

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Martin County Administration Building
County Commission Chambers
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 221-1498
www.martinmpo.com

Wednesday, February 1, 2012 - 9:00 a.m.

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Sheila Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Sheila Kurtz
Amy Eason
John Patteson
Michael Houston (arrived at 9:10 A.M.)
Trent Steele (arrived at 9:06 A.M.)
Albert Zilg
Kevin Trepanier, Ex-officio

Members Excused:

Joseph DeFronzo, Vice-Chair
Alex Trovato

Members Absent

None

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Gavin Jones, Senior Planner
Michael Malham, Planner II
Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II

Others in Attendance:

Patrick LaConte

A quorum was present for this committee.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Ms. Amy Eason. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Patteson. There were no objections. The agenda was approved unanimously.

Ms. Beltran stated that there is an extra agenda item which was requested by the Board of County Commissioners at the January 24, 2012, meeting. She requested that this item be included as "Agenda Item B" after the Election of Officers and that the Agenda approval be amended to reflect same. Mr. Patteson inquired if the elections could be tabled until a later date in hopes of a larger attendance, but he was advised that only two members were excused and three were vacant. It was left to the pleasure of the committee how they wished to proceed with the elections, to which the committee chose to proceed with elections.

The motion to approve the agenda was amended by the motioner to reflect the addition of Agenda Item B, SR 710 Big John Monahan Bridge, as requested by Ms. Beth Beltran. Mr. Patteson amended his second to concur with the addition. There were no additional discussions. The amended motion was approved unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms. John Patteson, and seconded by Ms. Amy Eason. There were no objections to the motion. The Minutes were approved unanimously.

5. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

6. AGENDA ITEMS

A. ANNUAL ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MEMO: temp12CACa01.01

Ms. Beltran stated that the MPO Bylaws require that the election of officers shall take place at the first meeting of the calendar year. The positions of Chair and Vice Chair, whose terms are for the period of one year, are up for election. Ms. Shelia Kurtz volunteered to remain as the Chair, and Ms. Amy Eason volunteered as Vice Chair.

Mr. Patteson made a motion to nominate the Chair to be Ms. Kurtz and Ms. Eason as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Al Zilg. The motion passed unanimously.

B. SR710 (Big John Monahan) Bridge

MEMO: XXXX

Ms. Beltran stated that this item was requested by the Board of County Commissioners at the January 24, 2012, Board meeting. It is concerning the SR 710 Bridge in Indiantown, which is on the State's Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). This bridge is a high level replacement bridge over the St. Lucie C-44 Canal (Okeechobee Waterway) and SR 76. FDOT requested that this bridge widening project come before the MPO Board in September, 2011, for a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment requesting allocation of an additional \$350,000 for right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. The Senior Project Engineer of the design build (DB) firm advised the Board that this ROW acquisition would reduce the length of the bridge span for a project savings for FDOT of between \$8 and \$10 million. In January, 2012 the Indiantown Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC) requested of FDOT that lighting on the bridge should be part of this project. FDOT maintains the lighting on the SIS facilities in Martin County (I-95 the Florida Turnpike) and four bridges on the State Highway System (Ernest Lyons Bridge, Roosevelt Bridge, Palm City Bridge and Jensen Beach Causeway). The BOCC sent a letter to FDOT requesting that lights be included as part of the SR 710 Bridge Project and they requested that this item proceed through the MPO Process. FDOT responded to the Indiantown NAC stating that they were not going to provide lights on the bridge as there were no safety concerns according to the lighting justification study conducted. FDOT did state that they were providing pedestrian lighting and pedestals on the bridge to allow for future lighting. Staff recommends the committee's recommendation to the MPO Board to send a letter to the legislative delegation requesting FDOT provide, install and maintain lights on the SR 710 Bridge as part of the widening project. Mr. John Patteson asked for clarification of the lights in the barrier walls and what are the plans for the current illumination. Ms. Beltran stated that currently, only pedestrian lights are planned for the barrier wall, which is the wall between the traffic and the pedestrian walkway, there are no overhead lights planned. The NAC would like overhead lights to illuminate the roadway over the bridge. Ms. Beltran stated that there is high pedestrian and cycling traffic in the Indiantown area. Mr. Patteson stated that he resides in the Indiantown area and is aware of the high volume of bicycle traffic. He stated that if bicyclers didn't have room or were not allowed to use the pedestrian walkway on the bridge that would put them on the roadway. He asked if there will be bike lanes, and if so, lighting would be needed. Mr. Patteson stated that if the bridge was poorly illuminated, a car crossing in the dark could have difficulty seeing a disabled vehicle with no lights, creating a safety hazard. He stated that he was in accord with the NAC's desire to have FDOT install lights on the bridge plus he would like to see a layout of the surface of the bridge to see if there will be bike lanes. Mr. Malham stated that State regulation mandates that bike lanes be installed as it is an SIS facility. Mr. Patteson stated that if there are bike lanes, that some form of roadway lighting

would be imperative. He stated that FDOT should revisit this project and the safety report, to justify why they deem that lights are not necessary on the bridge. Ms. Eason added that the point here is that FDOT is designing the bridge for future lighting, so it sounds like it is more of a “money” issue. Mr. Houston added that if FDOT is already saving \$8 to \$10 million from the ROW acquisition, that those funds should be used to eliminate this safety hazard and install lighting. Ms. Eason suggested that the reason the committee is getting this now is that FDOT is trying to push this into the funding cycle for the Legislature.

Mr. Houston stated that if the NAC were requesting ornamental lighting on the bridge that could be an issue, as it could be costly. Mr. Patteson stated that there is nothing showing what type of lighting the NAC is requesting. He said that this committee needs additional information and more discussion as to the proposed and future uses of the lighting.

Mr. John Patteson made a motion to recommend that the Metropolitan Policy Organization (MPO) Board send a letter of concurrence to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), with a copy to the Florida Legislative Delegation, agreeing with the requests of the Indiantown Neighborhood Advisory Committee (NAC) and the Martin County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), requesting roadway lighting on the John Monahan/Highway 710 Bridge. This motion was amended to include that this committee and the MPO Board should receive a copy of FDOT’s Safety Survey Report at the next scheduled meeting. This report should indicate FDOT’s justification that roadway lights are not needed on the bridge at this time; the design of the roadway surface to see if bike lanes are included; what type of lighting is currently designed for the bridge, the type of lighting being requested by the NAC and what are the proposed future designs for lighting of the bridge, as adequate lighting is imperative to the safety of cyclists or a disabled vehicle on the bridge. This motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Houston. There were no objections to this motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Beltran stated that she would find out the desired lighting selection requested.

C. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACTION PLAN

MEMO: temp12CACa01.02

Ms. Beltran introduced Mr. Malham, Planner II with the MPO, who presented the draft Action Plan at the Joint Advisory Committee meeting in November, the MPO Board in December, to the CRA, and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. Mr. Malham stated that he has made some changes in the Action Plan to incorporate the input gleaned from these organizations. He stated that he is requesting an endorsement from this committee for the Plan. Mr. Malham addressed the highlights of the Action Plan, the positive impacts of cycling and walking, the conceptual projects, the implementation strategies and the next steps

to be taken. Mr. Malham discussed the top 20 projects and many connectivity gaps which the Plan hopes to fill. He advised that he plans to present the Final Draft to the MPO Board on February 20, 2012.

Ms. Eason requested clarification on Appendix A which addressed the fatalities by age from 2006-2010. Mr. Malham advised that those are five year totals using the same population figure, showing bicycle fatalities/injuries or pedestrian fatalities/injuries and the percentage. Mr. Patteson asked if there was a connection between where the most accidents occurred and the priority to build a bicycle path. Mr. Malham advised that criteria of that nature were factored in during the Project Feasibility Scoring. Mr. Patteson advised that there are different types of bicyclist in this community, those who use the on-road facilities and those who will only use the sidewalks and multimodal paths. Mr. Malham advised that more information is available now, but this information was obtained using the 2010 Census as it is the most comprehensive in terms of solid numbers which have already been tallied up in demographics and various categories. Safety was factored in also when scoring the projects.

Mr. Trent Steele asked if the County has considered sponsorship of bicycle paths in an attempt to raise funds for the projects. Mr. Malham advised that an Adopt a Path Program is one of the strategies. BPAC has discussed having some of the local bicycle clubs take an active role in that form of funding, which is included in the Goals, Objectives and Strategies. Mr. Steele asked if there could be a more intensive fund raiser, such as paying to permanently have the path named after you and you provide any repairs or improvements to the path. Someone else could be the sponsor to keep it clean and clear for an annual fee. A family may want to sponsor a path as a memorial to a rider. Mr. Malham agreed that it would be a good idea and he will bring this to the BPAC. Mr. Steele inquired if there were any abandoned railroad tracks. Mr. Patteson advised that there are some in Allapattah. Mr. Malham noted the Rails to Trails Project. Mr. Patteson suggested that Mr. Malham contact the Head Ranger, Mark Nelson, from Jonathan Dickenson State Park, to get information about mountain bike trails in Oleta State Park in North Miami. That could be a huge draw for people with a lot less infrastructure required. Mr. Houston stated that the State is preparing to do management plans on Allapattah and Seabranck Parks. They have discussed soft trails in those areas. Mr. Malham stated that they will look into it, as he is supposed to be on the mailing lists of the Park Management Plans. There is a project in the planning stages in Seabranck. Mr. Malham advised that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council is working with Palm Beach to get a regional bike/ped/greenways started which they hope will run in all of South Florida.

A motion to recommend this Final Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan to the MPO for approval was made by Mr. Steele. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zilg.

Mr. Patteson asked what the impact would be on approving this Action Plan. Mr. Malham clarified that the approval would be to the Vision, the Strategies, the Goals and Objectives, and the Conceptual Projects. Mr. Patteson asked Mr. Malham if this information was based on office research or if he has field observations to look at existing facilities and markets where they have made these on road projects as in Dade County, Key Biscayne, and Cocanut Grove to name a few. Mr. Malham stated that this is based on office research. Mr. Patteson suggested that he should go to some of these areas as he may learn of ways to and how to proceed, as these communities have already been where Martin is now. Martin could benefit greatly from their mistakes and successes.

Mr. Houston wanted to see if there were any measureable standards which could be brought to the committee to show increase of bicycling. Mr. Malham stated that the information being used is the American Community Survey which is from the 2010 Census, this information is compiled every three to five years. Short of the National Transit Survey which is completed every ten years, which has the best information, but we haven't been able to get it. We are putting together a travel survey to learn where people want to go in an effort to better serve them and establish targets for future infrastructure planning.

Ms. Eason asked if they could get a bicyclist study the same way they obtain traffic studies. Mr. Malham stated that a bicycle study is being performed in Indiantown by FDOT. Ms. Eason asked if this could be incorporated by the County to count bicycles and pedestrians when they perform the traffic counts. Mr. Patteson wants to have better details of the bicycle injuries, time of day, was intoxication a factor, the location, was the cyclists doing something they shouldn't have been doing? Mr. Malham stated that the Sheriffs' Department does have an accident report that lists all traffic collisions involving bicycles and pedestrians. It is in the strategies to review that report every two years.

Ms. Kurtz asked if the motion which was on the floor to recommend this Final Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan to the MPO for approval was sufficient or if the additional information (further expansion of staff research for other communities solving similar bicycle and pedestrian issues for the next update, to investigate the possibility of having a bicycle and pedestrian traffic count and to investigate reasons for accidents for both fatalities and injuries) was needed. After discussion, Ms. Kurtz stated that the motion was being approved and amended to include the additional items aforementioned and should be presented to the committee at the next update.

The motion on the floor to recommend this Final Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan to the MPO for approval was made and amended to include the following additional information at the next update: encourage expansion of staff's research of other communities solving similar bicycle and pedestrian issues, to investigate the possibility of having a bicycle and pedestrian traffic count, and to investigate reasons for accidents involving both fatalities and

injuries, by Mr. Steele. The motion with the amendment was seconded by Mr. Zilg. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)
UPDATE 2011 – FINAL REPORT**

MEMO: temp12CACa01.03

Ms. Beltran stated that this is the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Final Report. The draft was presented to this committee at the November Joint Advisory Committee Meeting. Mr. Gavin Jones, Senior Planner of the MPO, is here to present Tier One of the Final Report and advise of any changes which were made from the Draft version. AECOM is here to also address updates since the presentation of the Draft Report. Mr. Jones presented handouts which contained the pages that were amended but the summary of all changes are in the Executive Summary. (See Handout) Mr. Zilg asked why the congestion is based East to West, why not North and South. Mr. Jones stated that the road segment in the study is an East to West roadway, and it becomes congested one way in the morning and the other way in the afternoon. Mr. Zilg asked about the congestion on U. S. 1, Mr. Jones advised that U. S. 1 was not the subject of this study. The introduction in the report depicts the process used in selecting this segment for the study. U. S. 1 will be a part of a corridor study at a later date to investigate what can be done as it has reached maximum expansion and traffic management systems are already in place. This segment was chosen because it is congested and it is not scheduled for any form of major improvement until approximately 2030 in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Ms. Kurtz inquired, with districts being divided differently and with St. Lucie pulling Palm City in their direction and Stuart being pulled in another area, with Martin Downs being the dividing line, how will that effect something like this, when you are looking for input. Aren't you going to have to include those other areas that are pulling Martin apart? Ms. Beltran advised that the re-districting regards a political standpoint for the Legislature which is different from the CMP of the Martin County Planning Area. Ms. Kurtz stated that money is political and funding is political and which road or bridge gets done first will need to be taken into consideration. Mr. Jones stated that the funds have been programmed through the MPO because it is based on the urbanized area boundary and funds are based on the population in the urbanized area. Mr. Patrick LeConte stated that it also will not affect the traveling public trends. Ms. Kurtz stated when the MSA [Urbanized Area – UZA] changed a few years ago, Martin was pulled into a formula and in order to get Federal funds, the communities had to have a population of 200,000 and above, and without that, the funds would not be issued. Ms. Kurtz said that she is concerned that this could affect funding this project. Ms. Kurtz stated that she reviewed the MSA [UZA] and the people who write reports like this are hired from outside of the area and they don't understand Stuart or Palm City. They look at the numbers from the University of Florida Census Report and other reports claiming that Port St. Lucie is just like Stuart, while it is

not. People involved in development of these feasibility studies, do not have a real picture of the area. Ms. Beltran stated that this project could have been affected by the Transportation Bill filed by the State DOT, requesting only one List of Project Priorities (LOPP) per UZA. Since Martin is in the St. Lucie UZA, there would only be one LOPP. However, at the MPOAC meeting last week in Tallahassee, the FDOT representative stated that language regarding only one LOPP per UZA was going to be pulled from the Transportation Bill, which would address Ms. Kurtz's concerns.

Mr. Patteson addressed turning lanes or lack thereof, on SR 714 which causes congestion. Mr. Jones stated that turning lanes are among some of the recommendations for congestion relief in the corridor, but it will be up to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) as to whether or not funds will be used to implement them or not. Some recommendations are purely improved signalization, and already being implemented. The additional lanes recommended will cost money and a study was performed to quantify the cost of congestion delay and not making the improvements, that is the basis of this report. Mr. Patteson asked when widening of SR 714 was planned. Mr. Jones stated that it was not going to be financially feasible to widening this corridor until 2030 which was why SR 714 was selected for this study. Mr. Jones stated that he is seeking endorsement of this Final Draft which will be reviewed by the TAC this afternoon and presented to the MPO Board on February 20th.

Ms. Eason advised the committee that she would have to abstain from this vote.

The motion to approve the CMP Final Report and to be presented to the MPO Policy Board at the February 20, 2012 meeting was made by Mr. John Patteson. Mr. Trent Steele provided a second to the motion. The vote was called. The motion passed unanimously, with one abstention.

Mr. Trent Steele left at 10:33 am.

Mr. Michael Houston left at 10:34 am.

E. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN ANNUAL REPORT

MEMO: temp12CACa01.04

Ms. Beltran advised that the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was approved by the MPO Board in 2009. There have been two annual reports since that time, and Mr. Michael Malham will present the 2011 update. Mr. Malham advised that this is the MPO staff's annual report to measurably review and document the public involvement with the transportation planning process. Staff's efforts have exceeded the metrics originally scheduled for this project. The goal of the PIP is to measure the amount of information disseminated, presented or received, to or from other organizations, agencies and the public. The committees to the MPO have approximately 82% position retention. The Bicycle, Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) is one member shy of capacity, the Citizen's Advisory

Committee (CAC) currently has three vacancies due to recent resignations, and staff has been actively soliciting new members. Martin County has a lot of people who wish to participate in these roles. The advisory committees receive their agendas seven days prior to meetings which is timely, and staff coordinates with Palm Beach and St. Lucie County's staff on a regular basis. Recommendations offered by the committees are taken to the MPO for final decisions; Objective two analyzes the outreach portion which covers surveys and events, one of which is the Build-A-Bike event; staff worked with the CRA on the Indiantown charette which was an unsuccessful attempt for a TIGER 3 Grant; staff advertises all meetings on the website, in the newspaper and online, all meetings are public, and held in locations of public access, all documents are searchable so that the vision impaired can also access them. Major documents [i.e. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and PIP] are displayed for 45 days of public review in six libraries throughout the county. The final section on engaging the public is the new and enhanced website, which is updated regularly with meetings and hearings, there are website surveys, calendars and under the Projects tab you can submit ideas to the MPO. Advertising in the local newspaper is done monthly, and Public Service Announcements (PSAs) are also being used by BPAC.

Mr. Zilg inquired about media involvement, publishing the meeting notices in the newspaper. Mr. Malham stated that the meeting notices are published monthly but the MPO will be creating more television PSAs to discuss bicycle safety information, gathering and creating ideas for the call for projects.

A motion to approve the Public Involvement Plan Annual Report as presented was made by Ms. Eason. The motion was seconded by Mr. Patteson. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

**F. TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING MODEL (TCRPM) 4.0
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)
MEMO: temp12CACa01.05**

Ms. Beltran stated that this will be the model that will be used for the upcoming 2040 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) update which will be presented by Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones stated that Martin's RLRTP Model includes three counties and is a representation of land use networks and trips which are generated by a representation of land use patterns, both residential and commercial. The LRTP was only adopted a year ago and FDOT has initiated the process of developing the next model to be used for the next update forecasting to 2040. That model will need validation to the 2010 conditions, involving building a representation of the road as it existed in 2010, providing a simulation of the land use for that time period, for both residential and commercial properties to compare simulated volumes which come from that model with the actual traffic counts taken in 2010. FDOT has said that it will take approximately \$450,000 to perform this task. The last three validations and updates have been fully funded by FDOT as they use the models for their own forecasting, project development and

environmental studies. After which they provide the validated models to the Treasure Coast M/TPOs. FDOT is soliciting financial participation of \$50,000 from the three M/TPOs which will be making use of the model upon their completion. These funds will be spread over the fiscal years 2012-13/14. In return for the financial participation they are offering a partnership for the M/TPO staff, both in the selection of the consultant and in reviewing the data accuracy provided for the model. FDOT has to issue a Note to Receive by June, 2012, and to have the validation work completed by the end of 2013, providing the M/TPOs 24 months of forecast work through the 2040 LRTP Update. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) delineates the participation by the three M/TPO staff in this process. The commitment of the \$50,000 is the first part of the adoption of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) later this spring. However, the DOT wanted this preliminary notice to the M/TPOs to insure the MOU language was universally agreeable. One issue is what the Model form should be, and the MPO Board has previously directed staff to use the existing Four Step Model. The Martin MPO Policy Board stated that they do not chose to use the Activity Based Model (ABM) as it is new, untested, and though you may be able to answer questions not available using the Four Step Model, the extra amount of effort and cost of usage is still unknown. The financial investment of the M/TPOs is limited to the \$50,000 regardless of the Model used, so any addition costs in the validation process will be absorbed by FDOT. There is no estimate as to the cost for the contract to date, issues occurred during the implementation of the contract are complex, but the uncertainty, the risk and cost to complete the validation will be solely absorbed by FDOT. The MPO Board signaled their financial participation with the caveat of using the existing Four Step Model. Ms. Kurtz stated that since there will be four partners in the contract what will be the trigger involving funding, concurrence or permitting which the parties will be looking into. Mr. Jones assured the committee that funding issues are solid, the M/TPOs are limited to \$50,000 through the completion of the validation, as stated in the MOU. Mr. Patteson asked if the model is a computer program, and what types of parameters can be used. Can information from a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) developer be plugged in producing an unbiased open relation as to the impact of the roadways. Mr. Jones stated that it is a computerized simulation of the major road network, and yes, the applicants of the DRI process pay for the simulation as they use the model in determining the proposed location, connect it to the road network and roughly the way the driveways will feed traffic to and from the development, and the model simulates the total traffic volume or focus strictly on the traffic going in or out of that particular project. This demonstrates how much of their project's traffic will be on which roads. Mr. Patteson inquired how often this service can be used by staff. Mr. Jones stated that there is no use limitation. He stated that the consultants to FDOT and with Martin's participation will validate the 2010 model and turned over to the M/TPOs for the forecasting work. At that point, a decision will have to be made, as what's on the ground today is known, but a prediction as to what will be on the ground in 2040 will be needed. Mr. Jones said that you would need to start with the countywide population forecasts, and then determine where the populous will be residing and work from

that respect. Mr. Patteson noted if developers have to pay for time, is that for staff time? Mr. Jones stated that an applicant who wants to develop a DRI will pay a consultant to develop the traffic analysis, and they will be using the same as Martin's model so everyone is using the same information. He stated that Martin will receive the model from the State DOT, and the distribution of project trips is subject to negotiation early on in the process, so the consultants don't move forward with their projects until the distribution is nailed down. Mr. Jones stated that all reviewing agencies have to sign off on it, because of intersection analysis and the distribution list is not revisited once approved. Mr. Jones said you would need to know where in an area in the county, people would be going and coming from, and the model is the best way to determine it. He stated that there also is oversight as to what gets plugged in. Mr. Jones clarified that the cost of using this model is born by the agencies, the applicant pays the consultant to produce the work and the agencies spend staff time to review the work. Mr. Jones stated that Martin will be using a simulation program which is produced by Citilabs, the software operational shell is "Cube" and the simulation engine is called voyager. Ms. Eason stated that there were a lot of issues after the 2035 plan and she has asked that everyone review the prior minutes as there were a lot of discussions on the model. Ms. Beltran stated that was the reason why Martin wants to be a part of the validation process this time and why the Board and County Engineering staff has been concerned about the new ABM. She advised that so many staff members remember the work on the 2035 Plan and that they wanted to stick with a program that has been tested. Mr. Jones advised that Palm Beach, Broward and Dade are going to be using the ABM, we can observe how well they like it, and maybe review it prior to the next RL RTP in five years. The ABM answers questions that are really not pressing in Martin. It's more about seeking results to congestion with maximum capacity build out, with signalization already applied. The ABM facilitates beginning to investigate introduction of congestion pricing, promoting telecommuting, changing parking laws in different areas, and whatever can be done next. Martin does not have those issues and the Four Step Model is an appropriate tool for making the decisions for the 2040 Plan. Ms. Eason stated that they utilized the information from the 2010 Plan and it was good assistance in their planning. Mr. Jones stated that a Census year is always a good time to use that information as it's more current, the in-between years are the least reliable as you are validating to a year for which you don't have an accurate count. Mr. Patteson asked if this model took into consideration the economic conditions. Are different perimeters used and when the economy changes drastically as it has in the recent past? Mr. Jones stated that the consultant performing the validation should be mindful when simulating 2010 conditions that they look at the things that would be affected during a recession. Buried in the model is how many work trips come out of this household daily, if you were using pre-recession figures you'd wind up with more work trips than were around in 2010, then you can use that for forecasting. By sticking with the industry averages, you can get base information, but there are too many factors that could affect the outcome so remaining middle of the road is best. If you miss the land use by 50,000 homes, that could be a bigger impact than the amount of traffic. Mr. Jones stated that this will be a work in progress.

7. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

8. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None.

9. NOTES

None.

10. NEXT MEETING


- April 04, 2012

11. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Patteson and Seconded by Ms. Eason. The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 AM


Recorded and Prepared by:


Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II


Date

Approved by:


Shelia Kurtz, Chair


Date