

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

2:00p.m. June 8, 2016
Cape Coral Public Works Building
815 Nicholas Pkwy E, Cape Coral, FL
Green Room/A200



AGENDA

Call to Order

Roll Call

New Business

1. Public Comments on New Business Items
2. Update on 2016 Sales Tax Referendums in other Florida Communities (Don Scott)
3. Overview of the Leadership Academy Meeting in Indianapolis (Johnny Limbaugh)
4. Performance Analysis of LRTP Amendments (Don Scott)
5. Round-a-bout Simulations (Don Scott)
6. TIGER Project Update (Don Scott)

Other Business

7. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
8. Announcements
9. Information and Distribution Items

Adjournment

* Action Items + May Require Action

All meetings of the Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) are open to the public. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting should contact Mr. Johnny Limbaugh at the Lee MPO 48 hours prior to the meeting by calling (239) 330-2242; if you are hearing or speech impaired call (800) 955-8770 Voice / (800) 955-8771 TDD. Or, e-mail jlimbaugh@leempo.com.

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 has been discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, or familial status may file a complaint with the Lee County MPO Title VI Coordinator Johnny Limbaugh at (293) 330-2242 or by writing him at P.O. Box 150045, Cape Coral, Florida 33915-0045.

UPDATE ON THE 2016 SALES TAX REFERENDUMS IN OTHER FLORIDA COMMUNITIES

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Staff will report on the status of the transportation related ballot measures that are currently being discussed/worked on in other communities in Florida. Staff will provide additional information on these ballot measures at the meeting and they include:

- Broward County – There are four scenarios being considered, a one percent thirty year infrastructure tax, a .75 percent twenty year transportation sales tax, approve both or reject both. The County is pursuing the .75 percent sales tax ballot measure to fund countywide road and transit improvements while the cities are pursuing a one percent sales tax over thirty years that would be used for “flood control, fire trucks, city buildings, preparing for climate change and improving local roads”.
- Duval County – Extension and repurposing of the current infrastructure sales tax to cover pension costs.
- Marion County – Sales tax referendum for public safety equipment and transportation capital and road rehabilitation projects.
- Hillsborough County – The County Commission voted 4-3 to reject putting a thirty year .5% sales tax on the ballot for transportation infrastructure this year.
- Palm Beach – Working on a ten year 1% sales tax increase to be used on infrastructure split between the School Board, County and the Cities.

**OVERVIEW OF THE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY
MEETING IN INDIANAPOLIS**

DISCUSSION ITEM:

Staff will provide an overview of the performance measure discussions that occurred at the Transportation for America Leadership Academy in Indianapolis last month.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE ANALYSIS OF LONG RANGE PLAN AMENDMENTS

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Provide input on the analysis of performance measurements for Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) amendments analysis.

The development of performance measurement rules are currently moving forward with final rules coming out over the next nine months. Some of the final rules have been identified and released, like the Safety Performance Management Measures, but the reporting requirements have a timeline that stretches out for years. The safety measures timeline includes an initial target achievement analysis set for December of 2019. In addition to the performance measures that have been provided, our local group is participating in the Leadership Academy with Transportation for America who is also working on developing appropriate performance measures.

At the last MPO Board meeting, there was a public comment on providing analysis as part of the LRTP amendments to take into account the impact of the amendments for meeting the future performance measures and targets. **Attached** is the LRTP criteria that was applied to the projects for ranking, along with a sheet on the initial statewide performance measures for a discussion on what measures we might want to use for now to analyze and include in the LRTP amendment process. Staff will also present at the meeting the analysis that was done as part of the upcoming Big Carlos Bridge LRTP amendment.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In response to MAP-21 guidance, each proposed project's performance was measured for their ability to meet criteria developed through the MPO committees, as shown in Table 3-2. The criteria asks the following questions of each project:

- Is the project expected to provide more capacity on roads that cannot currently handle the amount of cars traveling on them?
- Does it provide bicycle, pedestrian, or public transportation improvements?
- Is the project expected to improve future capacity?
- Is it in an area with safety concerns?
- Does it address system preservation or maintenance of assets in place?

- Does it provide or enhance intermodal connectivity?
- Is the project on or support emergency evacuation routes?
- Does it positively or negatively impact the environment?
- Is there a local financial commitment for the project?
- Does it positively or negatively impact the environment?
- Does it positively or negatively impact underserved populations?
- Is the project expected to improve access to major activity centers?
- Does the project showcase or encourage innovation?
- Is the project on a designated truck route?

Table 3-2: 2040 Transportation Plan Project Prioritization Evaluation Criteria

Project Prioritization Evaluation Criteria	Weight	MAP-21 Planning Factors							
		Economic Vitality	Safety	Security	Accessibility/Mobility	Quality of Life/Environment	Connectivity between Modes	Efficient System Management	Preservation of the System
Existing volume to capacity ratio	15%	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Provides bicycle, pedestrian, or public transportation improvement	15%	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Future volume to capacity ratio	10%	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Safety	10%		✓						
System preservation/maintenance of assets in place	10%	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓
Intermodal connectivity	8%	✓			✓		✓		
Emergency Evacuation Route	6%		✓	✓				✓	
Environmental impacts	5%	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Project commitment	5%	✓						✓	
Social-cultural effects/environmental justice	5%		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Roadway significance and access to major activity centers	4%	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Innovation	4%					✓			
Truck Route	3%	✓			✓		✓		
TOTAL	100%								

Existing volume to capacity ratio

Score based on the number of vehicles (volume) that use the road today, compared to the number of cars the road can efficiently move or process (capacity).

Criterion Description	Score
Volume to capacity ratio < 0.90	1
Volume to capacity ratio 0.90 to 1.00	3
Volume to capacity ratio 1.00 to 1.20	6
Volume to capacity ratio > 1.20	10

Provides bicycle, pedestrian, or public transportation improvement

Score based on whether the project provides improvements for bicycle, pedestrian, or transit use.

Criterion Description	Score
No bicycle or pedestrian improvement	0
Either bicycle or pedestrian improvement	5
Both bicycle and pedestrian improvement	7
Transit and pedestrian improvements	10

Future volume to capacity ratio

Score based on the volume projected to use the road in 2040, compared to the capacity in the configuration it will be in 2040 (includes any projects to increase capacity).

Criterion Description	Score
Volume to capacity ratio < 1.00	1
Volume to capacity ratio 1.00 to 1.25	3
Volume to capacity ratio 1.26 to 1.50	6
Volume to capacity ratio > 1.20	10

Safety

Score based on a project's location, specifically regarding whether or not the project is on a roadway with a high emphasis area crash rate.

Criterion Description	Score
Improvement on roadway w/out high emphasis area crash rate	0
Improvement on roadway with high emphasis area crash rate for one emphasis area	5
Improvement on roadway with high emphasis area crash rate for two or more emphasis areas	10

System preservation/maintenance of assets in place

Scores given to projects on roads needing to be resurfaced.

Criterion Description	Score
Project is not a bridge or on a road identified as needing to be resurfaced in next 25 years	0
Project is a bridge or on a roadway identified as needing to be resurfaced in next 15 years	5
Project is a bridge or on a roadway identified as needing to be resurfaced in next 10 years	7
Project is a bridge or on a roadway identified as needing to be resurfaced in next 5 years	10

Intermodal connectivity

Score based on a project's ability to connect between modes (road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit), and higher scores given if more modes are connected.

Criterion Description	Score
Not designated as intermodal access route or transit corridor	0
Designated as an intermodal access route	5
Designated as a transit corridor	7
Designated as both an intermodal access route and transit corridor	10

Emergency evacuation route

Score based on whether a project is on an evacuation route, and what classification the roadway is. Roads that process a higher number of people and are designated as evacuation routes receive higher points.

Criterion Description	Score
Not an evacuation route	0
Collector road designated as an evacuation route	4
Arterial road designated as an evacuation route	7
Interstate designated as an evacuation route	10

Project commitment

Score given to projects that have funding commitment in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and/or TIP. The further along in the planning/design process, the higher the points.

Criterion Description	Score
Not programmed in CIP or TIP	0
PD&E, design and engineering, and/or route study programmed in CIP or TIP	5
Right-of-way acquisition and/or construction programmed in CIP or TIP	10

Social/cultural effects/environmental justice

Score based on potential impact to an environmental justice area. Adding more lanes in an environmental justice area reduces the score for the road.

Criterion Description	Score
Exceeds 4 lanes in environmental justice area	-10
Exceeds 2 lanes in environmental justice area	-5
Does not impact environmental justice area	1

Environmental impacts

Score based on a project impacting environmentally sensitive area or is an alternative to a potentially harmful project.

Criterion Description	Score
Improvement enters an environmentally sensitive area	-5
Improvement abuts an environmentally sensitive area	0
Improvement is an alternative to entering an environmentally sensitive area	5

Roadway significance and access to major activity centers

Score based on a project's connection to an activity center. Providing a connection to an activity center within the county receives a high score, while connecting to activity centers outside of the county earns the highest score.

Criterion Description	Score
No direct connectivity between major centers of development in the county	0
Direct connectivity between major centers of development in the county	7
Direct connectivity between major centers of development in and outside the county	10

Innovation

Score based on a proposed project's potential to increase travelers' general experience, use innovative financing methods, create new and lasting partnerships, and/or introduce project types that are new to the area. Innovation can be part of project development or execution.

Criterion Description	Score
No perceived innovation	0
Some perceived innovation	5
Much perceived innovation	10

Truck Route

Score based on whether a project is on a facility with higher than average county truck traffic.

Criterion Description	Score
Lower than county average truck traffic	0
Higher than county average truck traffic	10

Multimodal Mobility Performance Measures Matrix

MODE		QUANTITY	QUALITY	ACCESSIBILITY	UTILIZATION
People	Auto/ Truck	Vehicle Miles Traveled Person Miles Traveled	% Travel Meeting LOS Criteria % Miles Meeting LOS Criteria Travel Time Reliability Travel Time Variability Vehicle Hours of Delay Person Hours of Delay Average Travel Speed	<i>Time Spent Commuting</i>	% Miles Severely Congested % Travel Severely Congested Hours Severely Congested Vehicles Per Lane Mile
	Transit	Passenger Miles Traveled Passenger Trips	Average Headway		
	Pedestrian		Level of Service (LOS)	% Sidewalk Coverage	
	Bicycle		Level of Service (LOS)	% Bike Lane/Shoulder Coverage	
	Aviation	Passengers	Departure Reliability	Highway Adequacy (LOS)	Demand to Capacity Ratios
	Rail	Passengers	Departure Reliability	<i>Highway Adequacy (LOS)</i>	
	Seaports	Passengers		Highway Adequacy (LOS)	
Freight	Truck	Combination Truck Miles Traveled Truck Miles Traveled Combination Truck Tonnage Combination Truck Ton Miles Traveled <i>Value of Freight</i>	Travel Time Reliability Travel Time Variability Combination Truck Hours of Delay Combination Truck Average Travel Speed		% Miles Severely Congested Vehicles Per Lane Mile Combination Truck Backhaul Tonnage
	Aviation	Tonnage <i>Value of Freight</i>		Highway Adequacy (LOS)	
	Rail	Tonnage <i>Value of Freight</i>		Highway Adequacy (LOS) Active Rail Access	
	Seaports	Tonnage Twenty-foot Equivalent Units <i>Value of Freight</i>		Highway Adequacy (LOS) Active Rail Access	

Reporting Periods: = Peak Hour = Peak Period = Daily = Yearly

Bold = FDOT MAP-21 Recommended Measure

Italicized Text = Measures added 2015

PRELIMINARY VISSIM SIMULATION OF ROUNDABOUTS

DISCUSSION ITEM:

As part of the Lee MPO Roundabout Feasibility Study, the MPO's consultant has completed preliminary computer simulations in VISSIM for the two (2) roundabout concepts for the intersections of Colonial and McGregor Boulevard and Periwinkle Way and Causeway Boulevard. The simulations will be shown at the June 8th Executive Committee meeting for review and comment.

TIGER PROJECT UPDATE

DISCUSSION ITEM:

The MPO staff will give an update on the TIGER project that will include:

- Current Status and Schedule of Construction
- Planning, Design and Implementation of Wayfinding Signage from a portion of the remaining funding