEMO: temp11CAC/TACa04.01

Ms. Beth Beltran provided Item's background. She explained that on September 1, 2010, the Project Team for the SR76 PD&E Study gave a presentation to both the CAC and TAC. The presentation was in response to the comments and concerns made by MPO Board members and the Martin County Engineering Staff at the May 17, 2010, MPO Policy Board meeting. Martin County Engineering Staff has concerns about the proposed roadway design and whether the traffic analysis is in agreement with the County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan's Future Land Use Map and population projections. MPO Board members questioned why a diamond-type of configuration is not being implemented for the SR 76 interchange, given earlier discussions with FDOT. The consultant responded that based on the traffic analysis, the diamond-type configuration was not feasible.

Ms. Beltran said that during the presentation on September 1st, the TAC and CAC both had concerns about whether the expansion of the bridge over the Turnpike (west of the SR76/I-95 Interchange) to six lanes was necessary. FDOT is going ahead with the design of this project, and TAC members were concerned that the project is moving forward with wrong data. MPO and County Staff have been working with the staff of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council on the 2035 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, and have found that the 2030 model, which was used for the SR76 PD&E Study, appears to have some inaccuracies in the traffic volumes. In particular, there seems to be a high number of trips coming from the west on SR76 and going north at the I-95/SR76 interchange.

Mr. Don Donaldson, Martin County Engineering Department Director, stated that one of the issues Engineering Staff had with the project was the proposed addition of a tear-drop loop at the interchange for the incoming traffic from the west of SR 76 from the Indiantown area to go north on I-95. Mr. Donaldson said that the proposed right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and the capacity for the improvements necessary to accommodate the

traffic coming from the west represented the biggest concern. Mr. Donaldson said that FDOT and FDOT's subconsultant have been relying on data obtained from the 2030 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (2030 RL RTP). He stated that County Staff is currently updating the 2035 RL RTP and new updated data is being incorporated in the plan, including data related to traffic volumes coming from the west of the County which reflects *less* traffic volumes. Mr. Donaldson said that, from the County's perspective, there is a potential that some of the options for the Preferred Alternatives of the SR 76 PD&E Study offered may change if traffic volume data proves to be different. He said that the Preferred Alternative that would meet the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidelines was a very large interchange, and FDOT was working with the County on interim improvements that would provide for a significant volume growth into the future; however, the concern is that this Preferred Alternative would accommodate more growth potential than the County would realize. Mr. Donaldson stated that given the sensitivity of our community to growth and how we prepare for it, this issue is being looked at very closely by County Staff.

Mr. Donaldson stated that County Staff suggests, given that the 2035 RL RTP data is currently being worked on and scheduled for adoption in January, 2011; that the TAC recommends to the MPO that the SR 76 PD&E Study includes the 2035 traffic data and by including this new data model, the Preferred Alternatives are re-looked at, the necessary adjustments are made, and the Preferred Alternatives are brought back for reconsideration. So, in effect it would delay the consideration of the Preferred Alternatives as currently presented until the 2035 data is ultimately approved by the Joint MPO/TPO Policy Board. Hopefully this re-analysis would result in more than one viable Alternative that may not necessarily include an interchange with a tear drop loop in it. Mr. Donaldson made his statement into a motion for further discussion. Seconded by Mr. Dan Hudson.

Mr. Hudson said that he was under the impression that there was design being done for this intersection, and he asked what the status of this was. Mr. Donaldson responded that he would prefer to discuss the design issue as a second part of this Item because it would require separate discussion and direction needs to be provided to FDOT. Chairman Amerson asked if the second discussion would address the corridor segmentation. Mr. Donaldson stated that the current PD&E is from Cove Road west to CR 711 (SW Pratt Whitney Road), but the segment that County Staff has looked at is the corridor portion from Monterey Road to SW Pratt Whitney Road as the SR 76 Corridor. He said that how Staff directs FDOT as it relates to the allocation of design funds is important, whether we decide to treat it as multiple segments or as one.

Mr. Joe Capra asked if there would be more than one motion to address the issues of this Item. Mr. Donaldson replied in the affirmative, he said that the second motion would be to provide direction related to funding of the current plan for FDOT to start design.

Mr. Shi Chiang Li from FDOT asked if Staff suggestion was to delay the analysis until the adoption of the 2035 RL RTP or to wait just using the available 2035 data to analyze it further. Mr. Donaldson responded that it was his understanding in talking with FDOT District Four Staff that the delay would be until the 2035 Traffic Data is formally adopted by the Joint MPO/TPO Board. Mr. Donaldson said that this data may be available right

now but it has not gone through the approval process yet. Ms. Sheila Kurtz asked if this data was finalized. Mr. Donaldson replied that it is not fully completed. Ms. Beltran stated that the 2035 Traffic Data would be discussed further at the upcoming October 7th Joint CAC and Joint TAC meetings hosted by St. Lucie.

Ms. Barbara Timmerman asked if it was safe to say that the updated 2035 data contains significant differences that would significantly impact moving forward with the SR 76 PD&E Study. Mr. Donaldson said that this is precisely County Engineering Staff's opinion.

Chairman Amerson asked Ms. Beltran to elaborate on the data discrepancies found by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC). [TCRPC are the producers of the 2035 RL RTP.] Ms. Beltran stated that the 2030 model contains several areas that triggered concerns because the traffic volumes did not make sense. One example was that the model showed a large group of "phantom" trips within a big Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) area being loaded into Cove Road. Ms. Beltran explained that this was a physical impossibility because those areas did not even connect to Cove Road; therefore, creating deficiencies in the area that maybe didn't even exist. Ms. Beltran said that another affected area is the western part of Martin County where the 2030 model indicates that the north-western part of Palm Beach County is a big traffic generator and this volume would be traveling east on SR 76 into Martin County and going north on I-95. Ms. Beltran stated that Mr. Mike Busha from TCRPC has talked to Mr. Randy Whitfield, Staff Director of Palm Beach MPO, and Mr. Whitfield agreed that their 2030 model was incorrect. Ms. Beltran said that Palm Beach MPO Staff was not aware what the traffic generator was, so they adjusted this data on their 2035 model to reflect a correct volume of traffic for that area.

Chairman Amerson recapped and stated that Staff is requesting consistency and accuracy in the data we are using for the SR 76 PD&E Study.

There being no further comments the motion carried unanimously for all TAC Members, with FDOT Representative Mr. Shi-Chiang Li abstaining.

Ms. Julie Preast moved a similar motion to the CAC. Seconded by Ms. Timmerman. The motion carried unanimously for all CAC Members

Mr. Donaldson proceeded to discuss the second issue which is that FDOT is in the process of advertising for *design* on the SR 76 corridor project related to this PD&E. He said the concern is that by delaying this study, FDOT may suspend the design contract. Mr. Donaldson stated that the choices are that FDOT could move ahead with the design contract and negotiate award pending the resolution of the PD&E; or FDOT could suspend the contract in which case they would move the money somewhere else and we would not be sure when FDOT would allocate funds back for the SR 76 corridor. Mr. Donaldson said that FDOT has also informed that as part of FHWA Adoption PD&E requirements for projects of this nature, there needs to be some sort of design for near term capacity improvement as a part of the PD&E program.

Mr. Donaldson said that Staff does want FDOT to continue to program design funds for SR 76. He stated that there has been some concerns in regards to which segment the design will occur, so at this time County Staff is focused primarily on the interchange improvements necessary to continue development along SR 76 where the concurrency issue is; the next priority would then be the segment between Monterey Road and Cove Road, however, this segment is not included within this PD&E Study. Given that there is some overlapping, **County Staff recommendation to FDOT is to continue programming design funds for the *entire* SR 76 corridor from Monterey Road to SW Pratt Whitney Road. Mr. Donaldson made his statement into a motion for further discussion.**

Ms. Lisa Dykstra from FDOT commented in regards of programming design funds for the entire corridor, and said that Mr. Richard Young, PD&E Project Manager, stated that until a re-evaluation is completed for the segment between Monterey Road to Cove Road, FDOT would be unable to move forward with the programming of the design funds. Mr. Donaldson said that this is the reason why the request is for the *entire* corridor, so in the event the segment between Monterey Road and Cove Road was not viable, the County would not lose the design funds by keeping the remaining segments available, allowing the County to maintain the funds active and programmed for this year. Mr. Donaldson stated that it is the County's position that these funds are not lost to future years or lost entirely.

Ms. Beltran requested clarification from Ms. Dykstra. Ms. Beltran said that it was her understanding that the current PD&E Study for the interchange segment that goes from Cove Road to SW Pratt Whitney Road requires design in order to be in compliance with FHWA requirements, and this is the reason why FDOT advertised the design phase; however, it seems that FDOT cannot program design funds for the update of the existing PD&E for the segment from Cove Road to Monterey Road. Ms. Beltran asked why there has to be design funds programmed for the PD&E for the western segment but not for the eastern segment of the same corridor. Ms. Dykstra responded that she knew that a PD&E Study was completed for the eastern segment. She added that it went for design and it ended up being for only four lanes; however, six lanes have been contemplated as the ultimate for that PD&E Study. Ms. Dykstra said that, at this point, there is already design done and completed for the eastern segment but that FDOT cannot go to the six lane design until the old PD&E has been re-evaluated.

Mr. Donaldson stated that there are some uncertainties to the design phase requirement of the PD&E Study, and that in the best interest of the community, the way that we could continue moving forward is to include the *entire* SR 76 corridor.

Chairman Amerson recapped County Staff's recommendation by saying that in the best interest of the public, FDOT should include the eastern segment in the design fund programming, complete the necessary PD&E update amendment supplemental to the six lane segment, and to include this segment and program the design funds. He said his question was how FDOT would accomplish that. Chairman Amerson stated that we need FDOT to figure out how to accomplish this recommendation. Mr. Li stated that he concurred with Mr. Donaldson, and that this suggestion would be in the best interest of the County.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Capra. There being no further comments the motion carried unanimously for all TAC Members.

Ms. Julie Prest moved a similar motion to the CAC. Seconded by Ms. Timmerman. The motion carried unanimously for all CAC Members.

Ms. Beltran made reference to the reason why the SR 76 corridor was broken into segments. Mr. Donaldson stated that Item C on this agenda would make reference to the segmentation of this corridor; however, *for the purpose of the design funding* of the PD&E Study Staff is asking FDOT to program and expend the funds somewhere in the *entire* corridor.

Ms. Daphne Spanos from FDOT stated that the design phase looks like it would have to be placed on hold, but that it is not FDOT's intention to jeopardize the design funds. She said that, in coordination with County Staff, there would be discussion as to what actually that design would be, and that it could be a scaled-back version of what the PD&E recommends. She said, "The thought is to keep it in place, don't lose your funding, don't potentially lose it to another project; keep it place and let's work together. It might involve scaling it back, but as a whole, ask FDOT to get your whole corridor funded for design and then those pieces would be ready in the future, hopefully when construction funds become available, and your interim [interchange] also would be then eligible for Federal funding...so that's a win-win for everyone."

B. TRANSPORTATION REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM (TRIP) and PROJECT SELECTION

MEMO: temp11CAC/TACa04.02

Ms. Beltran provided background. She said that in order to qualify for TRIP funding, in 2006 the Martin MPO, St. Lucie TPO, and Indian River MPO established a new regional entity called the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC) to address the prioritization of regional projects. The voting membership of the TCTC consists of the Chairperson and one other member of the Policy Board of each of the Treasure Coast area's MPOs.

Ms. Beltran said that although TRIP funding was not available last year, FDOT has informed the three Treasure Coast MPOs that \$568,581 is available for application. This amounts to \$189,527 per county, and these monies will be programmed for FY2013/14. The staff of the Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River MPOs recommend this year's TRIP funding be put towards improvements along the Florida East Coast (FEC) corridor in anticipation of passenger rail service operating in the Treasure Coast region. Indian River and St. Lucie MPOs are proposing to put their portion of the TRIP funds toward train stations along the FEC tracks in their respective counties. Ms. Beltran explained that Martin has already received ARRA funding for its Transit Depot in Downtown Stuart along the rail corridor; however, the ARRA funds are only paying for the building itself. Hence, MPO Staff is recommending that Martin's portion of the TRIP monies fund the exterior amenities of the transit depot, including bus parking/circulation, passenger access and covered walkway.

Mr. Donaldson added that this money could give the County the ability to build the platform or the covered walkway to the bus area.

Ms. Beltran referred the Members to the email copy included in the handout (copy on file) and pointed out that both Indian River County and St. Lucie County have a back-up project for funding. Ms. Beltran stated that the SR 76 project is listed on the Rainbow List that was prepared the last time the TCTC planned for TRIP funding. Thus, MPO Staff is recommending listing the SR 76 project as the back-up project for TRIP funding.

Mr. Mathes moved to recommend to the MPO Board approval of using \$189,527 (Martin's portion of the \$568,581 in TRIP funding) for the exterior amenities of the Transit Depot, including bus parking/circulation, passenger access and covered walkway. Should this project not be accepted by FDOT, then, the request is to move the funds towards the SR 76 project, as this is the second project priority for TRIP funding. Seconded by Ms. Prest. The motion carried unanimously for all CAC Members.

Mr. Hudson moved a similar motion to the TAC. Seconded by Mr. Donaldson. The motion carried unanimously for all TAC Members, with Mr. Joe Capra abstaining.

Ms. Prest requested an update on the Transit Depot project. Ms. Rauth replied that a consultant had been selected and Staff is in the process of negotiating the design contract with the awarded consultant. Ms. Prest asked if the Transit Depot design would carry the historical reflection of the area. Chairman Amerson responded in the affirmative and said that the exterior architecture and the overall architecture of the design would carry the theme of the former train station; with some interior modernization of the office space. Ms. Prest asked Mr. Hudson if the City of Stuart would be willing to work on additional right-of-way to accommodate perhaps a bus transfer station; or if the City has whatever is needed to make this a cohesive project that would include all these amenities, per the latest motion. Mr. Donaldson stated that this would indeed be a Transit Depot for buses. He said that this is the primary purpose of it, but this Transit Depot is also situated and designed in a manner that it would have a platform to eventually make it also a Train Depot. Mr. Hudson concurred and he stated that this is a coordinated effort between the County and the City. Chairman Amerson shared some preliminary concept design of the Transit Depot.

C. FISCAL YEAR 2012 LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES (LOPP)

[Item added to the agenda]

Ms. Beth provided background and said that each year, the MPO is required to submit its list of Project Priorities for the coming fiscal year. Ms. Beltran distributed handouts with the list of roadway priorities for FY 2012 (copy on file). She said that the priority projects must be drawn from the Cost Feasible Plan for Martin County that was adopted into the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan. Last year, the Indian Street Bridge (ISB) project was separated into three different projects because the bridge portion of the project was funded with ARRA funds. The western roadway segment leading up to the bridge was ranked #1, SR 76 improvements were ranked #2, the eastern roadway segment of the ISB project was ranked #3, and Willoughby Boulevard was ranked #4.

Ms. Beltran stated that Staff is recommending that the rankings of the projects stay the same for FY2012. However, Staff is also recommending that the SR 76 project be split into an eastern segment and a western segment (just as it was discussed in Item 4A on this agenda), showing the eastern segment remaining as the #2 priority. Additionally, because the level of service deficiencies are not as crucial along the western segment of SR 76, Staff is proposing to move that portion of the project to #5.

Ms. Beltran said that there were two other lists included in the handout: the Enhancement Project Priorities list, and the Bike, Ped, Bus Shelter Box Fund Project Priorities list. Ms. Beltran stated that there were no changes made to the Enhancement Project Priorities List.

Mr. Capra asked when it would be appropriate to add a project that entails sidewalk improvements to the Enhancement Projects list. Ms. Beltran responded that Staff would receive notification from FDOT as soon as the Enhancement Funds would become available. MPO Staff would then notify all interested parties that the new Enhancement Fund cycle has opened and that application packages are available. Ms. Beltran added that funds would be available next for FY 2015.

Mr. Donaldson had a concern regarding the FY 2012 Priority Roadway Project Priority list. He stated that the converging point of the segments-split (into eastern and western segments) has been set at Cove Road, and he was wondering if it would be a better idea to have the converging point of the split at the I-95 interchange instead. In this way the I-95 interchange would be included in the #2 priority for the purposes of FDOT funding.

Ms. Lisa Wichser from Martin County Engineering commented that it would come out of discussion whether to leave the I-95 interchange as part of the County's interim interchange modification, which is funded through the County's CIP, and leave it within the ongoing SR 76 PD&E. Mr. Donaldson responded that his concern is precisely that the ongoing SR 76 PD&E is for the segment that falls as priority #5 on the list; the I-95 interchange would then be in a lower priority in terms of construction.

A discussion ensued about the new proposed segmentation of the SR 76 corridor. The big concern was whether changing the converging point of the corridor segmentation would "confuse" FDOT and would jeopardize the funding of the projects as prioritized.

Ms. Lisa Dykstra politely interrupted the discussion and informed that a few minutes ago she has called and contacted Mr. Steve Braun from FDOT District Four. Mr. Braun suggested that it would be a good idea to have the limits from the I-95 interchange to Monterey Road and from SW Pratt Whitney Road to the I-95 interchange. This would provide flexibility to allocate funding for either one segment. Mr. Donaldson stated that he was very pleased to know that Mr. Braun concurred with this suggestion.

Mr. Mathes made a motion to change the limits of the SR 76 project from the I-95 interchange to Monterey Road, and from SW Pratt Whitney Road to the I-95 interchange. Seconded by Ms. Preast. The motion carried unanimously for all CAC Members.

Mr. Hudson moved a similar motion to the TAC. Seconded by Mr. John Fanticola.

Ms. Dykstra commented that Mr. Braun wanted to clarify that if a change was made from I-95 to Monterey Road that there was no guarantee that FDOT could add six lanes from the interchange to Cove Road, as this expansion has not been included in the existing (the old) PD&E Study [as previously discussed]. Ms. Daphne Spanos, Project Manager from FDOT stated that this expansion was indeed covered in the old PD&E from 1984. Mr. Donaldson welcomed FDOT's clarification on this regard during the upcoming MPO Board meeting.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously for all TAC Members.

MPO Staff mentioned that there were two other lists included for the Committees review under the discussion of **Item C: the Enhancement Project Priorities list, and the Bike, Ped, Bus Shelter Box Fund Project Priorities list (copy on file)**. Mr. Mathes moved Staff recommendation and amended his original motion to include approval these two lists as presented by Staff. Ms. Prest seconded the amended motion. The motion carried unanimously for all CAC members.

Mr. Hudson moved a similar amended motion to the TAC. Seconded by Mr. Donaldson. The motion carried unanimously for all TAC Members.

5. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ms. Prest said that CR 714, from CR 710 to I-95 is treacherous as there are no shoulders along this corridor. She requested that this be looked into, possibly expand this road and to consider placing shoulders on both sides. Mr. Donaldson said that some of the areas along this corridor do not meet the standards and it would be problematic to add pavement shoulders. Ms. Prest requested coordination efforts with the work that is currently being done in the canopy area of the corridor. Mr. Donaldson assented to research this request further.

6. COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC

None

7. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None

8. NOTES

On file.

9. Next Meetings

- October 07, 2010 – Joint CAC with St. Lucie County, hosted by St. Lucie County, in the St. Lucie County Administration Building, Conference Room #3, 2300 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, FL at 2:00 p.m.
- October 07, 2010 – Joint TAC with St. Lucie County, hosted by St. Lucie County, in the St. Lucie County Administration Building, Conference Room #3, 2300 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, FL at 10:30 a.m.

- November 17, 2010 – CAC meeting, location TBD.
- November 17, 2010 – TAC meeting, location TBD.

10. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chairman Amerson adjourned the meeting at 10:11 am.

Recorded and Prepared by:



Lisandra Bonet, Administrative Specialist II

Nov. 17, 2010

Date

Approved by:



Sheila Kurtz, CAC Chair

11-17-2010

Date



Sam Amerson, TAC Chair

11/17/10

Date