

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
of the  
**SARASOTA/MANATEE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
MPO Conference Room  
7632 15<sup>th</sup> Street East  
Sarasota., Florida

6:00 P.M.

**MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 4, 2009**

Chair Warner called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. A quorum was present. Those in attendance were as follows:

**PRESENT**

**Manatee County**

Steve Shroyer  
Lawrence Miller  
Stanley Hochman  
James Lacher  
Gerald Noeske  
Thomas O'Brien  
David Sessions  
Dale Stephenson

**Sarasota County**

Kafi Benz  
Pamela Thompson  
John Hendricks  
Mitch McKnight  
Dorian Popescu  
Millie Small  
Rod Warner  
1 Vacancy

**City of Sarasota**

John Teran

**City of Venice**

1 Vacancy

**City of Bradenton**

Don Bingham  
James Bruen

**City of Palmetto**

Mickey Hopkins

**Island Transportation Planning Organization**

Robert Engel

**ABSENT**

**Manatee County**

Jill Winters (Excused)

**Sarasota County**

Joseph Miller

**City of Sarasota**

Tollyn Twitchell

**Town of Longboat Key**

Charlie Czech

1  
2 **Non-Voting Member**

3 Manon Lavoie, FDOT

4  
5 **Staff**

6 Michael Howe, Executive Director

7 Sue Clapsaddle, HR/Fiscal Manager

8 Keith Drake, Principal Planner

9  
10 **Others**

11 Chris Piazza, FDOT

12 Aaron Kaster, FDOT

13 Arif Abdulla, Citizen

14 Lori Diamant-Abdulla, Citizen

15 Susan David, Citizen

16  
17  
18 Because there were individuals from the public who wished to speak to the Transportation Improvement  
19 Program item, Chair Warner reordered the agenda accordingly (Committee Action will be presented prior  
20 to the Reports & Presentations section).

21  
22  
23 **CHAIR'S REPORT**

24 Chair Warner reported on the following:

- 25  
26  
27 ➤ One of his "platforms" as Chair was to see if the CAC could be more pro-active to improve traffic  
28 flow for everyone. It has been his observation there are a lot of positive projects that are  
29 disjointed (groups not communicating but yet the projects are connected in some fashion). Chair  
30 Warner referenced seven projects – 1) USF/New College has a master plan for the section around  
31 the airport and US 41; 2) North Trail corridor from 14<sup>th</sup> Street to University Parkway; 3)  
32 Fruitville Road improvement from US 301 to US 41 within the City of Sarasota; 4) Bayfront  
33 corridor from 14<sup>th</sup> Street to Orange Avenue; 5) US 301 from 12<sup>th</sup> Street North which includes a  
34 reconfiguration of the intersection of US 41 and US 301 at Wood Street; 6) US 41 that goes from  
35 there down to Bee Ridge; and 7) the County has the SCOPE initiative (Transit Initiative) for the  
36 Bee Ridge corridor from US 41 to I-75. Chair Warner added Honore Avenue.

37  
38 All of the projects have different combinations of government jurisdictions. He questioned if the  
39 projects were collectively put together and approached and raised up for funding, would the  
40 bigger size, the importance and the outcome, have an outcome benefit that would be more likely  
41 to happen. He noted that it was referred to as a jurisdiction overlap.

- 42  
43 ➤ The Bus Rapid Transit System had one change recommended at a joint session of the Sarasota  
44 County and City Commission today which was the route from Ringling to Mound go down  
45 Orange Avenue rather than Osprey Avenue as presently proposed. Question was also raised at  
46 that meeting as to why the trolley in downtown Sarasota failed. The trolley is once again being  
47 promoted.

1 **MPO STAFF REPORT**

2  
3 Mr. Howe reported on the following:

- 4  
5 ➤
- 6 ➤ Updated Public Participation Plan (required document of federal and state law) will be adopted. There is a Limited English Proficiency policy that will allow people who have difficulty speaking English to be more engaged in transportation planning.
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9 ➤ The MPO has a new website – [www.mympo.org](http://www.mympo.org). A new feature is that it can convert documentation on the website to any available selected language.
  - 10
  - 11 ➤ Legislative session – there was an additional \$120 million cash raid on the Transportation Trust Fund.
  - 12
  - 13 ➤ The Growth Management Bill was signed by the Governor this week. This particular bill has different exceptions for transportation concurrency which may have an impact in the future.
  - 14
  - 15 ➤ This October there is to be a new Federal Transportation Act.
  - 16 ➤ Thanked the CAC members for their service and noted it was very much appreciated.
  - 17

18  
19 **FDOT'S REPORT**

20  
21 Ms. Lavoie deferred her report to later in the meeting.

22  
23  
24 **III. COMMITTEE ACTION**

25  
26 **FY 2009/2010 – 2013/2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

27  
28 Mr. Drake, MPO staff, reported that the TIP was adopted every June. In December, FDOT presented its Work Program which in fact is the same document as the TIP but in a different format. The first five pages of the TIP provide a summary of the document.

29  
30  
31  
32 FDOT was able to program a phase of the highest priority (major improvement project) which is the US 41 Bypass in Venice. FDOT also programmed the highest CMS projects – in Manatee County all three are on Cortez Road intersections – 43<sup>rd</sup>, 59<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> Streets; in Sarasota County the dynamic messages signs in the City of Sarasota were programmed.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Mr. Howe referred to page B-12 and reported that at the last MPO Board meeting of May 4<sup>th</sup>, Sarasota County decided to do the following. When the Stimulus dollars were allocated, this area received approximately \$13 million. Of that, the State also had another funding source to do some State Stimulus projects. They programmed the US 301 project in Sarasota County from University Parkway to downtown. Sarasota County requested that the North Cattlemen project be switched to a stimulus project with US 301 being constructed as planned with payback to occur in a later year. Sarasota County is now able to get the North Cattlemen project done along with the US 301 project.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Chair Warner opened the meeting to the public.

- 47  
48 1. Arif Abdulla, resident of RiverPointe, expressed concern with SR 64 east of Carlton Arms and the dangerous intersection of SR 64 and 39<sup>th</sup> Street East. He requested that the
- 49

1 intersection be addressed with some type of communication being established. Some  
2 residents use 43<sup>rd</sup> Street East which is safer to make the turn.  
3

- 4 2. Susan David, RiverPointe Homeowners' Association, requested there be dialog in order  
5 to have some input and kept apprised of this project with regard making a left hand turn  
6 out of the community.  
7

8 Both speakers expressed concern regarding the capacity improvement on SR 64 and would like to  
9 see some type of solution for a dangerous turn at 39<sup>th</sup> Street (or some other location along there to  
10 make it a safer turn, or a combination of things, and for a dialog to occur given the timeline).  
11

12 Mr. Piazza, FDOT, stated he would provide his contact information and provide them with  
13 information as to what was being designed for that intersection.  
14

15 Mr. Hochman: I move that we recommend approval of the FY  
16 2009/2010-2013/2014 TIP.  
17

18 Mr. Miller: I second the motion.  
19

20 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
21

22  
23 **OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**  
24

25 There were no further comments received from the public.  
26  
27

28 **I. CONSENT SECTION**  
29

- 30 1. Approval of the April 4, 2009 Meeting Minutes  
31

32 Ms. Benz: I move that we accept the minutes as presented.  
33

34 Mr. Noeske: I second the motion.  
35

36 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
37  
38

39 **II. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS (May Require CAC Action)**  
40

- 41 1. Anna Maria Island Bridge Project Development and Environment Study  
42

43 Mr. Chris Piazza, FDOT, reported that FDOT was complete through the public hearing  
44 for the Anna Maria Island Bridge project. FDOT will provide the Coast Guard with its  
45 recommendation in order to obtain approval and move on into the design phase.  
46

47 Mr. Piazza provided a highlight of the PowerPoint slides contained in the agenda packet.  
48 Some highlights included:  
49

- Alternatives included transportation systems management (low cost interim improvements to intersections and transit); no build (includes maintenance and repair of existing bridge for an estimated 10 years); rehabilitation (replacement required after 25 years) and replacement options (low, mid-high level and tunnel)
- FDOT analyzed north, center and south alignments
- Proposed typical section A-two-lane bridge with one 12' sidewalk (45 mph design speed) and a proposed typical section B-two-lane bridge with 2 10' sidewalks (45 mph)
- A low-level drawbridge (21' vertical clearance), mid-level drawbridge (45' vertical clearance) and a high-level fixed 65' vertical clearance were analyzed
- Right-of-way acquisition

Mr. Hochman questioned the project cost of a major rehabilitation and the fixed bridge alternative. Mr. Piazza replied it would be \$72 million (15 year life span) and the fixed bridge alternative was \$102 million (75 year life span).

For clarification, it was noted that the bridge dollars were a separate funding source and would not affect any other MPO priorities.

Mr. Stephenson stated that the recent rehabilitation was just throwing money away; that funding should have gone toward a new bridge. Mr. Piazza noted that ten years ago (when this issue was brought up), it would have cost \$14 to \$16 million to replace.

- Of the 4,200+ surveys mailed to the entire island and those on the mainland that were part of the project area, the survey results revealed the preferred alternative (463 surveys received through 4/9/09) were for replacement with a high-level fixed; south alignment and typical Section B
- FDOT's preferred alternative is for the high-level fixed bridge, south alignment and typical Section B (two sidewalks)
- After presentation to the TAC on Monday, FDOT will prepare to submit the document to the Coast Guard

Mr. Engel reported he had attended a public hearing wherein a wind study was presented. The elevated wind speed risk has to be weighed against the risk on a daily basis of a draw span each time the bridge goes up – there are every day risks and once in a blue moon risk which need to be weighed.

Mr. Lacher questioned how long before the Coast Guard approval. Mr. Piazza replied some time in September.

Mr. Howe stated that once funding was received and it goes into the design phase, a design review committee would be formed.

## 2. Regional Enhancement Program

Ms. Lavoie stated what FDOT has been facing was that projects would be in the years to be constructed and the local government would desire change which created confusion/problems for FDOT. What FDOT came up with is that every year starting in

1 2015/2016 \$1.2 million will be put aside toward regional projects which will be  
2 competitive statewide.

3  
4 Chair Warner questioned the criteria. Ms. Lavoie noted some contained in the agenda  
5 packet (and that MPO staff received correspondence outlining more detailed criteria) and  
6 noted some of the criteria included:

- 7  
8       ➤ MPOs/BCCs will be required to develop a regional trails element and include in  
9 their next LRTP in order to receive Transportation Enhancement Program  
10 funding (TEP) for regional TEP projects;  
11       ➤ Regional projects will only be considered if they are included in the LRTP;  
12       ➤ Eligible regional TEP projects will be selected based on a point system; and  
13       ➤ Right-of-way is an eligible phase for regional TEP projects.

14  
15 Ms. Lavoie stated that FDOT will prioritize the projects much like the TRIP; FDOT will  
16 look such things as connectivity – connecting two or more major activity centers and  
17 traverse in more than one county.

18  
19 3. FDOT Project Expenditure Report

20  
21 Ms. Lavoie explained the each column of the spreadsheet entitled “Project Expenditure to  
22 Date Per Phases” contained in the agenda packet. The report is as a result of a motion  
23 passed by the MPO Board that the FDOT annually report, prior to the development of the  
24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the current status of transportation projects  
25 such as the timeline, completion date, actual costs incurred to date as compared to the  
26 TIP.

27  
28 Chair Warner, along with other members, commended Ms. Lavoie for a fine job in  
29 preparing a very comprehensive report – very well done. Ms. Lavoie stated she arrives at  
30 the MPO office at least one-half hour before the CAC meetings begin, and encouraged  
31 anyone with questions to feel free to meet with her prior to the meeting.

32  
33 Chair Warner requested the CAC to take the spreadsheet figures and put in a summary  
34 form as to the dollars spent vs. the number of dollars considered by the MPO when the  
35 priority was set, where the dollars are now and spent and then another look at the  
36 timeline. The purpose of this is for the MPO Board to see how the dollars have been  
37 spent, what’s the reality of the funds that were dedicated and what it is doing to other  
38 projects. Mr. McKnight added that FDOT cost estimating needed to be looked at. Chair  
39 Warner stated that an elected official should see where a project stands, what it costs and  
40 what is going to be done.

41  
42  
43 **IV. DISCUSSION SECTION**

44  
45 There were no items scheduled.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **Once Around the Table**

- Mr. Hendricks stated that he was awaiting some follow up information regarding the Public Private Partnership meeting held on May 29<sup>th</sup>. He will advise MPO staff when he receives the information in order to place this item on a future agenda.
- Regarding a survey on the island, Mr. Lacher referred to a letter from Mr. Kissick regarding a proposal that was turned down. Mr. Lacher noted he objected to Mr. Kissick's opinion as to why proposal was turned down .
- Ms. Benz stated that on August 18<sup>th</sup>, the University of Florida's Transportation Research Center is sponsoring a workshop on roundabouts to be held in Orlando and felt a member should attend. Chair Warner stated this matter would be dealt with at the July 9<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting.
- Ms. Small requested to add one more project to Chair Warner's projects of jurisdiction overlap – the Scenic Highway – US 41 through Sarasota.

**VI. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Due to the upcoming Independence Day Holiday, the next regular meeting will be July 9, 2009.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 p.m.