

DATE: Monday, July 27, 2020

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: Telephone/Video Conference

Maika Arnold, Vice Chair, Town of Longboat Key Representative



MEETING ACCESS INFORMATION:
Instructions are attached

MEETING MINUTES

Vice Chair Maika Arnold called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and confirmed a quorum was present.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

Members

Jesten Abraham, FDOT
Maika Arnold, Town of Longboat Key Planning, Zoning & Building
Sarah Blanchard, Sarasota County Area Transit
Lynn Burnett, Holmes Beach/ITPO
Kim Clayback, City of Bradenton Public Works
Clarke Davis, Manatee County Public Works
Brett Harrington, Sarasota County Planning and Development
Daniel Ohrenstein, City of Sarasota Transportation Engineering Division
Colleen McGue, City of Sarasota Planning Department
Amy Nelson, City of Venice Planning & Zoning
Ben Newman, City of North Port Public Works/Engineering
Jonathan Roberson, Manatee County Area Transit
Kathleen Weeden, City of Venice Engineering Department
Paula Wiggins, Sarasota County Public Works

Others

Wally Blaine, Tindale Oliver
Vishal Kakkad, Manatee County
Lawrence Massey, FDOT
Jennifer Musselman, Kittelson
Brian Pessaro, TBARTA
Franco Saraceno, Kittelson
Gerardo Traverso, City of North Port

Staff

Ryan Brown
Sue Clapsaddle
Alvimarie Corales
Nanette Eubanks
Leigh Holt
David Hutchinson
Nancy Simpson
Corinne Tucker

Reports and Presentations

a. 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Cost Feasible Plan Workshop

- Ms. Jennifer Musselman, Kittelson, provided an overview of the Transportation Revenues Forecasting-State and Federal Revenue Programs:
 - Bridges, Safety and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) are funds that FDOT will allocate to the MPO off the top but these funds are not found in the plan. There are projects in the plan that may qualify for future SIS funding or safety funds.
 - The MPO does have a say on how funds are allocated in the following State and Revenue Programs: for Other Arterials and Right-of-Way, Transportation Management Area (TMA), Transportation Alternative (TA), and Transit.

- Local Revenue Programs: State distributed fuel taxes; Local option fuel tax revenues and transportation impact fees. All fuel tax revenues are committed to debt service and maintenance needs therefore those sources were not included in the Cost Feasible Plan.
- Projects that already have partial funding and are in the pipeline were given additional priority.
- Projects were funded in order based on the MPO project prioritization criteria.
- Generally, use Other Arterials money first for state roads.
- SU funding used for local TSM&O and multimodal projects after 10% Other Arterials is used.
- Sales Tax/TIF revenue used for local capacity/new road projects, supplement with Other Arterials match when available.
- Balance of available revenue, after all projects are funded, included in 7 boxed fund programs.
- Over \$2 billion in investments in the Cost Feasible Plan:
 - 55 miles (centerline miles) of bicycle, pedestrian, and completed streets improvements
 - 105 miles (centerline miles) of technology improvements
 - 50 miles (centerline miles) of new roadways and roadway widening
 - 9 new roundabouts
 - 3 new/upgraded interchanges
- Attempted to divide the money evenly between the two counties: Manatee County 49% and Sarasota County 51%.
- 65% of the money went to state roads and 35% to local roads.
- Boxed Funds:
 - Multi Modal Emphasis Corridor (MMEC) program: \$300 million
 - Safety: \$75 million
 - Resiliency: \$75 million
 - TSM&O: \$75 million
 - TSM&O Staffing and Data Management: \$5 million
 - Transportation Alternatives: \$20 million
 - FDOT Arterials: \$200 million

➤ Ms. Leigh Holt, Staff, began by sharing how funding becomes available by referencing the FDOT Revenue Forecasting Guidebook of July 3, 2018:

- State Capacity Programs-FDOT takes the lead in planning these projects; SIS Highway construction and ROW, aviation, rail, seaport development and intermodal access.
- Other Capacity Programs- "...MPOs may use the total funds estimated for these two programs to plan for the mix of public transportation and highway improvements that best meets the needs of their metropolitan areas." Which staff took very seriously and used this money first.
- Off System (Local) Roads- MPOs in TMAs can assume all estimated TMA funds and 10% of the FDOT estimates of Non-SIS Highway Construction and ROW funds can be used for "Off-System" roads. This has not been specifically called out in a plan and in order to do that we are trying to leverage your impact for that when a jurisdiction wants to build a road, the impact fees can be used to draw down some of the Other Arterial funds for local roads at 10%.

Ms. Leigh Holt provided a presentation regarding the 2045 First Draft Cost Feasible Plan:

- Safety:
 - \$75 million 'boxed funds' available; projects are identified in the annual Safety Report, which is updated annually; and there over 50 eligible locations that jurisdictions can apply for.
- Security:
 - Six multi modal emphasis corridors are evacuation routes; TS&MO projects on state roads; two new/updated southern interchanges – build out of SR 681 and an interchange somewhere between Yorkshire and Raintree.
- Infrastructure:
 - Not spending our money on new bridges, that money comes from Central Office but the MPO will continue to ask for full funding for the bridges which will be listed in the LRTP.
- Resiliency:
 - Required to address and have \$75 million 'boxed funds' available; Resiliency study funded in Fiscal Year 2021/22 in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP); out of that work project

priorities will be determined (in study) then the jurisdictions would be able to apply for those locations that have been determined are at risk.

- **Reliability:**
 - Corridors that are least reliable have been identified in the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) which has been updated and a new CMP will be provided within the next 30 days; Stated funding for MMEC corridors to relieve congestion on those roads.
- **Mobility:**
 - Capacity expansion on existing roads; construction of new regional connectors that add capacity; local match to move 10% of state's Other Arterial funds to local roads.
- **Technology:**
 - TS&MO Master Plan identifies Top 10 state and local roads in each county; FDOT funds 20 state corridors and MPO funds 20 local corridors; \$75 million 'boxed funds' available.
- **Autonomy:**
 - TS&MO Master Plan identifies CV/AV priority corridors; FDOT funds I-75 and US 41; MPO adds University Parkway.
- **Economy:**
 - E-Commerce Extensions: I-75/Port Manatee; SRQ Airport; University/SR 70; and I-75/Yorkshire/Raintree.
 - Gateways: Palmetto; Convention Center; Bradenton; Holmes Beach; Bradenton Beach; Longboat Key; SRQ; Newtown; The Bay; Venice; and North Port.
- **Tourism:**
 - Beaches and Baseball-Multi modal improvements on four beach corridors; Multi modal improvements; Complete Streets; and ATMS event management for three baseball stadiums.
- **Equity:**
 - Premium Transit: US 41 study in FY 2020/21; 20-minute headways (Bradenton to Sarasota).
 - Future Target Corridors: Cortez (30-minute headways); Ringling Bridge micro transit; Manatee; University; Ringling/Fruitville; Stickney Point/Clark; US 41 (north and south).
- **Livability:**
 - Complete Streets: 7th Street, Palmetto; 9th Street area, Manatee County; and East Venice Avenue, Venice.
 - Gulf Coast Trail: Palmetto; Holmes Beach; Bradenton Beach; Longboat Key; and Sarasota.
 - Gulf Coast Trail Studies: Bradenton - Downtown/Green Bridge to 75th; Sarasota/Sarasota County - Payne Park to Benderson Park; Sarasota County/Charlotte County - Venetian Waterway to Charlotte County Line; 10% of TMA/SU funds for local Complete Street and Gulf Coast Trails Project.
- **Projects:**
 - Project priorities currently in the Work Program fully funded through construction.
- **Delivery:**
 - Other Arterial funds for state road projects; 10% of Other Arterial funds on local road projects by matching with impact fees or other local funds; TMA/SU funds for local road projects with local match; Maximum \$1 million TMA/SU funds on state road projects; 10% of TMA/SU funds for Transportation Alternatives and Complete Streets.

Ms. Leigh Holt stated the Plan has addressed the Vision; promoted economic diversity, with the tourism project, gateway projects, and e-commerce connections and extensions; preserved environmental health by investing our money in the Project Development & Environment (PD&E) studies for the new local roads; and we are investing more in vibrant places by using some of our TMA/SU funds for Complete Streets and walking and bicycling.

b. Once Around the Table

Anna Maria- No comments received.

Bradenton- No comments received.

Bradenton & Holmes Beach- Ms. Lynn Burnett, ITPO, asked regarding the roundabouts that were connecting to the Barrier Island, were there one or two? Ms. Leigh Holt answered that right now there is one at Gulf Drive and Manatee Avenue. Ms. Lynn Burnett also asked if there is one at Eastbay and SR 64. Ms. Leigh Holt stated

she did not have that one. Ms. Burnett asked if that would fall under FDOT or if it would be the responsibility of Holmes Beach. Ms. Holt responded it can be added and requested Ms. Burnett to send an email of what she is requesting.

Longboat Key- Vice-Chair Maika Arnold stated the Town of Longboat Key is supportive of the list. She noted the Town of Longboat Key Commission has the Broadway Street roundabout as a bigger priority than the Longboat Club roundabout and because it is a higher priority, the Town will probably start on that in the next few years.

Vice-Chair Arnold asked if the number on the far-right column is in millions, i.e. \$72 million for the multi modal corridor. Ms. Holt answered yes; the large dollar amount has to do with drainage issues.

Vice-Chair Maika Arnold emphasized the Town Commission is strongly advocating for bridges with flexible lanes, pedestrian over passes over US 41, and improvements to Bridge Street roundabouts.

Manatee County- Mr. Clarke Davis stated regarding the discussion about the funding and the split between the two counties as 49% versus 51% and it may sound like a little bit but that is 4% more for one county than the other and part of that is explained by the University Parkway improvements at approximately \$160 million being out only in Manatee County's bucket and it is a road that lies along the county line and be shared between them. He stated maybe that is what is being done in the background, but it is not obvious to him.

Mr. Clarke Davis stated regarding the discussion about the different boxes of funds that his personal thought is that the fewer buckets of money you have, is better. He understands there are certain things that have to go into buckets, i.e. Transportation Alternative (TA) funds that are set aside at the federal level, but every time it is sliced it creates a new restraint on funding and the Cities have struggled to fund Congestion Management Projects (CMP) due to the \$1 million in funds is not enough or not able to do a sidewalk project because the \$600,000 a year is not quite enough. Mr. Clarke Davis stated he likes the idea of making sure we are prioritizing projects, doing performance management, reviewing the different projects to ensure we are addressing all the different things, but without having a perfect answer for how it should look, he is hesitant to say we should have 6 buckets of money when it probably could be 3. One broad bucket, maybe a TS&MO/ATMS type of bucket and the TA money, which must be separate. Mr. Clarke Davis stated that reliance on attracting state arterial funds using local impact fee matches may be a little ambitious at the start but may work over time just like the State has projects in their pipeline, the first 5 years that they will need to complete using their funds and the local governments will as well, so while years 6 through 10 may not look committed in our Capital Improvement Program any of the jurisdictions that have a good amount of impact fee money coming in will have projects that they are starting in the first 5 and finishing in the second 5. He stated there is a chance that we may have overstated our capacity to do that, at least in the first part of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Regarding specific projects he noticed Rye Road and CR 675 were highlighted toward the end of the program but we see more immediate needs on Upper Manatee River Road (UMRR) and Fort Hamer Road as that north/south corridor through the two counties that feeds more into the Lakewood Ranch Boulevard corridor than it does the overall Lorraine Road corridor which I think it was trying to do there. He stated they do see Rye Road and CR 675 being emerging issues over time, there is more development that has been done, and also in the Fort Hamer corridor. We have University Parkway connecting SR 70 in our plans and have not thought very much about programming it.

Mr. Clarke Davis stated regarding the Port Connector and interchange in north county, he likes the idea that we are planning for it. There are some different forces with private developers meeting with Manatee County and Manatee County meeting with Hillsborough County. Consensus is there will be an interchange somewhere along the north county line, he's just not sure if it will be in Manatee County or Hillsborough County and where it is will make all the difference in which roads connects to it from Manatee County.

Ms. Leigh Holt stated regarding the percentages (49% versus 51%) are just starting in the second 5 years and if we add the first 5 years to that with the amount of money that is going to be invested on 15th Street East that Manatee is going to come out ahead so that is how we will present that. The year that the projects are

funded needs work for all jurisdictions. Right now, they are funded completely based on how they scored and that was just a function of the time Staff had to get ready for this presentation. Ms. Holt stated Staff wants input from the jurisdictions on which 5-year block makes sense for them to match their plan; to provide in the order of importance and staff will do their best to match them up.

Mr. Clarke Davis referenced the table that was submitted that shows the 5 year funding block for construction that's the end year of that 5 year block asked if 2030 would be the block from 2026 to 2030 or is that the first year of the block. Ms. Jennifer Musselman stated it is the last year of the block.

North Port-Mr. Ben Newman commended MPO Staff on the list. He noted of important project that is not on the list is Hillsborough Boulevard between US 41 and where it connects to Raintree Boulevard; that connection to Hillsborough Boulevard and Veterans Boulevard in Charlotte County we believe there is a lot of traffic that is going to be diverted to that segment of Hillsborough Boulevard to get to US 41. He stated since North Port shares that road with Charlotte County they will be working on a project to widen Hillsborough Boulevard between Raintree Boulevard and US 41.

Another important project that is beginning to start is the extension of Toledo Blade Boulevard from Tropic Aire Boulevard through the northern portion of Sarasota County at SR 72 as an emergency evacuation route. The City will be looking to move those projects into the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for Cost Feasible Funding.

Mr. Ben Newman requested clarification if the "yoe" on the Cost Feasible Plan list for the dollars is for year of entry. Vice Chair Arnold stated "yoe" stands for year of expenditure; to inflate the dollars.

Palmetto- No comments received.

Port Manatee- No comments received.

Sarasota- Ms. Colleen McGue also commended staff and consulting team on the great work. Regarding the Cost Feasible Plan Worksheet that was sent out asked what the project codes meant. Ms. Jennifer Musselman responded they are for FDOT internal use.

Ms. Colleen McGue asked how can we tell how a project scored on the list, is it by the order they are presented within the jurisdictions? Mr. Franco Saraceno stated they prepared the Cost Feasible Plan in order by rank except for the pipeline projects; for this table they were sorted by the construction years.

Ms. Colleen McGue asked if there is going to be list of how the projects were ranked, at some point or will they be presented in year of expenditure? Ms. Leigh Holt answered they must be presented in year of expenditure, which is why staff needs input from the jurisdictions on what year you want them. She stated the reality is that all the projects are in the Cost Feasible Plan, so if they are in the score does not really matter; the score is only used to get them in the Plan.

Regarding the long-term future Ms. Colleen McGue asked that when the MPO is amending its plan next year and has more insight regarding future revenues, how will the jurisdictions know if their projects are going to stay in the plan. Ms. Leigh Holt stated the MPO has a lot of money in boxed funds including that big box for Other Arterials (just like FDOT's money) so Staff would start using the funds within the boxes first. She stated that even if we have a new revenue forecast (which we probably will) that means we would have to reduce the plan, then we would keep all the projects in the plan and reduce the boxes.

Ms. Colleen McGue stated she would like more information regarding the TS&MO projects and that the City of Sarasota will get back with Staff regarding which year they would like their projects prioritized in. Ms. Leigh Holt stated she would need that information in the next week or so.

Ms. Leigh Holt stated the TS&MO projects, the Top 10 state and the Top 10 local in each county, Staff has FDOT's list of actual recommendations for those corridors and actual dollars projected for each of those locations. The MPO fully funded those local roads at the amount that the FDOT has forecasted for those locations. The FDOT TS&MO Master Plan is eminent, not sure when it is coming out, but they did share the list with MPO Staff and that is where those funds came from.

Ms. Leigh Holt clarified that we cannot put dollars for transit projects into the LRTP Cost Feasible list unless we have full commitment for operations and maintenance from the counties. The MPO does have the studies and the Transportation Alternatives set aside so if the TAC and the MPO Board supports that additional set aside for Transportation Alternatives, once the study on US 41 is completed, then MCAT and SCAT can come in and ask for the projects and show the operations and maintenance.

Ms. Colleen McGue noted that when Ms. Leigh Holt was presenting, she mentioned Ringling and the City of Sarasota has several streets called Ringling. She believes what Ms. Holt was referencing was Ringling Causeway. Ms. Leigh Holt responded yes, and she would clarify in the future.

SRQ Airport- no comments received.

Sarasota County- Ms. Paula Wiggins asked if the Surtax for Sarasota County is passed would it be possible to have a Cost Feasible Plan updated?

Also, stated she thought Sarasota sent in something regarding Tuttle Avenue widening to 4 lanes from 61st to Martin Luther King to be evaluated for cost feasible. Also thought the MMEC would be eligible for some state funds

Ms. Paula Wiggins noted Amazon is going to be building a distribution center in the Sarasota Business Center.

Noted the list shows University Parkway from US 301 to I-75 widen to 8 lanes goes beyond what Sarasota County has designated for that facility.

Ms. Leigh Holt stated the only way to show capacity on University Parkway is to use those lanes, but we are not proposing additional lanes. What is being proposed is that the right-of-way (ROW) be preserved from US 41 out to SR 70 for some type of future capacity which would be managed lanes or av/cv type lanes not new roadway lanes for cars. Long term we need to convert to add capacity.

Regarding Tuttle Ms. Leigh Holt stated it is in the Cost Feasible Plan, but it will be evaluated from University to Fruitville for what it needs. Ms. Paula Wiggins noted the County has a large development in the pipeline. Ms. Leigh Holt stated it needs multimodal capacity.

Ms. Paula Wiggins stated a few projects are labeled as extensions and they are not and prefers they not be labeled that way: Knights Trail, Lorraine Road and Proctor Road is not an extension, and the name of the road is Dove Avenue. Sarasota County currently has it listed as Proctor Road extension from the Lorraine extension to SR 72.

Ms. Leigh Holt requested for Ms. Wiggins send via email her list and comments. Ms. Wiggins agreed.

Venice- Ms. Kathleen Weeden stated Albee Farm Road is a County facility, not a Venice facility. Colonia is an intersection south of Bayshore is north of the city limits as well. She noted that basically every project listed for Venice is in Sarasota County or is a Sarasota County facility.

Ms. Kathleen Weeden stated Venice had applied for Laurel Road from Knights Trail to Jacaranda and does not see it in the LRTP. Ms. Leigh Holt stated it may have been missed.

Another County section that had been discussion as a 2nd priority was the Pinebrook Road from Center to Edmonson, Ms. Kathleen Weeden noted she did not apply for this project. Pinebrook is not on Sarasota County's list either. Ms. Weeden stated a letter was sent to the County regarding Pinebrook being a priority for Venice after Laurel Road; Venice Avenue and Pinebrook intersection is still Venice's #1 priority and #2 is Laurel Road from Knights Trail to Jacaranda based on the City Council's decision. Ms. Paula Wiggins stated it will be very low on the list because the Sarasota County Board priority is Lorraine Road.

Ms. Leigh Holt confirmed the East Venice Avenue Bridge is a priority of the City of Venice Council. Ms. Kathleen Weeden responded yes, it is.

MCAT- Mr. Jonathan Roberson gave kudos to MPO Staff and consultant team on including premium transit and specifically giving attention to US 41 and Manatee which are critical corridors. He stated that on the premium transit map shown in the presentation the transfer station in Palmetto is not listed for a priority transit station. This is a station on the northern end of Manatee County and a connector to a regional service that MCAT offers to St. Petersburg and is hoping it gets added. Asked if the plan can look on how to elevate some corridors into a SIS or an emerging SIS corridor, particularly US 41.

SCAT- Ms. Sarah Blanchard stated SCAT continues to look at the US 41 corridor to improve service but did notice the LRTP Cost Feasible did not have any projects for US 41 South/the City of Venice and as SC AT finds locations for its mobility hubs, would they be added.

Ms. Leigh Holt stated that University to Pearl is fully funded for multimodal and several roundabouts south of University. As we study those corridors MCAT and SCAT would be able to apply for the Transportation Alternative funds for the improvements on any of those multi modal corridors as along MCAT or SCAT can document the operations and maintenance available.

Vice-Chair Maika Arnold noted Ms. Leigh Holt will be bringing back this information to jurisdictions for one on one meetings, another presentation will be made to the TAC in September and then vote on it in October. Ms. Leigh Holt thanked everyone for their input.

Adjourn

Having no further business, the TAC meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.