

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
of the
SARASOTA/MANATEE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
7632 15th Street East
Sarasota, Florida

AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 22, 2018 at 5:00 P.M.

THE CAC WILL ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT ON ALL ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA

Public input will be limited to **two minutes** per person per agenda item.

Anyone wishing to speak on a specific agenda item or under the Open to the Public Section is requested to fill out a "Public Comment" card and provide it to MPO staff.

Call to Order/Confirmation of a Quorum (Sara Calhoun, Manatee County, Chair)

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes: September 10, 2018

Open to the Public

Chair's Report

FDOT Report

I. COMMITTEE ACTION

1. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments (Jesten Abraham, FDOT)
2. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Introduction (Leigh Holt, MPO)

II. PRESENTATIONS (May Require CAC Action)

1. Call for Projects/Application Review (Ryan Brown, MPO)
2. Active Transportation Plan Update (Jennifer Musselman, Kittelson)
3. Legislative Priorities (Leigh Holt, MPO)

III. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Election of Officers (Current Chair is Sara Calhoun, Manatee County (ITPO) and Vice Chair is Kafi Benz, Sarasota County)
 - a. Election of CAC Chair from one County, Inclusive of Municipalities within that County; and
 - b. Election of CAC Vice Chair from alternate County, Inclusive of Municipalities within that County.
2. Once Around the Table

IV. NEXT MEETING DATES

Committee Meeting: January 14, 2019

V. ADJOURNMENT

All interested parties are invited to appear and be heard on each of the above items. Written comments filed with the MPO will be considered. Copies of all the above proposed documents are available by calling the MPO Office at 941-359-5772.

This notice is published pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Laws, Florida Statutes, and MPO Policy. No stenographic record by a certified court reporter is made of this meeting. Accordingly, any person who may seek to appeal any decisions involving the matter noticed herein will be responsible for making a verbatim record of the testimony and evidence at this meeting upon which any appear is to be based.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact the Sarasota/Manatee MPO at 941-359-5772 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

The MPO's planning process is conducted in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes. Any person or beneficiary who believes he/she has been discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability or family status may file a complaint with the Sarasota/Manatee MPO Title VI coordinator Leigh Holt at 941-359-5772 or by writing her at 7632 15th Street East, Sarasota, Florida 34243.

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
52
53
54

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
of the
SARASOTA/MANATEE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MPO Conference Room
7632 15th Street East
Sarasota, Florida 34243

5:00 P.M.

MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

Chair Sara Calhoun called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. A quorum was present.

Members Present

Jesten Abraham, FDOT
Kafi Benz, Sarasota County
John Cable, City of North Port
Sara Calhoun, ITPO
Richard DeGennaro, Manatee County
Bob Gause, City of Palmetto
Denise Greer, Manatee County
John Hendricks, Sarasota County
Jordan Leep, Manatee County
Richard Longo, City of Venice
Gerald Noeske, Manatee County
Eileen Normile, City of Sarasota
Dorian Popescu, Sarasota County
Anne Ross, Manatee County
James Schmidt, Sarasota County
John Teran, City of Sarasota
Jake Wilson, Town of Longboat Key

Staff Present

Ryan Brown
Alvimarie Corales
Leigh Holt
David Hutchinson
Rachel McClain
Corinne Tucker

Guests Present

Glenna Blomquist, Citizen
Dr. Ron Viton, Citizen
Cynthia Beals, Citizen
Nancy Boos, Citizen
Jeff Winslor, Citizen
John Ollson, Citizen
Hellena Lahens, Citizen
Robert Hartwell, Citizen
Shay Hawkinberry, Citizen
Cardiena Hardy, Citizen
Jamie Gage, Citizen
Brenda Kersey Hadayia, Citizen
Keenan Wooten, Citizen
Stephen Boyes, Citizen
Charles Spencer, Citizen
Tina Clifford, Citizen
Neelny Jones, Citizen
Michelle Grimsley, Citizen
Rev. James Golden, Citizen
Commissioner Charles Smith, Citizen
Giselle Stolper, Citizen
Jr. Bishop Lawrence Livingston, Citizen
Rodney Jones, Citizen
Dr. Mac Sellars, Citizen
Dimitrie Denis, Citizen
Tyrone Scorsone, Kittelson & Assoc.
Sarah Catala, FDOT

Approval of the June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Kafi Benz made a motion to approve the minutes. It was seconded by Mr. James Schmidt and passed unanimously.

Open to the Public

Chair Sara Calhoun announced the CMNAA presentation would not be presented tonight and that it would be presented at the MPO Board meeting on September 24, 2018 at the Holiday Inn at 9:30 a.m. but you can still speak for two minutes, if you would like.

When was it pulled off the agenda? Ms. Leigh Holt, MPO Staff, replied the middle of last week. Is there a reason why, because my understanding was it was to be presented here so that this advisory committee can make a recommendation to the MPO Board. So with it being off the agenda, we are concerned, that we are not going to have an opportunity to have a discussion and have a vote to make any

1 recommendations at that meeting. Ms. Holt stated there is not going to be any vote at the Board meeting
2 and there are no decisions to be made. It is simply a presentation for information only. So there was no
3 reason to bring it to the committees and it was FDOT that asked to only bring it to the Board because it is
4 for information only.

5 Is the Citizens Advisory Committee supposed to represent the Citizens on what gets presented to the MPO
6 Board for their vote and for their discussion? It is important to us because we want the MPO Board to
7 have the information from this committee and we want this committee to know what the citizens view of
8 that before it gets presented. Ms. Holt replied the MPO Board gets the minutes from this meeting. So
9 any comments that you make would go to the Board, but there are no decisions to be made at this point
10 for the Central Manatee Network Alternatives Analysis. There is no vote.

11 So this committee has not seen the presentation that will be presented so they don't know what's in it.
12 Ms. Holt replied that the committee has seen the presentation twice before so that is why we didn't want
13 to bring it back to them.

14 In what forum, was that on the June 18th, or what? Ms. Holt replied that she could go back and check the
15 dates.

16 Does that become public knowledge that we can get a copy of those presentations? Ms. Holt replied
17 sure. Is that something that can be emailed to us or is there a place to go and find it? Ms. Holt replied
18 they are on our website and I can give you the dates to look at.

19 Ms. Eileen Normile asked if something changes on an agenda can there be a disclaimer, or something
20 put on the website that says to call the day before to check... or something so people know that there has
21 been a change? Is there some way we can institute that? Ms. Holt replied yes.

22 Mr. James Schmidt, calling a point of information, the people that came today and sign up to talk can still
23 take two minutes to tell what their issue is. That is something that they are entitled to do.

24 But is it a moot point for us to be here and do that? That if you are not going to make any
25 recommendations as the advisory board to the MPO on this specific issue that affects us? Ms. Holt replied
26 no, that is the point of the public comment period, is for you to be heard here and it becomes part of our
27 formal record of the organization.

28 Mr. Schmidt asked will it come back before this committee again?

29 She is saying no and that is our concern. Ms. Holt replied it will come back when there is something to
30 vote on. Mr. Schmidt stated so your two minutes is not for not, okay, because at some point this
31 committee will make a recommendation to the MPO Board and your comments will be of interest.

32 Rodney Jones: I am Rodney Jones and I am the President of the Manatee County branch of the NAACP.
33 We are in direct opposition to any elevated structure going through Manatee County or the First Street
34 corridor. We believe that the FDOT has committed a Civil Rights violation. We believe that the minority
35 community runs the risk of being the most impacted and were deliberately excluded from the process.
36 They did not have public workshops in our community even though we are ground zero and we are ground
37 zero for the proposed flyover, as they call it and it is the highest performer and is defiantly a target for
38 FDOT. As I stated there were no public meeting in our neighborhood, we were only offered community
39 meetings, but we had well over a hundred people show up to a community meeting in opposition to it, all
40 of our community leadership and none of those voices were recorded due to we were only offered a
41 community meeting. So the entire process may have been disingenuous. At a meeting at St. Paul
42 Missionary Baptist church they relayed that, in front of a room full of people, that the FDOT and their
43 consultants have done a terrible job of communicating to the community. They left us confused in
44 admitting to it. So for them to continue to move forward, it is grossly inappropriate. In addition, FDOT
45 has a long list of consultants that they use on not well vetted projects. They actually cut our process short
46 to move to the PD&E stage when they were not even done with the mobility study. Along with that short

1 run there were a lot of other projects that could have been vetted out of that process. We are in direct
2 opposition and have been and will submit a law suit against the Florida Department of Transportation.
3 Thank you.

4 Dr. Mac Sellers: I represent the Turner Temple CDC and the Lake Park area. Let it be known on record
5 that we, the Lake Park area and the Turner Temple CDC, we just do not approve the concept of the flyover
6 moving forward. We feel it is bad for our community and unfortunately what happens most times is we
7 are left after the fact on what you are going to do without having the advantage of having input. Now that
8 we have a possibility of having input and I say we as a community. Loud, proud disapprove of the flyover.

9 Stephen Boys: Thank you advisory community for the opportunity to speak to you all. I live in downtown
10 Bradenton. I am a social worker and I work with Head Start. I am a resident of the Village of the Arts.
11 The reason why I want to talk to you is about the PD&E study. I see a few problems with the study the
12 proposed areas were the bridge is to come in. The logical problems, cultural problems, going through
13 historic areas, so it is unlikely that the PD&E would find First Street to be the only viable option for an
14 elevated through way. The problem with the through way is that, through ways do not ease rush hour
15 traffic congestion, which is a common belief that FDOT has. Anthony Downs is an economist, he writes
16 about this in his 1992 book; Still Stuck in Traffic. He shows that peak hour traffic congestion rises to
17 meet maximum capacity. That means if you take a four lane road and build it to an eight lane road, you
18 just get eight lanes of traffic congestion during rush hour. Now 10:00 a.m. traffic it does ease traffic
19 congestion but that is not any of our problem here. Our problem is rush hour traffic congestion and it
20 doesn't work to ease that. The other problem is it is a big economic bomb to the downtown areas, to
21 Palmetto and Bradenton when this gets dropped there. We don't want to look like Tampa, we don't want
22 to feel like, gosh someone said this to me these are not my words; we don't want to feel like trolls. Right,
23 we don't want to look up and see a gigantic bridge. I am trying to start a little business in the Village of
24 the Arts and I don't like the idea of looking up and seeing pile-on after pile-on. So I think the research is
25 not behind this project and I think the economics are not behind this project. So thanks for your
26 consideration.

27 Dimitrie Denis: I am your future County Commissioner for District Two where the proposed fly away is.
28 You have representation on every side and of course you have the representation here of the black
29 community. My thoughts are as simple as this if we are going to put in a fly away that is going to impose
30 on a community perhaps we can use our business relations to create commercial real estate investments
31 for some of these communities that might be devastated by this fly away. Thank you.

32 Nancy Boos: I am an owner at Bel Mare Condo in Palmetto. I am here to ask for your help in making the
33 right infrastructure choice for our community. I am talking about the efforts being made to eliminate
34 congestion along the US 41 corridor and DeSoto Bridge. At a time when the priorities for most cities in
35 the United States are shifting away from designing city infrastructure to enhance mobility toward
36 promoting economic and environmental sustainability, livability, and social equality, we seem to be
37 leaning in the other direction! Consider Pinellas County built flyovers along US 19. Former Chairman of
38 the Pinellas MPO and Chairman of the Pinellas County Commission, Judge George Greer said, and I quote,
39 "It killed business at virtually every intersection there was a flyover built, businesses do not thrive along
40 service roads." Many, many cities have learned that boulevards and at grade solutions yield more positive
41 benefits to the community when compared to the impact caused by elevated highways. In virtually every
42 case this tradeoff was made without seriously sacrificing traffic needs.

43 If one looks at the problems in New York, Dallas, I have researched these, Milwaukee, San Francisco,
44 Denver, Syracuse, and even Tampa plus many other communities it will be seen that over time elevated
45 highways in urban areas have been poison. Most of these communities have either torn out or are
46 planning to tear out their elevated highways in an effort to rebuild vibrant surroundings. To date the
47 results have been better than expected and have not sacrificed traffic needs.

1 Why then would we think we can overcome all the negative aspects actually experienced in the past?
2 Please help select an option that does not destroy our community. We firmly believe that changes to I-
3 275 and I-75 are an integral part of an effective overall solution.

4 John Ollsen: I second what Nancy was saying there. I am on the Board of Directors for the Bel Mare
5 Condominiums in Palmetto and I am also a licensed professional engineer. I would like to bring to your
6 attention to our findings regarding the connection between the CMNAA capacity alternatives and I-75
7 traffic volumes. There is a connection there, even though most of the folks deny that. First, I want to be
8 certain that you know I am opposed to any form of elevated highway traffic capacity option. History has
9 shown that they destroy any adjacent areas in communities. On learning of the capacity alternatives, in
10 fact one third of the current traffic across the DeSoto and Green Bridge is through traffic we can only
11 conclude that part of this capacity solution needs to be increasing I-75 capacity. Conversations with the
12 MPO staff and City of Palmetto indicate a consistent belief that traffic on I-75 has no relationship to traffic
13 across the DeSoto and Green Bridge. However, FDOT's own 2040 projections show variations in I-75
14 demand for alternatives in the study area. Using FDOT's own traffic counts they all reduce the demand
15 on I-75. In other words, all the I-75 traffic is going this way and is crowding out Palmetto and Bradenton.
16 A major portion of the high traffic volumes on the DeSoto Bridge is due to congestion on I-75. Building
17 more capacity through the center of Palmetto and Bradenton will only count toward the problem.
18 Furthermore, despite having been told no I-75 capacity studies were in the pipeline we have learned that
19 there is an FDOT PD&E study underway that centers on toll lanes within the medians of I-75 corridor.
20 Also, the expansion of the I-75 bridge is only a year away from ground breaking. We in the Riviera Dunes
21 community intend to engage a prominent traffic engineer to perform an independent study that we are
22 confident will show conclusively that the I-75 corridor is in fact a major factor in solving the DeSoto corridor
23 capacity issue. Therefore I-75 and I-275 should be addressed in the CMNAA study and we respectfully
24 request the MPOs attention to this matter.

25 Jamie Gage: I am an image and story guy so instead of talking about traffic I am going to tell you what
26 that traffic does. If you have ever parked for a long period of time at the airport and you come back and
27 your car is covered in black soot from the jet fuel that burns, as these trucks roll by and these diesel semis
28 drive by all of that pollution has to go somewhere so it lands on your car, on your homes, this would be
29 passing right over a river, passing over boats. I have to clean my boat constantly as it is without it and it
30 is just really a harbor on everything that we have. It is pollution, it is noise pollution. Even now we have
31 done noise studies at Riviera Dunes and the traffic that exists on four lanes of traffic is above what is
32 aloud by the government. So if we were to take that four and add two more lanes to it, we are going to
33 do that, so now we have six lanes, and then we are going to take a four lane super highway and put it on
34 top of that, you have to envision that. Because as we talk about a flyover nobody realizes what that
35 means, so now we have a ten lane highway going right through downtown Bradenton from Palmetto. So
36 you are really going to bypass all of those things, those businesses are going to suffer and if you are in
37 Manatee Memorial Hospital on the third floor or in intensive care you will have semi's rolling by you twenty
38 four seven. I mean you have to think about the impact that takes for somebody that has just been through
39 surgery and has to recover. It is not the best decision. There are a lot of different opportunities, I think
40 we have seen now that FDOT is looking at a study and our belief is that the study needs to go around that
41 seven mile perimeter, it needs to extend past I 75. Thank you for your time.

42 Shay Hawkinberry: I am the president of the master association for the Riviera Dunes encompassing and
43 representing over 1,200 residents in the Palmetto area. It was recommended that I come speak to this
44 committee because it is the Citizens Advisory Committee. This is the Committee that makes
45 recommendations on behave of its citizens to the MPO Board. I don't know how much you guys know
46 about what is going on in the PD&E study and the flyover. I am sure you heard it, we have been in the
47 newspaper, we have had news reports about it. We want everyone to know that we directly oppose it for
48 all the reasons that have been spoken here today. I was told by a member of this committee, that they
49 did not know about some of these issues, that they didn't know the public opposed it. We oppose it for
50 the reasons that everyone has spoken about here today. The Rural healthcare organization is quoted as

1 saying "linking highway traffic noise to direct health effects, that is causes shorter life expectancy." In
2 Riviera Dunes we have both children and the elderly retirees. If one person there, there health is going
3 to be impacted, if one child could die or one elderly person could die five years or ten years sooner then
4 expected, is that worth it. The MPO and FDOT may think that it is only one life, it is only five lives, every
5 life matters. This committee needs to make a recommendation to take the flyover off the table. We were
6 told that this committee and the MPO Board can actually take any alternative that was presented by the
7 FDOT and they can take it off the table right away and that is what we are asking you to do. We want this
8 committee who represents us citizens to make sure the MPO Board votes at that September 24th meeting
9 to take the flyover alternative off the table. Then we will support any other alternative that makes since
10 that does not negatively impact the health, the property value. We are the biggest tax base for the
11 Palmetto area, the Riviera Dunes community. So not only is building that flyover going to impact the
12 health and safety of the residents but it is going to drastically impact the tax base and the property values.
13 Thank you.

14 Keenan Wooten: I am a long-life citizen of the City of Bradenton born and raised ward five, Central CRA,
15 District Two as well born and raised in this area. We are totally against this flyover in our community and
16 our neighborhood. I am in an area where economic stimulation is very hard, businesses are very hard to
17 come by in the area that is full with low social economic issues, vacant lot issues, trying to stimulate any
18 kind of economic growth in an area that is pretty much struggling. I was one of the ones that was born
19 and raised in this area and actually moved back to try to correct a lot of problems that we have had over
20 the years. I could have moved to Atlanta or New York or anywhere but I am right here trying to make a
21 change in our community. A flyover would destroy any economic movement that we might think of having
22 especially in ward five and in District Two where we already struggle everyday to bring in businesses, to
23 create funds or to create any kind of movement in our community as far as jobs, as far as businesses
24 coming in, as far as just day to day living. We are constantly right now fighting with every municipality,
25 with every government locally here in Bradenton for our neighborhood. Now we are fighting with FDOT
26 about a flyover. So we are here totally against this, there are a lot of people in our neighborhood that
27 cant make it here but I'm just glad to be here to represent for our neighborhood and what we strongly,
28 strongly believe in. I want to thank you for your time but we are against this in our neighborhood that is
29 struggling everyday and we want your consideration to say no.

30 Charles Smith: Thank you Manatee County Commissioner Charles Smith until November 19th and I will
31 probably be back in about four months after that. We are not for the flyover. We have said it over and
32 over again. We do not support the flyover. My family is the owner of five million dollars' worth of business
33 in a mile radius. Two homes, a packing house, commercial property on 8th Avenue and a commercial bail
34 bond business. The people do not support it. Here are the residents of this community they do not
35 support to divide this community. It brings havoc on our churches and economic development for
36 generations to come. The investments in these communities have been invested by the Riviera Dunes
37 and other communities. They do not have time to waste taxpayers money with this false hope that we
38 are going to allow you to build a flyover. It is not going to happen folks. I can tell you all you have to do is
39 call your Legislative leadership. It seems to me that FDOT is trying to shift the money to some other parts
40 of the State. The State will not support the flyover if the local community does not support the flyover.
41 So lets wakeup, smell the coffee and quit playing games with the people. We have to move forward with
42 improving the quality of life in this community. We are the twentieth fastest growing county in America
43 today and are slowly moving up. So this flyover is just running away good clean businesses that want to
44 develop here in our community buying jobs and small businesses. So I hope this advisory board can make
45 recommendations to the MPO Board that we are on the record and we are not going away, we are bold
46 and not afraid to fight this issue. I am not going to jeopardize my family and my childrens economic base
47 that my father built for 55 years to destroy his business. One of our businesses is only about 400 yards
48 away from where you are talking about developing this. We are not going to support it folks. The power
49 is in the people. So listen to the people. It destroyed Miami Dade county, the pride of the community, a
50 public safety issue to law enforcement. Homeless issues downtown have moved into these communities.
51 We can take care of our homeless but we need to make sure we don't shift the problem.

1 Rev. James T. Golden: Pastor at Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church in the City of Tampa
2 Florida. I am a former City Council member and I am here today but before I say what I have to say I would
3 like to ask how many of the members of this Citizens Advisory Committee live within one mile on either
4 side of 301? No one? 13th Avenue in Bradenton and South of 17th Street in Palmetto, that is one mile
5 on either side. Nobody on the Citizens Advisory Committee live in that area? I didn't think so.

6 Dorian Popescu stated you need to be more active to people on the ... Rev. Golden: No sir, no! This is an
7 appointed by the elected officials. That is why we have to come here today. Mr. Popescu stated but
8 residents can apply and they will be elected. Rev. Golden: No they wont be. Mr. Popescu stated they will
9 be designated by their City Councils. Rev. Golden: No they will not. I was not designated when I served
10 on the City Council. I can argue with you for about two minutes, but you understand my point. That the
11 people that are asking for relief are not sitting at the table, they are sitting around the walls. Which makes
12 your job even more crucial, even more critical because you represent the unrepresented. We are here
13 today to simply say two things. Number one, I heard that there are like nine proposals for what could be
14 done to alleviate this downtown congestion and we seem to be fixated on one, that is not right. We don't
15 even know what the other options are. Let me simply say that if we are one community and if you are the
16 Citizens who are advising the Metropolitan Planning Organization, please let them know that you are
17 speaking on behalf of people who are not at the table. I beg you to be cognizant of the fact that much of
18 the business that you see along that corridor was not there when I took my seat on the City Council. We
19 created the Central Revitalization area that brought in the Wawa, and the two or three gas stations along
20 there and the other businesses that are there. We need that and we don't need to have it just destroyed
21 because some engineer somewhere is trying to solve a traffic problem. The traffic problem that you are
22 trying to solve will create community problems which is longer then the traffic problems that you are trying
23 to solve and besides we all know that there are other alternative routes to dealing with that particular
24 corridor. I close with this the least disruptive way it will take to accomplish what you say you want to
25 accomplish, for the congestion there is to go down the area where the least number of homes some
26 businesses will be disrupted and that is 9th Street East. The roads are already wide and it is the narrowest
27 place where the bridge can come across. It will not interfere with the people that who are there at Riviera
28 Dunes. It will come right out 301 cut right across the river and go to 9th Street. I would simply like to ask
29 is anybody talking about this with Tropicana? Has anybody said hey we are trying to solve a problem.

30 Rob Hartwell: I live in Riviera Dunes, on the back side of Riviera Dunes in the Hammocks Community and
31 in between there is a new Sanctuary Cove development and I wanted to stress a couple of points. First
32 of all in St. Pete/Clearwater when they built the flyover they destroyed the business community there.
33 Hundreds of businesses there were struggling and went out of business. There are articles about it but
34 it is really important to look at what it did to the businesses. The other option is on the other side of
35 Riviera Dunes, going through Sanctuary Cove, in between Sanctuary Cove and Riviera Dunes and the
36 Hammocks, and that would be the worst possible situation. Flyovers on both sides of Riviera Dunes. So
37 it is not only the flyover in the front but the flyover in the back and a brand new bridge option in the back
38 which is hugely expensive. You are building all new infrastructure to meet in the middle of the river and
39 surrounding our community. The impact of surrounding Riviera Dunes which is about 25% of the entire
40 tax base in Palmetto would destroy the community and the property values. That is not even my main
41 concern, my main concern is coming up next. Property values decrease, the health of the citizens, the
42 health of the community, a vibrant community, a beautiful community and it is destroyed if you combine
43 options. Now we do support widening the DeSoto Bridge and we are united in the community behind that
44 too. We support shifting some and looking at the I 75 bridge which is being widened next year. So they
45 didn't look at that in the study. The final point I wanted to make is I was Chairman of the Environmental
46 Subcommittee of Fairfax County Virginia's Planning Commission, I was Chief of Staff on the Hill, I was
47 appointed by the Governors of Virginia, three Governors. I have studied a lot of these issues and have
48 worked on these issues over the years. Fairfax County Virginia, the largest County in the State of Virginia.
49 I have only been here for about four years and I love it, I love my community. The environmental situation
50 behind our community also includes roosting grounds for White Pelicans, it includes Wood Stork habitat.

1 There are some environmental issues that I don't think they have looked at yet in between the
2 communities and I urge you to look at those before you make a recommendation. Thank you.

3 Jr. Bishop Lawrence C. Livingston: I am the Executive Director of Eternity Temple Washington Park CDC
4 and we have been working very diligently with various commission groups, four so far, with Commissioner
5 Charles Smith about the 80 acres of land were they are about to ram Highway 41 through our
6 neighborhood. We call it Vietnam cause so many people got killed before they tried to correct the errors
7 that they brought. That is through the Lincoln Community. We would like to put in a resolution that we
8 are totally against this flyover and also it will impact the 80 acre project and the new swimming pool that
9 will be at Lincoln and the tunnel. So that is basically all I want to say. I have heard everything else and I
10 agree that we... I have seen flyovers in my travels all the way up to New York and Boston, so we don't
11 want it here.

12 Glenna Blomquist: I have a little handout here if you didn't get one, there are copies in the back. I live on
13 Palmer Boulevard and that is part of what I am going to talk about. If you haven't been East of I 75
14 recently you will notice that there is phenomenal development. I am here today to advocate for an
15 increase and expedited funding for the completion of Iona Road extending to Fruitville Road. This is a
16 two mile piece of road. This roadway has a significant impact on future safety. The projected traffic is
17 "F" between Iona and Debrecen and "F" between Debrecen on Palmer and Fruitville, and "F" between
18 Debrecen on Fruitville and Lorraine. So what happens when all these people have to evacuate? They
19 are going on Canopy Road, that is one of their choices. Many of these people use this North South route
20 because there isn't any other one. Now think about this, what North South route you would use if you
21 were in this predicament? In front of my house, which is 8167 Palmer, there is a narrow bridge every
22 person every vehicle trying to get to Cattleman or Fruitville as you cross this little bridge which is obsolete
23 and not safe in my observation. The engineers may disagree with me but if they saw the truck traffic over
24 this they would agree. So what I am here to say is to ask for expedited and increased funding for two
25 miles of road that has been on the future land use map for almost thirty years. Thank you.

26 Dorian Popescu: So due to the fact that we have had so many visitors and one subject even though it is
27 not on our agenda it is unanimous, I move to recommend to the MPO to discard the flying lane from the
28 nine other options for improving the traffic from Bradenton to Palmetto. Mr. John Teran seconded the
29 motion.

30 Bob Gause: I hate to kill it out right without knowing everything else that is out there but I understand the
31 motion and I don't think we want to see the MPO take position supporting it based on the fact that these
32 people thought there was going to be a presentation. Honestly, I thought I was going to see a presentation.
33 I didn't get the notice that it was coming off the agenda, maybe I missed it. So I would rather see the
34 MPO postpone any decision and at some point I would like to talk about something that I brought up
35 almost a year ago which was an alternative, that Brent Lacy didn't want to look at, based on the article in
36 the paper this morning that FDOT is fixing to create a very easy alternative for a short term solution and
37 they are still not considering it. So I mean I got some concerns.

38 Chair Sara Calhoun: Please keep in mind the presentation at the MPO meeting will be just a presentation
39 there will not be any recommendations out of that. It is our job to certainly bring the concerns of these
40 citizens to them and I can do that when I do my report but I don't know that we are in a position to make
41 a recommendation on it until we all know the facts.

42 Richard DeGennaro: I have been out of touch and am not up to speed on this topic but I don't recall the
43 other alternatives. The idea of a flyover is usually a disaster in other places. However, the motion was
44 made and seconded by people from Sarasota County. I am not prepared to make a motion right now
45 because I am behind the curtain. I am not prepared to vote for the motion if it still stands on the table.

46 James Schmidt: That is why I held back because I am Sarasota County and I don't really live in Manatee,
47 so it doesn't affect me one way or the other. I do think the one thing we can make a motion on is to ask
48 that the MPO be certain to take into consideration the overwhelming concerns of the community opposed

1 to a flyover and I think that's not saying we are for it or against it but we are saying the community has
2 really spoken to us and said their concerns about it that are legitimate concerns in our opinion. If it is a
3 legitimate concern in your opinion then you vote yes for the motion then if it isn't then you just let it fly. I
4 think that is what we should do not say we are for or opposed because they haven't even gotten to the
5 point were they are asking us for an opinion. However, I do think we do need to let them know that we
6 have heard 13 people representing a large number of the community who have made some really salient
7 points about the community, culturally in the community in terms of business. Those issues are all
8 extremally important issues and I think we should note that we have heard that and are very much
9 concerned and would like for them to take special concern about it.

10 Kafi Benz: I would like to know from Leigh if possible, whether this is going to come before this committee
11 for consideration in the future and whether it would be more appreciate for our comments regarding it
12 given the MPO at a later date? Ms. Leigh Holt stated this will definitely come before you at a later date.
13 Kafi Benz: On the bases of that I will not support the motion and I call to question.

14 John Hendricks: I agree with James that we don't have enough information to make a specific
15 recommendation, but I think when this many people come and speak about it and have good reasons for
16 it and they participate in the process it would be a travesty if the MPO does not pay attention to it. I think
17 we should recommend that the MPO have a hearing with these people that are making these objections
18 and listen to them and not just say that we will do something about it later, but we need to say something
19 to them now. They need to pay attention to this problem and agree to meet with and take into account
20 the local citizens needs and interests and the problems that they think this will bring. I think we are
21 making a joke out of a democratic process.

22 Dorian Popescu: I would like to change the motion to reflect what John and James are saying, in other
23 words we ask the MPO to reconsider the alternatives and let the MPO know that we have had about 26
24 visitors to our meeting, more then any other time in 25 years I have been on the CAC. We have never had
25 so many and they need to reconsider and to listen to the residents in that area. John Teran seconded the
26 revised motion.

27 Bob Gause: I actually have a conflict of interest. I represent the developer of the hotel that is adjacent to
28 this project which means that I have a conflict on how to vote on this because I have an interest right
29 there next to it. I think Denise Greer does too. We are working on the same project.

30 Chair Sara Calhoun stated there is a motion on the table that we present to the MPO that we had this very
31 large group of citizens came in with overwhelming and logical concerns. John Teran seconded the motion.
32 The motion passed with 2 abstaining.

33 **Chairs Report**

34 There was no Chair's Report.

35 **Staff Report**

36
37
38 Mr. Ryan Brown presented Mr. Dorian Popescu with a letter of recognition from Sarasota County
39 Commission for his 25 years of service to the MPO's Citizen Advisory Committee.

40 **I. Committee Action**

- 41
42
43 1. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments Authorization of Roll Forward
44 Projects.

45
46 Mr. Ryan Brown, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the roll forward amendments. Mr. John
47 Cable made a motion to recommend MPO Board adoption of the roll forward amendments. It
48 was seconded by Mr. James Schmidt and passed unanimously.

1
2 2. Public Participation Plan Update
3

4 Ms. Corinne Tucker, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the Public Participation Plan update
5 and also provided a PowerPoint presentation of the website redesign. Mr. James Schmidt
6 made a motion to recommend MPO Board approval of Public Participation Plan update. It
7 was seconded by Ms. Anne Ross and passed unanimously.
8

9 3. Performance Targets/Project Priorities Process
10

11 Ms. Leigh Holt, MPO Staff, Ms. Alvimarie Corales, MPO Staff, and Mr. Tyrone Scorsone,
12 Kittelson & Assoc., provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Performance Targets/Project
13 Priorities Process. Mr. James Schmidt made a motion to recommend MPO Board adoption of
14 the Performance Targets and TIP Amendments as presented. It was seconded by Mr. John
15 Cable and passed unanimously.
16

17 Recommended Motion as presented:
18

- 19 • Safety
 - 20 ○ Support FDOT statewide performance targets for Vision Zero as a long-term
21 goal
 - 22 ○ Adopt the proposed MPO safety targets for the Sarasota/Manatee region
- 23 • Infrastructure Condition
 - 24 ○ Support FDOT statewide system performance targets for infrastructure
25 condition
 - 26 ○ Adopt proposed Sarasota/Manatee bridge priorities
- 27 • Mobility/Congestion/Reliability and Freight/Economy
 - 28 ○ Support FDOT statewide system performance targets for reliability and freight
- 29 • TIP Amendments
 - 30 ○ Adopt the required performance targets amendment to the Transportation
31 Improvement Program (TIP)
32

33 **II. Presentations**
34

35 1. FDOT Report
36

37 Mr. Jesten Abraham, FDOT, announced project updates:
38

- 39 • I 75 and SR 70 Interchange improvements is scheduled to begin construction on
40 October 8, 2018, weather permitting, with completion of the project in early 2021.
41 There will be a pre-construction public meeting from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on
42 Thursday, September 13, 2018 at the Manatee Technical College, 6305 SR 70 East
43 Bradenton, Florida 34203. Brian Bollas is the project Manager and can be reached
44 at Brian.Bollas@dot.state.fl.us.
- 45 • FDOT District One will be participating in Mobility Week which is October 27th through
46 November 3rd. Let FDOT liaisons know if you are hosting an event or know of any
47 events that are going on, so that FDOT can be a part of it.
48

49 a. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)
50

1 Ms. Sarah Catala, FDOT, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the 2045
2 Long Range Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) for Fiscal Years 2029-2045. Some
3 highlights include:
4

- 5 • The purpose of the SIS 2045 CFP
- 6 • SIS planning process four key components are the: unfunded needs
7 plan, long range cost feasible plan, 2nd five years plan, and adopted
8 work program
9

10 **III. Other Business**

11 1. Once Around the Table

12 There were no comments from Members.

13 **IV. Next Meeting Date**

14 Committee Meeting: October 22, 2018

15 **V. Adjournment**

16 Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.
17
18

DRAFT

COMMITTEE ACTION

AGENDA ITEM I-1

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) AMENDMENTS

Presenter: Jesten Abraham, FDOT

Summary: This amendment brought forward by the Florida Department of Transportation is requesting changes to the following projects in Manatee County:

- FPN 433592-3 US 41 Lighting Retrofit, Year 2019, \$5,000.00
- FPN 444049-1 US 41 – 7 Lane Section, Year 2019, SA \$10,000.00 and ACSS \$125,000.00
- FPN 444398-1 Manatee County Area Transit 5339 (B) Bus Maintenance, Year 2019, FTA \$1,931,000.00 and LF \$478,250.00

If approved by the MPO Board at the November 8, 2018 meeting, the listed projects will be added in the current adopted FY 2018/2019-2022/2023 TIP.

Attachment: Letter From FDOT Dated October 10, 2018

Recommended

Action: Recommend MPO Board Adoption of the FDOT Requested Amendments



Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

801 N. Broadway Ave
Bartow, FL 33830

MIKE DEW
SECRETARY

October 10, 2018

Mr. David Hutchinson
Executive Director
Sarasota Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization
7632 15th Street East
Sarasota, FL 34243

RE: Amendment to the Sarasota Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization's Fiscal Years 2018/2019 through Fiscal Years 2022/2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Dear Mr. Hutchinson:

The purpose of this letter is to request the Sarasota Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) adopt the following amendment to the FY 2018/2019 – 2022/2023 TIP at the November 8, 2018 Board Meeting.

This project must be listed correctly in the Sarasota Manatee TIP to ensure authorization of funds. Please refer to the attached table for additional information.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (863) 519-2769.

Sincerely,



Jesten Abraham
Community Liaison

JJA:ja
Enclosure

cc: Leigh Holt, Sarasota Manatee MPO
Ryan Brown, Sarasota Manatee MPO
Rachel McClain, Sarasota Manatee MPO
Wayne Gaither, FDOT

County	Item Segment	Description	Phase Group	Ph	Seq	Fund	Year	Amount
Manatee	433592-3	US 41 LIGHTING RETROFIT	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	31	01	ACSS	2019	5,000
Manatee	444049-1	US 41 – 7 LANE SECTION	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	31	01	SA	2019	10,000
				32	01	ACSS	2019	125,000
Manatee	444398-1	MANATEE COUNTY AREA TRANSIT 5339 (B) BUS MAINTENANCE	GRANTS AND MISCELLANEOUS	94	01	FTA	2019	1,913,000
						LF	2019	478,250

COMMITTEE ACTION

AGENDA ITEM I-2

2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) INTRODUCTION

Presenter: Leigh Holt, MPO

Summary: The purpose of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is to develop future transportation facilities in Sarasota and Manatee Counties. The LRTP must consider the full complement of transportation modes – roads, bicycles, pedestrians, trails, transit, parking, railroads and airports. The plan includes at least twenty years and must be updated every five years.

The LRTP presents the transportation improvements that are needed today and in the future to help move people and goods safely and conveniently about the community. Based on a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3-C) planning process, the MPO's LRTP is governed by Federal law and regulations found in Title 23 United States Code (USC) Section 134, Title 49 USC Section 5303, and codified in Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 450.

Required planning elements include analysis of comprehensive plans for all partner jurisdictions, regional modeling, scenario development, revenue forecast, 25-year cost feasible budget, and extensive public outreach and community engagement.

Attachment: LRTP Scope

Recommended

Action: Recommend Approval of the LRTP Implementation Plan

Sarasota Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization Sarasota/Manatee MPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan DRAFT Scope of Services

Introduction

The Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) seeks to update its long range transportation plan (LRTP) through 2045 to meet mobility challenges in the community. With the rise in economic development across the State of Florida, and a rapidly increasing population, Sarasota/Manatee communities have experienced a surge in economic growth and development. This has diversified the regional economy and changed the landscape significantly creating new transportation demands. The two-county area is regularly considered to be among the Top 20 fastest-growing urban areas by census calculations.

The MPO must develop an LRTP that addresses no less than a 20-year planning horizon. The intent and purpose of the LRTP is to encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of a cost-feasible intermodal transportation system that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight; and foster economic growth and development within and through urbanized areas of the State, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption, air pollution, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The LRTP must include long and short-range strategies consistent with Federal, State, and local goals and objectives. The chart below presents the Federal and State statutes, regulations, and resources related to development of the LRTP for MPOs.

Federal and State Resources

Federal	
Scope of the metropolitan planning process and development of the metropolitan transportation plan.	23 U.S.C. 134 (h) and (i)
	49 U.S.C. 5303 (h) and (i)
Congestion management process, and development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.	23 C.F.R. 450.322, 450.324, and Appendix A to Subpart 450
FHWA/FTA LRTP 2018 Expectations Letter (January 10, 2018)	http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/LRTP%20Expectations%202018.pdf
State	
MPO responsibilities and LRTP requirements.	Section 339.175, Florida Statutes
FDOT Florida Planning Emphasis Areas 2018	http://www.fdot.gov/planning/Policy/metrosupport/Resources/Florida%20Planning%20Emphasis%20Areas%202018%20Final.pdf

Federal Requirements for the LRTP

Federal regulations require MPOs to develop LRTPs through a performance-driven, outcome-based approach to planning. The metropolitan transportation planning process shall be continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive; and provide for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that will address the following factors: [\[23 C.F.R. 450.306\(a\) and \(b\)\]](#):

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system across and between modes for people and freight;
- Promote efficient system management and operations;
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
- Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system, and reduce or mitigate storm water impacts of surface transportation; and
- Enhance travel and tourism.

In addition to these planning factors, Federal law and regulation requires the LRTP to include, at a minimum:

- The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(1\)\]](#)
- Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, non-motorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors), which should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan. In addition, the locally preferred alternative selected from an Alternative Analysis under the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Capital Investment Grant Program needs to be adopted as a part of the plan. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(2\)\]](#)
- A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with the required performance management approach. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(3\)\]](#)
- A system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the required performance targets, including progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including

baseline data; and, for MPOs that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system, and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(4\)\]](#)

- Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(5\)\]](#)
- Consideration of the results of the congestion management process including the identification of single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(6\)\]](#)
- Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(7\)\]](#)
- Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in [23 U.S.C. 101\(a\)](#), and associated transit improvements, as described in [49 U.S.C. 5302\(a\)](#), as appropriate. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(8\)\]](#)
- Descriptions of proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates (e.g., design concept and design scope descriptions). [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(9\)\]](#)
- A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(10\)\]](#)
- A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented. Revenue and cost estimates must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s). For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(11\)\]](#)
- Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with [23 U.S.C. 217\(g\)](#). [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(12\)\]](#)
- Both long and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(b\)\]](#)

- The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(f\)\]](#)
- Integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), including the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) required under [23 U.S.C. 148](#), the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required under [49 U.S.C. 5329\(d\)](#), or an Interim Agency Safety Plan in accordance with [49 C.F.R. Part 659](#), as in effect until completion of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan; and may incorporate or reference applicable emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate, to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(i\)\]](#)

State Requirements for the LRTP

[Section 339.175\(6\)\(b\), F.S.](#), requires the LRTP to provide for consideration of projects and strategies that::

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life;
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- Promote efficient system management and operation; and
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

In addition to these considerations, Florida Statutes require MPOs to develop, in cooperation with the State and public transit operators, transportation plans and programs for each metropolitan area that provide for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities, including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, which will function as an intermodal transportation system for the metropolitan area, based upon the prevailing principles provided in [s.334.046, F.S.](#) and [s.339.175\(1\), F.S.](#)

The process for developing such plans and programs shall provide for consideration of all modes of transportation; and shall be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive, to the degree appropriate, based on the complexity of the transportation problems to be addressed. [\[s.339.175\(1\), F.S.\]](#)

To ensure the process is integrated with the statewide planning process, MPOs shall develop plans and programs that identify transportation facilities that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions. These include the facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) designated under [s.339.63, F.S.](#) and facilities for which projects have been identified pursuant to [s.339.2819\(4\), F.S.](#) (Transportation Regional Incentive Program). [\[s.339.175\(1\), F.S.\]](#)

The LRTP must be consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved local government comprehensive plans of the units of local government located within the jurisdiction of the MPO. [\[s.339.175\(7\), F.S.\]](#) Each MPO is encouraged to consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce GHG emissions. [\[s.339.175\(7\), F.S.\]](#) The approved LRTP must be considered by local governments in the development of the transportation elements in local government comprehensive plans and any amendments thereto. [\[s.339.175\(7\), F.S.\]](#)

The LRTP must address at least a 20-year planning horizon, must include both long-range and short-range strategies, and must comply with all other State and Federal requirements. The LRTP also must consider these prevailing principles: preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida's economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility. [\[s.339.175\(7\), F.S.\]](#) The LRTP must, at a minimum:

- Identify transportation facilities, including, but not limited to, major roadways, airports, seaports, spaceports, commuter rail systems, transit systems, and intermodal or multimodal terminals that will function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(a\), F.S.\]](#)
- Consider the goals and objectives identified in the [Florida Transportation Plan \[s.339.175\(7\)\(a\), F.S.\]](#).
- Give emphasis to those transportation facilities that serve national, statewide, or regional functions; and must consider the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan. If a project is located within the boundaries of more than one MPO, the MPOs must coordinate plans regarding the project in their LRTPs. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(a\), F.S.\]](#)
- Include a financial plan that demonstrates how the plan can be implemented, indicating resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. The financial plan may include, for illustrative purposes, additional projects that would be included in the adopted LRTP if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(b\), F.S.\]](#)
- Assess capital investment and other measures necessary to ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system, including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(c\)\(1\), F.S.\]](#)
- Assess capital investment and other measures necessary to make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion, improve safety, and maximize the mobility of people and goods. Such efforts must include, but are not limited to, consideration of infrastructure and technological improvements necessary to accommodate advances in vehicle technology, such as autonomous technology and other developments. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(c\)\(2\), F.S.\]](#)
- Indicate, as appropriate, proposed transportation enhancement activities, including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic easements, landscaping, historic preservation, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff, and control of outdoor advertising. [\[s.339.175\(7\)\(d\), F.S.\]](#)
- Be approved by each MPO on a recorded roll-call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the MPO membership present. [\[s.339.175\(13\), F.S.\]](#)

Scope of Services for Developing the LRTP

Federal and state guidance on performance-based planning provides a strategic framework to articulate and structure the implementation and achievement of a successful planning process. The Consulting team will coordinate with MPO staff to develop a LRTP that will:

- Develop a vision for the plan along with a review of goals and objectives established by the MPO.
- Assess the total transportation needs for the MPO area with input from transportation agencies and local jurisdictions.
- Review the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and committed transportation projects.
- Utilize public involvement, in line with the existing MPO Public Participation Plan, to establish community priorities and to involve the public throughout the planning process.
- Consider alternative technologies and systems, such as the use of autonomous vehicles and on-demand transit services.
- Use scenario-planning to explore alternatives and solutions for the region's future multimodal network.
- Develop a draft 20-year cost feasible plan.
- Conduct Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) screen for appropriate projects.
- Produce draft 2045 LRTP document and allow interested parties reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan.
- Coordinate with MPO Staff to produce a project schedule that concludes with plan adoption by November 2020.

Transportation Planning Model

FDOT developed the Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure (FSUTMS) for use by all Florida MPOs to determine current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends for this 20-year planning horizon. Additional analytical techniques and/or models may be used after consultation with FDOT. The MPO must document in the LRTP the models and methodology used, and prepare technical memoranda documenting how the techniques can be used in various planning applications.

The LRTP will include a traditional travel demand model-based analysis, including the development of needs plan and cost feasible network scenarios. The analysis will include traffic volumes, population, and employment numbers for three 10-year time periods, 2025, 2035, and 2045.

LRTP Needs Plan

The LRTP will include a Needs Plan and a Cost Feasible Plan. The Needs Plan takes into account current and future transportation needs without consideration of financial constraints. The Needs Plan can aid in inventorying a region's transportation needs to prioritize which projects should be funded to achieve a more efficient and interconnected transportation system.

Federal law requires the MPO to address the ten Planning Factors shown on page 2 as a part of the planning process. The degree of consideration and analysis of the factors should be based on the scale and complexity of the area's issues and will vary depending on the unique conditions of the area.

There are two new planning factors that need to be considered in the 2045 LRTP: (1) improving the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reducing or mitigating stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and (2) enhancing travel and tourism. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.306\(b\)\(9\)\]](#)

The 2045 LRTP will be required to describe the performance measures and the targets the MPO has selected for assessing the performance of the transportation system. A system performance report will also be required in the LRTP. The report is a tool that evaluates and updates the condition of the transportation system in relation to the performance measures and targets and should include:

- FDOT and MPO adopted targets,
- The baseline condition at the start of the evaluation cycle,
- The progress achieved in meeting the targets, and
- A trend-type comparison of progress.

Consistent with the planning factors, FHWA, FTA, and FDOT have issued Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) give priority to particular issues. The MPO will consider the PEAs in its modal planning for future system improvements and address them specifically in the LRTP. FDOT has identified three priorities for inclusion in the 2045 LRTP.

- Transportation performance measures
- ACES (Automated/Connected/Electric/Shared-use) Vehicles
- Rural transportation planning

The Needs Plan should include only transportation projects that are necessary to meet identified future transportation demand or advance the goals, objectives, and policies of the MPO, the region, and the state. MPOs will include a cost estimate of these needs in the LRTP. The needs estimate should include all costs (operations, maintenance, capacity expansion, etc.) of all projects associated with all modes; and estimated needs should be reported by mode.

The Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC) adopted the [Financial Guidelines for MPO 2040 Long-Range Plans](#) in January 2013 to improve uniformity in the reporting of financial data and estimating transportation needs in MPO LRTPs. This document provides guidelines for defining and reporting needs in the LRTP.

Development of the Needs Plan will include:

- Review of local jurisdiction long-range and Comprehensive Plans
- Master plans for modal agencies including MCAT, SCAT, Port Manatee, and the Sarasota Bradenton International Airport
- Incorporation of MPO adopted performance measures and targets
- Scenario planning, vision consensus, and identification of high priority corridors
- Community engagement through workshops, events, and online surveys

Cost Feasible Plan

Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure dollars,” based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(11\)\(iv\)\]](#)

The LRTP must demonstrate fiscal constraint, which means the plan includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. [\[23 C.F.R.\]](#)

Cost feasible projects will include all those improvements that can be funded with projected revenues in year of expenditure dollars by respective five- or ten-year time bands. The cost feasibility of improvements will be determined based on cost and revenue and respective priority of improvements in the needs plan. The use of “boxed funds” will be evaluated to fund programs such as ATMS, feasibility study implementation, and/or non-motorized improvements. Improvements eligible for inclusion in boxed fund programs will not be evaluated for cost feasibility on a project basis, but will be included as candidate improvements for the respective boxed funds.

Environmental Mitigation

The LRTP must include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.324\(g\)\(10\)\]](#)

Federal regulation defines environmental mitigation activities as strategies, policies, programs, and actions that, over time, will serve to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or eliminate impacts to environmental resources associated with the implementation of a LRTP. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.104\]](#) The LRTP mitigation discussion could identify specific challenges to mitigation implementation, such as areas where the ability to mitigate for a particular resource may be limited, as well as activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the plan. The mitigation text should be accompanied by maps depicting existing and future areas designated for mitigation, conservation, or preservation.

Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) Planning Screen: The Efficient Transportation Decision-Making (ETDM) process is Florida’s procedure for reviewing transportation projects to consider potential environmental effects. The intent of the ETDM is to provide a method for early consideration of ecosystem, land use, social, and cultural issues, prior to a project being included in the LRTP. Information gathered may be used to satisfy National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. Examples of major transportation improvement projects include:

- Widening existing roadways to include additional through lanes;
- Addition of High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes;
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lanes;
- New roadways;
- New interchanges and major interchange modifications;
- New bridges and bridge replacements; and
- Major public transportation projects, such as Intermodal Passenger Centers and new fixed guideway service.
- ETDM screens of major transportation improvement projects included in the highway component of the Strategic Intermodal System Cost Feasible Plan will be conducted by FDOT.

The ETDM process allows resource and regulatory agencies and the public an opportunity to review and comment on proposed transportation projects during the development of the LRTP. Based on feedback from

the Planning Screen, the MPO may adjust project concepts to avoid or minimize adverse impacts, consider mitigation alternatives, and improve project cost estimates.

The LRTP will include a section that lists all projects screened through the ETDM Planning Screen process to document the level of agency consultation that has occurred. A Purpose and Need Statement must be included for each project entered into ETDM, as well as a summary of the major issues and comments noted by the resource agencies during their review. The project list and summary of major issues and comments assists in focusing on specific geographic areas and strategies for project mitigation purposes.

The MPO is expected to evaluate and provide comment about potential social and cultural effects of projects included in the LRTP based on available information as part of the ETDM Planning Screen process. The social and cultural evaluation addresses six issues:

- Social;
- Economic;
- Land use;
- Mobility;
- Aesthetics; and
- Relocation.

Public Involvement

MPOs are required to develop and use a documented Public Participation Plan that defines a process for providing reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process to individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.316\(a\)\]](#)

In developing the LRTP and TIP, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities. In addition, the MPO shall develop the metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area. [\[23 C.F.R. 450.316\(a\)\(3\)\(b\)\]](#)

The LRTP public involvement will follow policies, objectives, strategies and activities from the MPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP), as applicable. The Consulting team will establish and sustain a communication regimen with the MPO staff, agency stakeholders, MPO committees, MPO Board and the public at large throughout the LRTP update process and will work closely with the MPO Public Involvement Coordinator. A lead committee will be organized and may be composed of partner agency representatives, as well as private stakeholders. The exact composition of the committee will be coordinated with MPO staff. Materials presented and input solicited at public and stakeholder meetings will be shared digitally through a LRTP-specific link on the MPO website and through social media.

LRTP Key Dates

2018	
<u>Key Event</u>	<u>Dates</u>
Scope and contract	11/5/18
<u>2019</u>	
Public Policy Panels	12/18 to 3/19
LRTP Kick-Off	4/22/2019
Baseline Survey	4/22/2019
Baseline Survey Deadline	5/24/2019
Draft Scenarios	6/14/2019
Scenario Planning Survey	8/09/2019
Scenario Planning Workshop	8/12/2019
Scenario Survey Deadline	9/30/2019
Vision Preview Workshop	10/25/19
Vision Survey	11/2019 - 12/2019
Autonomous Vehicles Showcase	12/2019
<u>2020</u>	
Vision Survey Deadline	1/6/2020
Vision Presentations	1/13 and 27/20
Corridor Planning Survey	3/9/2020
Corridor Planning Survey Deadline	3/23/2020
Cost Feasible Plan Workshop	4/20/2020
Cost Feasible Plan	5/4 and 18 /2020
Final LRTP Draft Presentation	9/14 and 28/20
LRTP Adoption	11/16/2020

LRTP Checklist

Section A- Federal Requirements	
A-1	<p>Does the plan cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>
A-2	<p>Does the plan address the planning factors described in 23 C.F.R. 450.306(b)?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(a)</p>
A-3	<p>Does the plan include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(b)</p>
A-4	<p>Was the requirement to update the plan at least every five years met?</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(c)</p>
A-5	<p>Did the MPO coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP)?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(d)</p>
A-6	<p>Was the plan updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(e)</p>
A-8	<p>Does the plan include existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(2)</p>
A-9	<p>Does the plan include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with 23 C.F.R. 450.306(d)?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(3)</p>

A-10	<p>Does the plan include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in 23 C.F.R. 450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data?</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(4)(i)</p>
A-11	<p>Did the MPO integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 119(e) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in 49 U.S.C. 5326; (ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in 23 U.S.C. 148; (iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan in 49 U.S.C. 5329(d); (iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate; (v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in 23 U.S.C. 149(l), as applicable; (vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan (MAP-21 section 1118); (vii) The congestion management process, as defined in 23 CFR 450.322, if applicable; and <p>Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.</p> <p>Please see the “New Requirements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.306 (d)(4)</p>
A-12	<p>Does the plan include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(5)</p>
A-13	<p>Does the plan include consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(6)</p>
A-14	<p>Does the plan include assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(7)</p>
A-15	<p>Does the plan include transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a)? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(8)</p>

A-16	<p>Does the plan describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(9)</p>
A-17	<p>Does the plan include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(10)</p>
A-18	<p>Does the plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented?</p> <p>Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)</p>
A-19	<p>Does the plan include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal- aid highways and public transportation? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(i)</p>
A-20	<p>Did the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under 23 C.F.R. 450.314(a)?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(ii)</p>
A-21	<p>Does the financial plan include recommendations on additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the plan, and, in the case of new funding sources, identify strategies for ensuring their availability? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iii)</p>
A-22	<p>Does the plan's revenue and cost estimates use inflation rates that reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s)? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(iv)</p>
A-23	<p>Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(f)(11)(vi)</p>
A-24	<p>Does the plan include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g)? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(g)(12)</p>
A-25	<p>Does the plan integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, or an Interim Agency Safety Plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.324(h)</p>
A-26	<p>Does the plan identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(g)(1)</p>

A-27	<p>Did the MPO provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)? 23 C.F.R. 450.324(j)</p>
A-28	<p>Did the MPO publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.324(k), 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(iv)</p>
A-29	<p>Did the MPO provide adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(i)</p>
A-30	<p>In developing the plan, did the MPO seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems such as low- income and minority households?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance.</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vii)</p>
A-31	<p>Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the plan? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft plan, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final plan?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vi) & 23 C.F.R.450.316(a)(2)</p>
A-32	<p>Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final plan differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts?</p> <p>Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(viii)</p>
A-33	<p>Did the MPO consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning area that are affected by transportation, or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities?</p> <p>Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the 2018 FHWA/FTA LRTP Expectations Letter for guidance. 23 C.F.R. 450.316(b)</p>

A-34	If the MPO planning area includes Indian Tribal lands, did the MPO appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the plan? 23 C.F.R 450.316(c)
A-35	If the MPO planning area includes Federal public lands, did the MPO appropriately involve Federal land management agencies in the development of the plan? 23 C.F.R 450.316(d)
A-36	In urbanized areas that are served by more than one MPO, is there written agreement among the MPOs, the State, and public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan transportation planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent plans across the planning area boundaries, particularly in cases in which a proposed transportation investment extends across those boundaries? 23 C.F.R. 450.314(e)

Section B- State Requirements

B-1	Are the prevailing principles in s. 334.046(1), F.S. – preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida’s economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the plan? ss.339.175(1), (5) and (7), F.S.
B-2	Does the plan give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities? ss.339.175(1) and (7)(a), F.S.
B-3	Is the plan consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved comprehensive plans for local governments in the MPO’s metropolitan planning area? ss.339.175(5) and (7), F.S.
B-4	Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions? ss.339.175(1) and (7) F.S.
B-5	Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered? s.339.175(7)(a), F.S.
B-6	Does the plan assess capital investment and other measures necessary to: 1) ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system, including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities; and 2) make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods? s.339.175(7)(c), F.S.
B-7	Does the plan indicate, as appropriate, proposed transportation enhancement activities, including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic easements, landscaping, historic preservation, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff, and control of outdoor advertising? s.339.175(7)(d), F.S.
B-8	Was the plan approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present? s.339.175(13) F.S.

PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM II-1

2019 PROJECT PRIORITIES/CALL FOR PROJECTS

Presenter: Ryan Brown, MPO

Summary: Florida Statute requires each MPO to develop a list of Project Priorities and to submit the list to FDOT. MPO member jurisdictions are being asked to update prior applications and to submit new projects for consideration by December 17 at noon.

Each application will be scored using the prioritization scoring methodology approved by the MPO board and committees in April, 2017 and updated this year to incorporate more effective measures.

The Draft MPO 2019 Project Priorities list will be taken to the MPO Board in January for a preliminary review. The final project priorities list will be taken back to the MPO Board in March in order to meet FDOT's timeline and will be submitted for FDOT funding consideration in developing the next tentative Five-Year Work Program (Fiscal Years 2020/2021 - 2024/2025).

PARTNER	DATE	ACTION
MPO	November 12 2018	Official Call for Projects
JURISDICTIONS	December 17 2018	Submit completed applications to MPO
MPO	January 28 2019	Technical/Citizens Advisory Committees (1/14) MPO Board DRAFT Project Priorities
JURISDICTIONS	February 1 2019	Jurisdictions RANK top priorities Submit adopted list of priority projects to MPO
MPO	March 25 2019	Technical/Citizens Advisory Committees (3/11) MPO Board ADOPT Final Project Priorities
FDOT	March 25 2019	Final approved list of priority projects submitted to FDOT

Attachments: Additional material will be sent separately

Recommended

Action: None

PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM II-2

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Presenter: Jennifer Musselman, Kittelson & Associates

Summary: This interim presentation will include preliminary work such as draft goals and their integration into the project scoring process as well as measures of effectiveness. Also, the base map package has been completed and will be used to provide various geographic information as the development of the plan continues to progress.

The following USDOT goals serve as the foundation for the Active Transportation Plan:

- Achieving a connected, safe, accessible and comfortable network for bicyclists, pedestrians, trail users, and transit riders,
- Improving safety for people walking, biking, and riding transit,
- Promoting equity in the transportation planning, design, funding, implementation and evaluation process, and
- Increasing the number of walking, bicycle, and transit trips in the region.

The final Active Transportation Plan will include recommendations to provide connectivity, improve safety, inform project implementation, and guide funding for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects.

Attachment: None

Recommended

Action: None

PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA ITEM II-3

2019 MPO LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Presenter: Leigh Holt, MPO Staff

Summary: Legislative Priorities will be presented at both Manatee and Sarasota Counties legislative delegation meetings. They will also be distributed to partner organizations including the counties, municipalities, League of Cities, chambers, EDCs, and others, for consideration as part of their legislative agendas.

The priorities may be brought back to the Board for updates after transportation bills are filed and the Legislative Committee process begins.

Attachment: 2019 Draft Legislative Priorities

**Recommended
Action:** Review 2019 MPO Legislative Priorities

2019 Sarasota/Manatee MPO State Legislative Priorities

TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

- **Support Transportation Project Priorities:**
 - **DeSoto Bridge Replacement/Capacity:** Expedite replacement of the bridge and identify increased north/south capacity . The Desoto Bridge, constructed in 1957, is at the end of its service life and maintenance costs continue to rise.
 - **River Road Expansion:** Increase capacity to a six-lane divided arterial roadway, including bike lanes, pedestrian walkways and transit accessibility features, tpo support economic development and provide a new evacuation route for Sarasota and Charlotte Counties.
 - **Barrier Island Mobility Improvements:** Advance funding for implementation of immediate and long term recommendations identified in the Barrier Island Traffic Study to address significant seasonal traffic issues.
- **Expand Port Manatee Freight Capacity:** Invest in port projects to increase cargo capacity and support intermodal connections to the port.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

- **Monitor Local, Regional, and State Funding:** Ensure equitable funding allocations for local and regional transportation priorities and support federal legislation that provides equity between states.
- **Encourage Innovative Transportation Alternatives:** Invest in multimodal improvements including public transportation; bicycle, pedestrian and trail facilities; and intelligent transportation system technologies (ITS); and prepare for the impact of autonomous and connected vehicles.
- **Expand Local Revenue Sources for Transportation:** Support legislation that preserves existing funding sources and explore new local and state revenue options to fund transportation facilities and operations.
- **Protect Transportation Trust Funds and Programs:** Allocate all funds received for transportation projects as defined in authorizing legislation including the State Transportation Trust Fund, the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund, the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) and County Incentive Grant Program (CIGP).

Sarasota/Manatee Metropolitan Planning Organization

Coordinated transportation planning for

Anna Maria / Bradenton / Bradenton Beach / Holmes Beach / Longboat Key / Manatee County / North Port
Palmetto / Port Manatee / Sarasota / Sarasota County / Sarasota Bradenton International Airport / Venice



CHAIRMAN

Commissioner Vanessa Baugh
Manatee County

VICE CHAIRMAN

Commissioner Alan Maio
Sarasota County

FDOT DISTRICT 1

Secretary L.K. Nandam

MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

David Hutchinson



*For more information on the
Sarasota/Manatee MPO
2018 Legislative Priorities
Please contact:*

Leigh Holt, Strategic Planning Manager
Sarasota/Manatee
Metropolitan Planning Organization
Office (941) 359-5772
Cell (321) 302-5848
leigh@mympo.org
www.mympo.org

MPO BOARD

City of Bradenton

Vice Mayor Gene Brown
Councilmember Patrick Roff

Island Transportation Organization

Mayor Dan Murphy, Anna Maria
Representing Anna Maria, Bradenton Beach,
and Holmes Beach

Town of Longboat Key

Commissioner Jack Daly

Manatee County

Commissioner Vanessa Baugh
Commissioner Betsy Benac
Commissioner Stephen Jonsson

City of North Port

Mayor Vanessa Carusone
Vice Mayor Linda Yates

City of Palmetto

Mayor Shirley Groover Bryant

City of Sarasota

Mayor Liz Alpert
Commissioner Willie Shaw

Sarasota Bradenton Airport Authority

Commissioner Carlos Beruff

Sarasota County

Commissioner Paul Caragiulo
Commissioner Nancy Detert
Commissioner Alan Maio

City of Venice

Vice Mayor Bob Daniels