

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) COMMITTEE MEETING
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, June 11, 2012 - 5:00 P.M.
Martin County Administration Building
Growth Management Conference Room, 1st Floor
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
(772) 221-1498**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Joan Moore, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:04 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

Ms. Joan Moore, Chair
Mr. Ken Natoli, Vice-Chair
Mr. Kevin B. Edwards
Mr. Steve Schimmel
Mr. Edward Vossen
Ms. Cheryl Lenartiene
Mr. John-Mark Palacios (Ex-Officio)

Excused Members

Mr. Jim Hudson
Mr. Ronald Shewmaker
Mr. Rick Yost

Members Not In Attendance:

Mr. Joseph DeFronzo
Mr. Hal Forslund
Ms. Dawn Arvin
Mr. Bill Schnell
Mr. John Mildenberger
Officer Michael Pope, (Ex-Officio)
Officer James C. Brooks (Ex-Officio)
Mr. Eric Cerniglia (Ex-Officio)
Mr. Martin Paulk (Ex-Officio)

Staff in Attendance:

Ms. Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator (arrived 5:53 PM)
Ms. Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II
Mr. Michael Malham, Planner II

Others in Attendance:

Markus Brannschweiger

Julie Preast

Patrick Glass, FDOT

Andrew Nunez, American Consultants

Brian Mirson, American Consultants

A quorum was present for this meeting.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

A motion to approve the Agenda was made by Mr. Ed Vossen. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cheryl Lenartiene. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes from the meeting of May 14, 2012 was made by Ms. Cheryl Lenartiene. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ken Natoli. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

5. FDOT COMMENTS

None.

6. AGENDA ITEMS

A. STATE ROAD (SR) 76 PD&E PROJECT UPDATE

MEMO: temp12BPACa09.01

Mr. Patrick Glass, Project Manager from FDOT introduced Andrew Nunez, with American Consultant Engineers who will be making a presentation. American Consultant Engineers was hired by FDOT to conduct this Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study. Mr. Nunez advised that this presentation has been presented to the CAC and TAC. (See presentation) Mr. Nunez advised of the project limits which are along SR 76 (Kanner Highway) from West of CR 711 (Pratt Whitney Road) to East of Cove Road, which includes the interchange improvements of SR 76 and I-95. He advised that the project was listed as a Project Need on the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) and the five year Work Program. Mr. Nunez stated that the construction is not funded at this time. Mr. Nunez showed the existing conditions, the traffic volumes from the 2035 and 2040, and the eight different alternatives which were reviewed. He gave a report of the preferred Alternative, Alternative 2A. The Value Engineering study suggested that the Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) be studied further. Mr. Nunez stated that although the DDI is not recommended at this time, they will be presenting it for public review at the public hearing. Mr. Nunez detailed the SR76 Preferred Alternative, the criteria used for the determination. Mr. Nunez advised that they are waiting approval from Florida Highway Association (FHWA) of the Interchange Modification Report (IMR), that the

public hearing will be July 12, 2012, starting at 5:30 PM at Indian River State College-Chastain Campus. The two items on the agenda at the public hearing will be the Preferred Alternative 2A and the public comment informational item of the DDI.

Mr. Edwards requested clarification as to the compatibility of the Alternative 2A and the DDI. He was advised that they are two totally different interchanges and would not be integrated. Discussion about how initially eight alternatives were looked at and when doing the numbers only a couple came forward from an operational perspective. It was determined that the enhanced version, Alternative 2A, was the Preferred Alternative. Mr. Mirson informed that the Board has stated that if the DDI is going to be reviewed during the design phase, the public needs to be informed and have an opportunity to provide input at the public hearing, which is what is being done. There will be videos of working DDI's to see how they look from the standpoint of a driver, and the overall workings of it.

Ms. Moore inquired as to the negatives of a DDI, and Mr. Edwards asked if a DDI were constructed, would it still be considered an Urbanized Intersection and would you still have to come to a complete stop. Mr. Mirson stated that it is an Urbanized Intersection, and you do have to stop at some points of the DDI. An advantage to the DDI operationally, is that there will be more separation between Jack James and the interchange, and fewer lanes may be used as there won't be the conflicting left turns. From the cyclist's perspective the bike lane will still be on the right side of the travel lane, so there is not a lot of difference. As far as pedestrian crossings, the traffic normally comes from the opposite direction, so proper signage will need to be placed to advise pedestrians to look in the other direction for on-coming traffic. Being able to educate motorists and pedestrians of the new configuration will be paramount, and signage, for an elderly population, could be a downside. Mr. Edwards stated that he really likes the design and the concept as it uses less land. He said that if people were able to get use to the DDI, the impact for future projects could be amazing with the need for less land. Mr. Mirson stated that as the consultants, it is important that they provide the public the information whether good or bad, and allow the public to make an informed decision. All of this information will be brought to the public, but the Alternative 2A is the design which is going forward.

Mr. Glass reminded the committee that Alternative 2A is only an enhancement to the existing ramp; people already know how to use it and the design is approved through FY2040. Mr. Mirson walked the committee through the DDI diagram as a motorist, a cyclist and a pedestrian. Mr. Schimmel asked what effect will headlights have on the motorists at night. Mr. Mirson stated that when you go through the curve, there is enough distance so you don't have the discomfort, the key is to have some low landscaping which will help to provide a break. He stated that the DDI has

primarily been used as retrofits to tight urban diamonds. What happens is a tight urban diamond which has a constraint of lanes either under or over a bridge, was used by converting the intersection into this tight urban they were able to provide greater capacity. Mr. Glass stated that with Alternative 2A you will be able to travel down SR 76 at 45 mph, but if you put in a tight urban diamond, the speed will be slowed to 35 mph through the intersection then they will speed back up to 45 miles.

It was noted by Mr. Edwards that this is a good thing for cyclists and pedestrians. The DDI provides the motorist a slower speed but less wait time at the light as opposed to a higher speed and a longer wait time at the light. Mr. Mirson stated that this will be presented at the public hearing, but it's only for informational purposes. Any decision regarding the DDI would be made from the community and the local policy makers, not FDOT. Mr. Malham advised the committee that both the CAC and the TAC supported the preferred Alternative 2A and to include the DDI at the public hearing for public review. The public hearing will be in July, but the next MPO Board meeting will not be until September which does allow time to gather public information.

A motion was made by Mr. Natoli to approve staff's recommendation to support Alternative 2A and ask that the DDI presentation be included at the public hearing for public review. Ms. Lenartiene provided a second to the motion. The vote was called and passed with Mr. Edwards in opposition.

B. FINAL FY2012/13-FY2016/17 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

MEMO: temp12BPACa09.02

Mr. Malham reviewed the Final TIP with the committee. He advised that the Board will see the Final on June 18, 2012. Mr. Malham stated that the TIP is updated annually and described the changes that were made since the committee saw the Draft. He noted that the Public hearing will be held at the MPO meeting on June 18, 2012. Mr. Malham stated that staff recommends approval of the Martin MPO FY2012/13 - FY2016/17 TIP with the understanding that FDOT will re-distribute funds from the Indian Street Project to fund the lights on the SR 710 Big John Monahan Bridge with the balance going to the SR 76 Project from the I-95 Interchange to Monterey Road, which was brought to this committee at the last meeting.

Mr. Natoli noted that the right turn lane on Monterey Road has been completely removed, as this committee discussed how bad right turn lanes are for cyclists, and that shoulders will be placed on Willoughby as Willoughby will eventually extend to downtown. He stated that this is good news for the committee. Ms. Lenartiene inquired if the transportation hub which was recently in the news is the same one for which the County had decided not to get Federal funds. Mr. Malham asked if she was referring to

the Transit Depot. She concurred. Ms. Beltran stated yes, that the State and the MPO will have to determine how they wish to re-distribute the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) Funds which are currently shown in the TIP. She added that it was a small amount, the State funding was \$189,000 with a local match of 50%, and this was just to supplement what the Federal Funds were going to construct. Mr. Malham stated that since the funds are already programmed its best to leave the funds there until the next WP. Ms. Preast inquired if the transit station funds were going to be reprogrammed. Ms. Beltran stated that they are regional State funds and this would have to be brought before the Treasure Coast Transportation Council. As this was a regional project [passenger rail on the FEC] that was how Martin was going to be able to use these funds to supplement the transit depot.

A motion was made by Mr. Natoli to approve staff's recommendation of approval of the Martin MPO FY2012/13 FY2016/17 TIP with the understanding that FDOT will re-distribute funds from the Indian Street Project to fund the lights on the SR 710 Big John Monahan Bridge with the balance going to the SR 76 Project from the I-95 Interchange to Monterey Road. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lenartiene. There was no opposition or further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Natoli noticed that two more sidewalks have been constructed with the 90 degree turn. One is at Publix on Martin Downs Boulevard and the other at Murano. He stated that two 45 degree fillers have been installed, so it is better.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Marcus Brannschweiger stated that he is trying to save Martin County money and he is a pedestrian. He stated that in his experience, cyclists do not use bicycle lanes so it is his opinion that the County should save their money and not include bicycle lanes on the roadways. He stated that he often walks on sidewalks that are only four feet wide. Mr. Brannschweiger added that only one bicyclist in ten uses the bicycle lanes and all of the others are on the sidewalks. He stated that the cyclists will yell that the pedestrians need to move over so they can ride through. Pedestrians should have the right-of-way (ROW) when on a sidewalk. He stated that there are about six cyclers for every one pedestrian and that must be the reason they feel that they need to shout to the pedestrians to get out of their way. Mr. Brannschweiger believes that cyclist act like they have more rights than a pedestrian. A pedestrian must use the sidewalk if one is available; he cannot be in the road. A motorcycle cannot be on the sidewalk, yet bicyclists believe that they have the right to be in both locations, which Mr. Brannschweiger states, is wrong. Mr. Brannschweiger stated that somehow, cyclists do not believe that a pedestrian has the ROW. Mr. Brannschweiger stated that the new sidewalks are being built larger which is good, but the old

small ones can't be changed. Something has to be done. There are signs that say "Bicyclists can share the road" and yet the cyclists are still on the sidewalk. He stated that everyone is now on the sidewalks, bikes, high speed motorized scooters and it creates a huge problem for the pedestrian.

Mr. Natoli stated that he disagreed, maybe it's a behavioral issue and the cyclists in his area need to learn to behave or be properly educated, but putting people or children out into the road isn't the answer. When you are riding on the sidewalk a cyclist needs to respect the pedestrian, but it's too much to push everyone to the road. Ms. Lenartiene stated that it is a consideration thing, and she sees both sides of the issue, though there are many very considerate cyclists too. She stated that it is the mentality of people as a whole, it's not a cyclist verses pedestrian issue it's just that people want to get somewhere when they want to be there and it's the "I'm bigger than you attitude" whether it's driver to driver, driver to cyclist, cyclist to pedestrian it's education as a whole. Mr. Brannschweiger stated that the cyclist needs to move over. Ms. Lenartiene stated that it's difficult as there are roadways without shoulders. Cars and cyclists are riding right up to the sidewalk and there are safety issues. Cutting off certain areas to people wouldn't work because walking or cycling may be a person's only mode of transportation. She stated that it is unfortunate that Mr. Brannschweiger has had such a bad experience but no one's safety should be compromised. Ms. Lenartiene stated that she's been walking on small sidewalks with her dog and it can be a challenge having a biker come by but people need to share. She stated that you can't ban someone from the sidewalk as you could jeopardize their life. Unfortunately, drivers as a whole are not considerate. She stated that a lot of cyclists get hit. She personally has been hit as a pedestrian, so she's aware of the safety issues.

Ms. Moore expressed her frustration with the matter as she's experienced issues while running and she stated that the cyclist was not one who should be on the sidewalk, it was a competitive cyclist. Mr. Brannschweiger stated that the problem is continuing to worsen. It was suggested that if Mr. Brannschweiger would inform the police of this poor behavior and about the cyclists that ride on the boardwalk at 8:00 PM, that they may monitor the situation, and be able to educate some of the cyclists. Ms. Moore stated that there was a recent law passed allowing motorized vehicles on sidewalks which was to accommodate motorized wheelchairs, however, now you see golf carts, electric bikes, and a little of everything. See added that this committee did not support that law.

Mr. Mirson presented a video of a DDI that was a converted tight urban which opened the day prior to the video. The video showed the movement through the DDI, which will be presented at the public hearing in July.

9. NOTES.

10. NEXT MEETING

July 9, 2012 will be a regular meeting.

11. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM without a motion.

Recorded and Prepared by:

Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist, II

Date

Approved by:

Joan Moore, Chair

Date