

**MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
JOINT BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN, CITIZENS' and TECHNICAL ADVISORY
COMMITTEES MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, November 16, 2011 – 1:30 P.M.
Martin County Blake Library-John F. Armstrong Wing
2351 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34997
www.martinmpo.com
(772) 221-1498

1. CALL TO ORDER

Beth Beltran advised the committees that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the TAC were unavailable to chair this meeting. In light of this information she suggested with the members' consent that Mr. Don Donaldson chair this joint meeting. Mr. Donaldson, Member of the TAC Committee, called the joint meeting to order at approximately 1:40 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Members in Attendance:

BPAC

Joan Moore, BPAC Chairman
Ken Natoli, BPAC Vice Chairman
Joseph DeFronzo (arrived 1:44 PM)
Kevin B. Edwards
Hal Forslund (arrived 2:45 PM)
Dawn Arvin
Jim Hudson
Dee Spera
Rick Yost (arrived at 1:45 PM)
Larry Hymonwitz, for John-Mark Palacios-FDOT

Members Excused:

Robert Taylor
Cheryl Lenartiene

Members Absent

John Mildenberger
Ed Vossen

CAC

Sheila Kurtz, CAC Chairman
Alex Trovato

John Patteson
Michael Houston
Albert Zilg
Kevin Trepanier

Members Excused:

Amy Eason
Trent Steele

TAC

Samantha Horowitz, Vice Chairman
Larry Hymowitz for Nancy Ziegler, FDOT
Mark Cocco
Don Donaldson
Lee Hoefert
Chon Wong for Gustavo Schmidt
Kim Delaney

Members Excused:

Sam Amerson, TAC Chairman
George Stokus
Paul Nicoletti

Members Absent

Robert Kellogg

Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Michael Malham, Planner II
Gavin Jones, Senior Planner
Margaret Brassard, Administrative Assistant II

Others in Attendance:

Vivek Reddy, AECOM
Patrick LaConte, AECOM
Andrew Nunes, American Consulting Engineers of Florida
Anson Sonnett, FDOT
Lisa Wichser, MC Eng.
Boyd Lawrence, MCSD
Brian Mirson, American Consulting Engineers of Florida

A quorum was present for this meeting.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Ms. Joan Moore. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ken Natoli. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

Mr. Donaldson stated that there had been a joint meeting between the CAC and TAC on September 28, 2011 and that the minutes should be approved separately from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee minutes.

A motion to approve the joint minutes from the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) minutes of the September 28, 2011, meeting was made by Mr. Lee Hoefert. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mark Cocco. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

The floor was given to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Chairman, Ms. Joan Moore to request approval of minutes by their committee.

A motion to approve the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) minutes of the October 10, 2011, meeting was made by Mr. Ken Natoli. Mr. Jim Hudson gave a second to the motion. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

A. SR 76 PD&E PROJECT UPDATE

MEMO: temp12C-B/P-TACa01.01

Ms. Beltran gave a background on this project. When the consultant made presentations to the Board and Advisory committees last year, there was concern over the traffic analysis as the study did not use the data from the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and did not appear consistent with the County's Comp Plan. Two motions concerning the PD&E Study were made by the Board. First, they asked that the 2035 data be used for the PD&E Study, and that the preferred alternatives be re-analyzed and brought back to the Board. Second, the Board asked that the design funds be programmed for the entire length of the project from Pratt Whitney Road to Monterey Road. FDOT agreed to the Board's requests, and American Consulting is here to present the updated PD&E Study.

Andrew Nunes of American Consulting stated that the SR 76 project limits stretch from west of I-95 to Monterey Road. (See handout) This project includes improvements at SR 76 and I-95 interchange, it is part of the St. Lucie and Martin Counties 2035 Project Needs and is number two on the List of Priority Projects (LOPP). This project is funded for design in fiscal year (FY) 2012,

right-of-way in FY 2014, but not funded for construction at this time. The updated 2035 Greater Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model, (GTCRPM) was received in March, 2011, the screening of the interchange alternatives memorandum has been updated and approved for the SR 76/I-95 interchange, and work has been done on the Interchange Modification Report (IMR) which will be discussed later. The project is slated for design in early FY 2012. The Methodology Letter of Understanding (MLOU) documenting changes in the IMR was approved by Florida Highway Administration (FHWA) and FDOT in August of 2009.

Mr. Nunes went on to describe eight different interchange designs and stated that Alternative 2, which is the enhancement of the existing interchange, is the only viable option. The interchange of SR 76/I-95 will require an expansion of the existing configuration, including a triple left turn from the west to northbound I-95. They also considered a slight re-configuration of the south bound "off" ramp, to improve the traffic operations. Regarding the existing roadway typicals, the proposed section along SR 76 west of Locks Road is proposed to be a four lane, divided section with a 12 foot multi-use path on the right side and a six foot sidewalk on the left. This section also incorporates bicycle lanes. The section east of Locks Road to Cove Road is proposed to be a six lane divided section with a six foot sidewalk on the left and a 12 foot multi-use path on the right, as well as bicycle lanes in both directions.

Park-n-Ride facility alternatives were also considered as a portion of this PD&E Study. There currently is a Park-n-Ride at Halpatiokee and two other potential sites were studied. The first is in the southwest quadrant of the interchange and the second is in the northeast quadrant.

The consultant met with the District Interchange Review Committee (DIRC), and Interchange Alternative 2A was recommended for further analysis. The revised Design Traffic Technical Memorandum, and the revised IMR were submitted on November 1, 2011 for review and approval. Mr. Nunes anticipates the IMR approval and a Public Hearing by April, 2012. In October, 2011, a Value Engineering (VE) Study was performed by FDOT on the PD&E Study of SR 76, to which they anticipate the results in about two weeks. One of the suggestions of the VE team was to consider a Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) for the interchange, as the DDI's currently in operation have exceeded expectations. When the VE Report comes out, they will be responding to those suggestions. Mr. Mirson stated that DDI's are very efficient, and being well accepted by the communities due to the decreased delay and minimum investment. The DOT would consider this alternative if the community accepts it. FDOT is proposing to proceed with the Preferred Alternative which basically maintains the current configuration, while proceeding to get the approval of the corridor, the interchange, the footprint and all associated environmental impacts, so the corridor could proceed forward. While this is happening, the Department will be providing the option that they would be willing to re-access the

interchange with the 2035 traffic overlay to determine if the DDI would provide Martin with the level of service knowing that the tight urban design would not. If that is the case, then they would provide Martin with the option of proceeding with the preferred alternative or reconsidering and implementing the DDI. A video presentation of a working DDI was viewed by the committees. Mr. Mirson stated that the example shown is a promising alternative. Mr. Donaldson clarified that the original recommended Alternative may still be a viable option, and that the DDI would only come in later should Martin chose to reconsider.

Mr. Natoli stated that on the four lane section of the road the sidewalk and the multi-use trail are on the outside of the right-of-way. On the six lane section they were moved to within four feet of the right-of-way, with 31 feet on one side and 36-37 feet on the other, why are the sidewalks on the inside and not further away from the road? It was advised that American Consultants has to accommodate some drainage in this section within the swales. Mr. Natoli noted that if the numbers were added up there is still 31 feet from the 12 foot multi-use path, to the edge of the path of the 200 foot right of way, so he didn't see why the sidewalks were so close to the roads. He added that the two sections (four and six lanes) are very similar which is why he didn't understand that sidewalk location variation. American Consulting said that they are looking at four foot minimums, but if the County wanted them to look more into meandering sidewalks, that could be investigated, but this is based on the standard minimum criteria. American Consulting will try to put the sidewalk away from the traffic and have scrubs and other greenery between the roads and the pedestrians, however, it will vary due to the location in the intersection. Mr. Mirson stated that this was a valid point and American Consulting will investigate moving the sidewalks.

Ms. Kurtz clarified that it was advised that there would be less delay and construction cost using the DDI verses the authorized alternative. She asked that the difference in costs be explained. Mr. Mirson stated that they have not been able to lay out all of the geometrics, but costs will be offset for the DDI by not having to modify the bridge structure, which will save about \$1.5 to \$2 million. By the time the signals and ramps are in, they will probably be about the same cost. Ms. Kurtz asked if Mr. Mirson felt solid regarding the 15%-18% decreased number from what was originally planned that is in the 2035 Plan. Mr. Mirson stated that American Consulting had no input in the acquisition of the numbers, the County provided them with the figures for the original model. Ms. Kurtz noted that there are no people in the area being discussed and in this model it doesn't look like there will be space for a sidewalk/trail. Mr. Mirson stated that this area has a regional park and regional connectivity is important when considering what the community wants to be as opposed to the reflection of what it is now. Joan Moore pointed out that it's a large recreational area. People frequently run out there on the sidewalks.

Mr. Donaldson stated that this presentation was for input only and that no approval is necessary at this time. He concluded that the DDI is an interesting concept and looking into it may still be an option as it frees up a lot of space for other possibilities in that area. He added that speaking to the communities in which they exist may be informative as he's been told that drivers are not aware that they have even crossed over until they have already reached the other side.

**B. CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)
UPDATE 2011 - DRAFT FINAL REPORT
MEMO: temp12C-B/P-TACa01.02**

Beth Beltran stated that the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Update is a requirement by both State and Federal law for transportation management areas. It's a systematic approach to improving safety and mobility without widening roadways. The update to the CMP was addressed in a two tier process. The first tier, which was done in-house, is the conceptual and regulatory framework of the CMP. The second tier is project specific, using that process. SR 714 was evaluated from Citrus to Martin Downs Boulevard. The scope was developed by MPO staff and reviewed and approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and FDOT. Gavin Jones, MPO Senior Planner, will present tier 1, followed by AECOM presenting the specific information on SR 714.

Mr. Jones stated that this study was to evaluate all possibilities outside of major capacity expansion of the roadway, using techniques such as signal optimization system management, ramp metering, and intelligent transportation system technology monitoring in order to make better roadway decisions, to name just a few methods. Martin County doesn't have a major problem with traffic congestion, less than 5% of the roads are considered congested. Only a few roadways have exceeded their level of service capacity and that is only during certain peak times. In larger urbanized areas the peak times become longer creating peak spreading. Only a few segments of Martin's roadways have reached or exceeded 90% of the level of service at which point the County would consider improvements. For example, Martin has determined it to be infeasible to widen certain areas of U. S. 1. These areas already have advanced traffic management systems and after further study, they will become the potential locations for the U. S. 1 Retrofit Project identified in the 2035 Plan. Other roads noted are in the Work Program, programmed for improvements; one is the Palm City Bridge and another is a section which feeds the bridge which will improve with the completion of the Veteran's Memorial Bridge, so these are not in line for future study. Of the remaining three projects that are not slated for improvements in the Work Program, two are slated for improvements in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) between Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-2030 and the last one isn't slated until it's financially feasible, which is approximately FY 2031-2035. This is the focal point which was used for the CMP study as widening the roadway is so far in the future, that congestion will need to be managed until that time.

Mr. Jones discussed the performance measure (see presentation) and showed how the different areas had congestion “peak times” and explained how use of parallel roadways help distribute and ease congestion. The performance measure investigated by the MPO this year is congestion cost. Traffic volumes are studied and converted to level of service letter grades which are reported annually. Mr. Jones stated that the organizations performing the study wanted to attach a value, or “cost” to the congestion. The method used to determine the cost was based on an assumed value of time per hour which a motorist loses while stuck in congestion. This is the same value per hour used by the Texas Transportation Institute when they perform their annual National Mobility Report. This is to quantify the time loss by motorists when action is not taken to relieve congestion. Mr. Jones turned the floor over to Patrick LaConte, of AECOM.

Mr. LaConte discussed the reviews which have taken place between the Martin MPO staff and AECOM and noted their approach in devising a plan which was provided to the committees. Mr. Vivek Reddy of AECOM was introduced as the Project Engineer who prepared the report. Mr. Reddy presented the Data Collection Report. He discussed the three main areas of SR-714 that were studied from Citrus Boulevard going east to the Turnpike. The main intersections were Citrus Boulevard, 42nd Avenue, and the Turnpike entrance. The minor intersections are Deggellar Court and Armelleni Avenue. Over the course of a year AECOM counted traffic, collected traffic data themselves, from the County, from FDOT and other sources, even determined travel time for this study by driving vehicles. This was done to determine needs for signals, turning lanes or other factors which could be implemented in order to better the roadways, improve safety, and cut wait time in queues. They put all the traffic data in a model called “Synchro”, which projects the delay for each movement as well as the entire intersection. Counts were held at different times during the day to accurately account for high and low traffic volume times. This is how they determine the letter grade for the report which runs from the letter “A” to the letter “F”. Any letter beyond “D” is failing. Reasons for failing vary, it could be queues lasting more than one light cycle, queues extending past the turning lane and into the major line of traffic, or people running the traffic signal. By the 2021 model the three major intersections are failing mainly in the peak hours. The Crash Data Review for SR-714 shows that within a three and a half year period there were 158 crashes. Almost 90% of the accidents happen at one of the three main intersections, the Turnpike intersection being identified by DOT as a high crash location as it exceeds the crash rate for a similar facility, and has been on their list for approximately three years. Mr. Reddy noted the Major Findings for the congestion, and some of the remedies which are being implemented in the future to mitigate the congestion.

Mr. Michael Houston inquired if the Citrus intersection would be a candidate for a roundabout analysis. Mr. Reddy stated that AECOM hasn’t looked at that as an alternative, but because the speeds on the west side of the road are 60 miles an

hour and there's a lot of truck traffic on that road, it would be difficult for them to maneuver around a roundabout. Mr. Houston mentioned that the increased speed normally isn't met until after the Citrus intersection, and that the east side of the road is an industrial area and will continue to become more industrial with the Sand's Commerce Park, so the speeds will probably not be what they are to the west. Mr. Donaldson added that roundabouts work best in smaller, low speed, urban areas. He stated that Martin is just getting use to roundabouts and to build a two lane roundabout, which would be needed for the volume, would take up a sizable amount of area and would not be productive. Mr. Natoli asked Mr. Donaldson why are there sidewalks to Sand's Commerce Park and beside it on Citrus, but not in front of it? Mr. Donaldson stated that it could have been one of the situations that the industrial park "paid in lieu of" so they contributed to the sidewalk program. The County has a program, that it is required to build sidewalks. But in areas that are rural, and not used, it does happen that businesses have paid a certain amount per foot in lieu of building a sidewalk and the County builds the sidewalk somewhere more readily useable. Mr. Donaldson assured the committees that the funds had been spent and are not sitting around to build a sidewalk in front of the Sand's Commerce Park at this time. It was noted that the area between Citrus and 42nd Avenue is predominately retail, and heading Eastbound on SR 714 there is not a left turn lane into the only entrance in that Commerce Park. There is a deceleration/turn in lane if you are going west, but you cannot turn into the Commerce Park if you are going east. It was suggested that in the future, areas of that nature should have adequate access and turning lanes built.

Dee Spera, a BPAC member, said that she had been stuck in traffic for a long period of time the day prior due to a train breaking down. Is it being taken into consideration the timing of the trains, and the railroad crossings that affect people exiting U. S. 1? Mr. Donaldson agreed that said that trains can impact the traffic, but there are large segments of the Martin community who have said that U. S. 1 is as large as it can be and they do not want the road any wider, so the County is stuck with what we have. The alternatives, including a fly-over on Monterey, were rejected years ago, not to say the idea can't return, but those are some of the challenges which Martin does face as it grows. The idea is that people will find alternate modes of transportation or wait.

Mr. Houston inquired of the intersection changes at Citrus. What will determine the time frame of the signal, and the number of vehicles that can pass in a cycle? Mr. Reddy stated that all the information, volume, timing of signal and number of lanes, are placed into the Synchro software, and the software determines the best signal delay for this interchange. Ms. Lisa Wischer's staff is already working on implementing these actions and it will be adjusted as necessary. Mr. Donaldson clarified that when you give a little time to one side of the road, you are taking it from the other, so it must be taken into consideration that it's share adversity.

Ms. Beltran reminded that Staff is looking for a recommendation to approve the Draft CMP so that it can be brought to the MPO Board on December 19, 2011. Staff will bring the Board's comments to the committees at their next meeting and it will return to the Board as a Final Report in February.

A motion was made by Mr. Alex Trovato to recommend the Draft CMP to the MPO Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mark Cocco. There was no additional discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. DRAFT BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACTION PLAN

MEMO: temp12C-B/P-TACa01.03

Ms. Beltran gave the history of how the Master Plan evolved to be an Action Plan as the committee believed that an Action Plan would be more productive. Ms. Moore, the BPAC Chair, was introduced, and she advised that this work has been a labor of love for over a year by the BPAC committee and a lot of time and effort went into this on behalf of the BPAC and the MPO staff. Ms. Moore thanked Mr. Natoli and Mr. Malham for their efforts in compiling the Action Plan.

Mr. Malham advised that he is looking for a motion to approve the Draft Action Plan and he would welcome any comments. Mr. Malham advised that the first plan was completed in 1998 and a draft was begun in 2000, however, it was never completed. There was a shift in policies back in 1991 mandating the incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian planning in transportation. This was echoed in the Florida Statute, Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP), and the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). In an effort to pursue the development of this plan at the local level, BPAC chose to make this an Action Plan instead of a Master Plan in order to bring bicycling, walking and transit more to the forefront. It was determined that the Action Plan would be action oriented with specific strategies, goals and objectives and implementation projects. This Plan would move toward the BPAC's vision which is to create an innovative and livable community where biking and walking are safe, enjoyable and viable modes of transportation, supported by great places, well maintained infrastructure, a strong community culture, and the streets are considered key components of the public space. (See presentation.) Mr. Malham discussed the plan and objectives and how they would complement the RLRTP. Mr. Malham discussed how they built the Action Plan projects on the 2030 Plan in their prioritizations and how a top 20 list was developed. The list was broken down by type; bicycle, pedestrian and shared use path. Mr. Malham stated that he will be presenting this Draft Action Plan to the MPO Board at the December 19, 2011, meeting with the Final being presented for adoption at the February meeting.

Mr. Natoli relayed his pleasure being able to meet with the CAC and TAC committees. He remarked on the importance of their input concerning street

widths, speeds, signalization, bicycle lanes, sidewalks and multi-use paths. He stated that as long as roadways are the main mode of transportation and there are turning lanes, high speeds and six lane roads, Martin can never be really bicycle and pedestrian friendly. It may not always be feasible to have alternative roads, but that is what will actually work becoming advocates for on road parking, and two lane roads with mixed use development. It causes people to have to get out of their cars, walk and ride bicycles. There are members of the MPO Advisory Boards who are visually challenged, and they also need to walk across these roadways.

Mr. Donaldson commended Mr. Malham and the BPAC efforts on the lists presented and appreciated the opportunity to see the projects broken down into types. This information will help in determining which mode would best fit or be able to be worked into a project in the future. Mr. Donaldson stated that the prioritizing process used was very well detailed, thought out and implemented.

Mr. Malham mentioned that the Enhancement Fund cycle will be coming up soon and he would like to see some of these projects included. The criteria process used in prioritizing these projects may be used in making those priorities. Ms. Beltran added that she and Mr. Malham are pleased that the Action Plan will be a working document and can be updated. The MPO staff hopes that when applications for Enhancement Projects are received from the City, County, or other entities, that these projects can be included in the Plan, as well as obtain funding. Mr. Houston requested clarification as to if the committee is being requested to agree with the criteria used and the rankings of the top 20 projects. Mr. Malham stated that the criteria was established several months ago and it was reviewed by two other entities, the CRA and PRAB. They approved, tweaked and blessed the criteria, so that has been established. Priority suggestions are always for anyone to voice, any project that wasn't in the top 20 scores became filler as to the next highest score, so there is room to add to the list. Mr. Donaldson concurred that this is a good tool to use and move forward, if there is a Safe Route to School project it helps if the project is shown on this list because it shows more desire or need for a project. Also, ranked projects have often been requested by the community, and reviewed by a few technical or other committees, so the feasibility is more predominant; however, it must be taken into consideration if unanimity is not present. It was noted that the committees are not approving a top 20, they are being given the opportunity to review these projects and it will come back to you in February. The methodology is what is being approved at this time.

Mr. Trovato asked what the purpose of having a bike lane and a shared use path. Mr. Donaldson advised that the bike lanes and the shared use paths serve different purposes. Mr. Malham stated that on State facilities, a bike lane is a requirement. People walking, biking, roller-blading, pushing strollers or wheelchairs use a shared use path, not all bicyclers will use a shared use path as some choose to ride at a higher rate of speed. Mr. Natoli added that only a

certain percentage of bikers will use a bike lane, the other 85% of bikers will not ride on the bike lanes when the road speed is 45 miles per hour.

Ms. Kim Delaney, with the Regional Planning Council working with the Palm Beach MPO is developing a Regional Greenways, Trails, Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility Plan to integrate facilities of seven counties from Monroe up to Indian River. Ms. Delaney suggested a 5D to the agenda, which would be a reference to the Regional Greenways and Trails efforts which would give the Martin MPO the opportunity to participate. Ms. Delaney will provide the information to Mr. Malham at a later date. Mr. Houston noted that St. Lucie has adopted a Master Plan, and that the regional connection between Martin County and St. Lucie County at Citrus is strong. Ms. Delaney added that the goal of that regional effort is to insure that when the connections meet, they are on the same side of the road or same location, to ultimately raise to the level where there are regionally identified priorities, these are priority facilities that are multi-County and of a sufficient size so that they can be considered regional.

Mr. Jim Hudson made the motion to approve the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan as presented with additional comment prior to the final adoption in February. The motion was seconded by Mr. Houston. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously.

6. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

7. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

8. COMMENTS FROM FDOT

None.

9. NOTES

Ms. Beltran advised that the MPO will be sending to the committees information regarding a Letter of Intent for the upcoming Enhancement projects for the spring, 2012 grant cycle. The applicants had a screening committee last year and one of the applicants requested that a letter of intent for a pre-application process be submitted in order for the applicants to get more information about the process prior to the State and MPO process going into effect. This should prevent some of the last minute scrambling in submitting project applications.

10. NEXT MEETING

BPAC-January 9, 2012-Growth Management Conference Room at 5:00 PM
CAC-February 1, 2012-Growth Management Conference Room at 9:00 AM.
TAC-February 1, 2012-Martin County Airport Conference Room at 1:30 PM

11. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Houston. A second was obtained by Ms. Moore. There were no objections. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned approximately 3:40 PM.

Recorded and Prepared by:



Margaret H. Brassard, Administrative Specialist II

Date: Feb. 13, 2012

Approved by:



Don Donaldson for
Sam Amerson, Martin TAC Chairman


Date: 2/01/12



Shelia Kurtz, Martin CAC Chairman

Date: 2/01/12

And



Joan Moore, Martin BPAC Chairman

Date: 2/13/12