Board Meeting

Wednesday, February 19, 2020
10:00 a.m.
1) Call to Order

Invocation
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call of Members
Announcements
2) Opportunity for Public Comment
3) Approval of Minutes*

Minutes of November 6, 2019
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TPO Board Action
4) CR 769 (Kings Hwy) Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study Presentation
Study Area

• From S. Kingsway Circle in Charlotte County to Peace River Street in DeSoto County
• Project length is 2.7 miles
Need for the Project

- Improve traffic safety
- Provide transportation infrastructure to support future growth in DeSoto County
- Enhance system linkage between DeSoto County and I-75
- Increase emergency evacuation capabilities in southwest DeSoto County
Planning Consistency

• Planning consistency requirements met
• FDOT Adopted Five Year Work Program
  ▪ Design - Funded in FY 2024
  ▪ Right-of-Way & Construction- Not funded
• Heartland Regional TPO 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan
  ▪ Design in 2026-2030 timeframe
• Consistent with Charlotte County Punta Gorda MPO 2040 LRTP
• Consistent with Comprehensive Plans for DeSoto and Charlotte Counties
Existing Conditions

• Two-lane rural roadway
• 12-foot travel lanes
• Swale drainage
• Right-of-way – 100 feet
Evaluation Segments

- **Segment 1**
  - S. Kingsway Circle to SW Glenadine Avenue

- **Segment 2**
  - SW Glenadine Avenue to Agnes Street

- **Segment 3**
  - Agnes Street to Peace River Street
Preferred Alternative - Segment 1

• Typical Section 1
Preferred Alternative - Segment 2

• Typical Section 2
Preferred Alternative - Segment 3

• Typical Section 3
No Build Alternative

- Kings Highway would remain a 2-lane roadway
  - Maintenance activities would be conducted
  - Milling and resurfacing
  - No capacity improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No design, right-of-way, construction, utility relocation, or maintenance costs</td>
<td>Does not meet the purpose and need for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to adjacent residential or business parcels</td>
<td>Results in reduced levels of service and increased traffic congestion for the traveling public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to the social, cultural, natural, or physical environment</td>
<td>Does not improve mobility for pedestrians or bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No inconvenience to the traveling public due to roadway widening construction</td>
<td>Does not improve emergency evacuation for residents in southwest DeSoto County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Segment 1</th>
<th>Segment 2</th>
<th>Segment 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Kingsway Circle to</td>
<td>Southwest Glendale Avenue</td>
<td>Agnes Street to Peace River Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South West Glendale Avenue to</td>
<td>to Agnes Street</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnes Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Impacts</td>
<td>No Build Alternative</td>
<td>Typical Section 1A</td>
<td>Typical Section 2B Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimized Urban Centered</td>
<td>West Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typical Section 3B Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels impacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of residential relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of business relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural, Environmental &amp; Physical Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened and endangered species impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological/historic site impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential contamination sites</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high &amp; medium risk ranking)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Impacts (acres)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain impacts (acre-ft)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Section 4(f) impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; neighborhood impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Costs (Present Day Costs)</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$2,006,000</td>
<td>$211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td>$923,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road right-of-way</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$418,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond right-of-way</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland mitigation</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway construction</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$16,129,900</td>
<td>$2,742,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable utility relocation</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI (15% of construction)</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$2,419,485</td>
<td>$411,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>$21,301,000</td>
<td>$4,531,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>Alternative C (1A, 2B &amp; 3B)</td>
<td>$27,720,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing

- Public Hearing held November 7, 2019
  - Turner Agri-Civic Center
  - Open house from 5 pm to 6 pm
  - Formal hearing presentation began at 6 pm
  - 55 attendees
Public Hearing

17 Comment Forms/Emails Received

- Support for road widening – want improvements sooner
- Consider traffic signals at both ends of Kingsway Circle and at Ben Drive
- Request to include roundabouts
- Concern about raised median impacting business/requesting median openings
- Concern about future speeding
- Concern about potential future flooding in Spring Lake subdivision
- Concern about increased noise levels due to truck traffic
- Be sure to consider proposed future developments in design of improvements
- Request for turn lanes at Spring Lake and Agnes St
Remaining Study Schedule

• Finalize project documents
• Receive Location and Design Concept Acceptance (PD&E Study approval)
• Complete PD&E Study Spring 2020
FDOT Project Manager

Steven Andrews
FDOT District One
801 North Broadway Avenue
Bartow, Florida 33830
(863) 519-2270
Steven.Andrews@dot.state.fl.us
www.cr769kingshighway.com
5) SR 82 National Highway System (NHS) Justification Report*
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NHS MODIFICATION
STATE ROAD 82
What is the National Highway System (NHS)?

- **According to Section 470.107 – Federal-aid highway systems:**
  The National Highway System shall consist of interconnected urban and rural arterials and highways (including toll facilities) which serve major population centers, international border crossings, ports, airports, public transportation facilities, other intermodal facilities, and other major travel destinations; meet national defense requirements; and serve interstate and regional travel. All routes on the Interstate System are part of the National Highway System.

- **In addition, States can propose modifications to the National Highway System (NHS) and authorizes the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) to approve such modifications provided they meet the criteria established for the NHS and enhance the characteristics of the NHS.**
Proposed NHS Addition
Proposed NHS Addition

• SR 82, currently functionally classified as a principal arterial, is proposed to be added to the NHS from SR 739 to SR 29.

• The portion of SR 82 from I-75 to SR 29 (including the 1.275 mile portion in Hendry County) is designated a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) corridor. The ends of the proposed addition (SR 739 to the west and SR 29 to the east) are both currently designated as NHS principal arterials.

• SR 82 serves as a major freight transportation route, connecting Hendry, Lee and Collier Counties. SR 82, from SR 739 to SR 29 meets NHS guidance criteria, and is recommended by FDOT for NHS designation.
**Action Requested:** Approval of the Modification to the NHS.

- This approval will assist FDOT in their recommendation to FHWA.
- This approval will also enhance the TPO’s position to secure funding for future projects.
  - Federal Aid Roads are those on the National Highway System (NHS) or functionally classified as Urban Collector / Rural Major Collector, or higher. These roadways are eligible for National Highway Performance Program funds.
Requested Action

**Motion:** HRTPO Board approval of Resolution 01-2020 accepting the proposed National Highway System (NHS) designation of SR 82 through Hendry County as recommended by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in the SR 82 NHS justification report and recommending to the FHWA the proposed addition of the portion of SR 82 passing through Hendry County to be added the NHS.
6) Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for 2019/20 through 2023/2024*
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Proposed Amendment

• Transit Projects
  • Central Florida Regional Planning Council
    • $818,050 in local and 5310 operating assistance funding for FY 2020 (Project Service Area: DeSoto, Hardee, Highlands, and Okeechobee Counties)
    • $240,000 in local and 5311 capital assistance funding for FY 2020 (Project Service Area: DeSoto, Glades, Hardee, Hendry, Highlands, and Okeechobee Counties) for mobility management
    • $286,000 in local and 5311 operating assistance funding for FY 2020 (Project Service Area: DeSoto County)

• Ridge Area ARC
  • $99,952 in local and 5311 operating assistance funding for FY 2020 (Project Service Area: Highlands County)
Opportunity for Public Comment
Requested Action

Motion: To Approve the amendment to FY 2019/20 – FY 2023/24 Transportation Improvement Program.

(Roll-Call Vote)
7) HRTPO and FDOT Certification Review*
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## Risk Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Frequency of Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>Triennially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noteworthy Practices

CTC Selection for Glades/Hendry

Transportation Improvement Program Outreach
## Recommendations and Corrective Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations/Corrective Action</th>
<th>HRTPO Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Action Requested

Motion to approve the Joint Certification Statement on the Metropolitan Planning Process and authorize the Chair to sign the Statement.
8) Performance Management Measures and Targets*
Statewide Safety Performance Measures

• FDOT has again submitted the target of Zero for all five safety performance measures to the Federal Highway Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100 Million Vehicles Miles Traveled Annually and Fatalities by Year


Fatalities:
- 2006: 94
- 2007: 68
- 2008: 77
- 2009: 67
- 2010: 62
- 2011: 51
- 2012: 49
- 2013: 59
- 2014: 58
- 2015: 70
- 2016: 67
- 2017: 80
- 2018: 87
State Highway System Fatalities vs Local Roads

- SHS
- Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Highway System Serious Injuries vs Local Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Measure</td>
<td>2011-15 Average</td>
<td>2012-16 Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>2.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>10.584</td>
<td>11.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Support the State target

2. Select a target specific to the HRTPPO Planning Area
The HRTPO submitted the target of Zero for all five safety performance measures in 2018 and 2019 based on the following considerations:

- Targets must be an actual number (not a percentage decrease)
- The TPO does not have the resources to adequately collect and manage the data necessary
- The majority of major corridors where incidents take place are SIS facilities
- If the State does not meet its target of zero, they must spend more funds on safety related projects
Requested Action

Motion to provide a recommendation to the HRTPPO Board related to safety targets
The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) describes the transportation planning projects to be performed within the study area.

- Summarizes planning tasks to be completed by the HRTPO
- Defines work products and timeline for major activities
- Proposes budget using federal and other funds for planning
- Estimated cost for each task
UPWP Tasks

Administration
- Transit Planning
  - MicroTransit Study
  - Prepare for TDP Update
- Transportation Disadvantaged Program
- System Performance
  - CMP Update
  - Regional Trails

Long Range Planning
- 2045 LRTP

Transportation Improvement Program
Regional Coordination
Public Participation
# UPWP Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 21 to March 21  - Agency Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Comment Period</strong>&lt;br&gt;March 5 – April 3, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 8 – TPO Adoption package comment period (7 days)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 15  - Board Adopts UPWP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

- Describes a vision for the region as well as defines the policies, operational strategies, and projects.
- A LRTP identifies the cost feasible transportation improvements for a 20-25-year period.
- A LRTP is updated every 5 years to adjust to changing population forecasts and land uses and updated costs and revenues.
- Considers all transportation modes such as transit and bikes
- Includes Congestion Management Process for relatively inexpensive projects such as intersections.
- It involves input of government and citizens
- It is adopted by the Transportation Planning Organization
What Is a Traffic Model?

• Typical definition:
  • A computer program that replicates the travel choices that individuals make

• Simply: A forecast of future travel patterns
  • Where are people traveling to and from?
  • What routes are they choosing to get there?
Why Are Models Important?

• They help us determine how much traffic may be on our roadways in the future.

• They help us to understand the impact that development has on our transportation system.

• They guide future transportation improvements.

• Allows us to think--what if?
Components of a Travel Demand Model

• Population (how many people do we have?)
• Households (where do they live?)
• Hotels/Motels
• Employment (jobs, shopping, restaurants, recreation, etc.)
• Schools (K-12, College, New Locations)
D1RPM - District 1 Regional Planning Model
District One - 2045 Cost Feasible LRTP Model Development Process and Schedule

**To MPO**
- **Nov-19**: Roadway Network Improvements (MPO/TPO area) 11/30/19
- **Dec-19**: 2015 Validation (11/30/19)
- **Jan-20**: 2045 Socio. Eco. Data (1/15/20)
  - 2023 E+C Network Development (1/15/20)
- **Feb-20**: E+C Network 2045 Deficiency Analysis (2/15/20)
- **Mar-20**: Alt. 1 - Networks and SE Data (3/15/20)
- **Apr-20**: Alt. 1 - 2045 Cost Feasible (4/1/20)
  - Alt. 2 - Networks and SE Data (4/15/20)
- **May-20**: Alt. 2 - 2045 Cost Feasible (5/1/20)
  - Alt. 3 - Networks and SE Data (5/15/20)
- **Jun-20**: Alt. 3 - 2045 Cost Feasible (6/1/20)
  - Alt. 4 - Networks and SE Data (6/15/20)
- **Jul-20**: Alt. 4 - 2045 Cost Feasible (7/1/20)
  - Alt. 5 - Networks and SE Data (7/15/20)
- **Aug-20**: Alt. 5 - 2045 Cost Feasible (8/1/20)
  - MPO Preferred Alternative Networks and SE Data (8/15/20)
- **Sep-20**: MPO Adopted 2045 Cost Feasible Model (9/15/20)

**From MPO**

**Process**

**District One - 2045 Cost Feasible LRTP Model Development Process and Schedule**
Network Alternatives
Hardee/Highlands, County Connector @ Schumacher Rd
Network Alternatives
DeSoto, South County Connector
Model Outputs

- Link volumes and speeds
- Estimates of regional Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT)
- Measures of congestion - Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C)
Volume to Capacity (V/C)

- .40 V/C
- .75 V/C
- .8 V/C
- .95 V/C
Volume to Capacity (V/C)

$V/C > 1.0$
## State and Federal Funds 2045 Revenue Forecast (Millions of Dollars)

### Capacity Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Periods (Fiscal Years)</th>
<th>26-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Roads Construction and ROW</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>84.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – Main Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>109.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates of 2018 through 2022 are contained in the FDOT Adopted Work Program
Other Roads estimated do not include projected funding for the TRIP program of the Federal TMA program (SU Fund Code)
Transit Estimates do not include projected funding for the Florida New Starts program
What is a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)?

- Florida’s highest priority of transportation hubs, corridors, and connectors
- Primary focus for implementing the Florida Transportation Plan
- Focus on moving people and freight
  - Between Florida and other states and nations
  - Between regions of Florida
- Re-evaluated every 3 years
- **HRTPO does not set these priorities but they must be part of the LRTP**
11) Audit Report
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The HRTPO is a Component Program of the CFRPC

- CliftonLarsonAllen, LLP, Certified Public Accountants
- Financial Reporting and Compliance with Government Auditing Standards
- Audit Completed and Final Submission Accepted November 27, 2019
- Report on Audit Controls
- No prior audit findings; No new audit findings; No questioned costs; No adjustments
12) M-CORES Update
Upcoming Events

- March 4
  - Task Force Meeting: Sebring
- March 26
  - Community Open House: Sebring
- April 28
  - Task Force Meeting: Arcadia
13) Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Activities
14) MPOAC Update

Next Meeting: April 30, 2020
MPOAC Weekend Institute 2020:
March 20-22, Orlando
April 17-19, Tampa
15) Other Business
16) Next Meeting

April 15, 2020