

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

AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 22, 2018 at 10:00 A.M.

THE TAC 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 (Kathleen Weeden, City of Venice, 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 TAC 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 Kathleen Weeden, City of Venice and Vice Chair is Ryan Suarez, Manatee County)
 - a. Election of TAC Chair from one County, Inclusive of Municipalities within that County; and
 - b. Election of TAC Vice Chair from alternate County, Inclusive of Municipalities within that County.
2. Once Around the Table

IV. NEXT MEETING DATES

Committee Meeting: January 14, 2018

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
55
56

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

10:00 A.M.

MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

Chair Kathleen Weeden called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Rachel McClain, Planning Assistant, confirmed a quorum was present.

Members Present

Jesten Abraham, FDOT
Sarah Blanchard, Sarasota County Area Transit
Lynn Burnett, Island Transportation Planning Organization (ITPO)
Ryan Chapdelain, City of Sarasota Planning Department
Kim Clayback, City of Bradenton Public Works Department
Brett Harrington, Sarasota County Planning & Development Services
Catherine Hartley, City of Bradenton Planning Department
George Isiminger, Manatee County Port Authority
Sage Kamiya, Manatee County Public Works
Mike Maholtz, City of Palmetto Public Works
Ben Newman, City of North Port Public Works/Engineering
Karla Owens, City of Palmetto Public Works Planning & Zoning
Micki Ryan, Sarasota County School Board Planning Department
Jeff Shrum, City of Venice Planning & Zoning Dept.
Ryan Suarez, Manatee County Area Transit
Kathleen Weeden, City of Venice Engineering Department
Chris Whittaker, City of North Port Neighborhood Development Planning & Zoning
Paula Wiggins, Sarasota County Public Works

Staff Present

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

Guests Present

Fabio Capillo, Manatee County
Sarah Catala, FDOT
Hellena Lahens, Sarasota Department of Health
Tyrone Scorsone, Kittelson & Assoc.
Gerardo Traverso, City of North Port
Chuck Walter, Sarasota County

Approval of the June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Paula Wiggins made a motion to approve the minutes, it was seconded by Mr. Chris Whittaker and passed unanimously.

Open to the Public

There was no one from the public that wished to speak.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's Report.

1
2 **Staff Report**
3

4 Mr. David Hutchinson, MPO Staff, announced the 2019 and 2020 Draft MPO calendars were available
5 and will be presented at the next MPO Board meeting.
6

7 **I. Committee Action**
8

- 9 1. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments Authorization of Roll Forward
10 Projects.
11

12 Mr. Ryan Brown, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the roll forward amendments. Ms. Lynn
13 Burnett made a motion to recommend MPO Board adoption of the roll forward amendments.
14 It was seconded by Mr. Jeff Shrum and passed unanimously.
15

- 16 2. Public Participation Plan Update
17

18 Ms. Corinne Tucker, MPO Staff, provided an overview of the Public Participation Plan update
19 and also provided a PowerPoint presentation of the website redesign. Mr. Ryan Chapdelain
20 made a motion to recommend MPO Board approval of Public Participation Plan update. It
21 was seconded by Mr. Chris Whittaker and passed unanimously.
22

- 23 3. Performance Targets/Project Priorities Process
24

25 Ms. Leigh Holt, MPO Staff, Ms. Alvimarie Corales, MPO Staff, and Mr. Tyrone Scorsone,
26 Kittelson & Assoc., provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Performance Targets/Project
27 Priorities Process. Mr. Mike Maholtz made a motion to recommend MPO Board adoption of
28 the Performance Targets and TIP Amendments as presented. It was seconded by Ms. Paula
29 Wiggins and motion passed with one opposed.
30

31 Recommended Motion as presented:
32

- 33 • Safety
34 ○ Support FDOT statewide performance targets for Vision Zero as a long-term
35 goal
36 ○ Adopt the proposed MPO safety targets for the Sarasota/Manatee region
37 • Infrastructure Condition
38 ○ Support FDOT statewide system performance targets for infrastructure
39 condition
40 ○ Adopt proposed Sarasota/Manatee bridge priorities
41 • Mobility/Congestion/Reliability and Freight/Economy
42 ○ Support FDOT statewide system performance targets for reliability and freight
43 • TIP Amendments
44 ○ Adopt the required performance targets amendment to the Transportation
45 Improvement Program (TIP)
46

- 47 4. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Draft Scope
48

49 Ms. Leigh Holt, provided an overview of the Draft LRTP Scope. Ms. Catherine Hartley made a
50 motion to recommend MPO Board approval of the Draft LRTP Scope and budget. It was
51 seconded by Mr. Chris Whittaker and passed unanimously.
52
53
54

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

II. Presentations

1. FDOT Report

Mr. Jesten Abraham, FDOT, announced project updates:

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

a. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)

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

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

2. Regional Traffic Management Website

Mr. Sage Kamiya, Manatee County, and Mr. Fabio Capillo, Manatee County, provided an overview of the Regional Traffic Management Website. The Twitter account is 941_Traffic and the website for more information is <https://www.smarttrafficinfo.org>.

III. Other Business

- Ms. Sarah Blanchard handed out the Proposed October SCAT route changes.
- Mr. Ryan Chapdelain stated the City of Sarasota Commission on Thursday, September 6, 2018 approved The Bay Master Plan and adopted phase 1a of the project.
- Ms. Paula Wiggins announced the 2018 World Rowing Master Regatta is September 27 through September 30, 2018.
- Mr. Jeff Shrum announced the City of Venice is looking for a senior planner.
- Ms. Kathleen Weeden stated the City of Venice is having a safety issue at US 41 North junction as it relates to Venetia Bay and Eagle Point Road and will be contacting the CTST group to see if they can help.

IV. Next Meeting Dates

Committee Meeting: October 22, 2018.

1
2
3
4
5
6

V. Adjournment

Having no further business, the TAC meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

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 (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

<u>2018</u>	
<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. <input type="checkbox"/> preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida's economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility <input type="checkbox"/> 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