



MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPOTAC)

Chris Mora – Vice-Chairman
Jim Davis
Jason Brown
Sgt. James Stewart
Karen Wood
Kathleen Geyer
William Schauman
Maria Aguilar
Tim McGarry

Monte Falls
Eric Menger
Rebecca Grohall
Terry Hill
Jason Milewski
Jason Nunemaker
Nancy Ziegler
Gus Schmidt
Thomas Mulligan

Bob Keating, Community Development Director - Chairman

AGENDA

The MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPOTAC) will meet at 10:00 a.m. on FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2006 in the First Floor Conference Room "A", County Administration Building, 1840 25th Street, Vero Beach.

1. Call to Order – Bob Keating
2. Approval of minutes –
- January 27, 2006
Action Required
3. Review of Proposed Aviation Boulevard Extension Corridor Study Scope of Services
Action Required
4. Status Report of Other MPO Advisory Committees
No Action Required
5. Other Business
6. Comments from the Public
7. Adjournment

8. Next Meeting
- MPOTAC: March 24, 2006; 10:00am; Conference Room "A"

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA, PLEASE CONTACT MPO STAFF AT (772) 226-1254.

ANYONE WHO MAY WISH TO APPEAL ANY DECISION WHICH MAY BE MADE AT THIS MEETING WILL NEED TO ENSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE, WHICH INCLUDES THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE ON WHICH THE APPEAL IS BASED.

ANYONE WHO NEEDS A SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION FOR THIS MEETING MUST CONTACT THE COUNTY'S AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COORDINATOR AT 772-226-1223 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

20

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee (MPO TAC) was held at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, January 27, 2006, First Floor Conference Room "A", County Administration Building, 1840 25th Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were Chairman Robert Keating, Community Development Director; James Davis, Public Works Director; Chris Mora, Traffic Engineer; Jason Brown, Office of Management and Budget Director (10:25 a.m.); Sgt. James Stewart, Sheriff's Department; Karen Wood, Community Transportation Coordinator, Council on Aging; Kathleen Geyer, Transportation Director, School Board, IRC; Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid; William Schauman, Public Safety Director, Town of Indian River Shores; Monte Falls, Public Works and Engineering Director; Tim McGarry, Planning Director, and Eric Menger, Airport Director, City of Vero Beach; Jason Nunemaker, City Manager, City of Fellsmere; Brian Grzesiak, Engineering Department, City of Sebastian, and Larry Hymowitz, Office of Modal Development, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District 4 Office.

Also present were IRC staff: Phil Matson, MPO Staff Director; Abigail Knight, MPO Staff Assistant III, and Victoria Phillips, Staff Assistant IV.

Absent were Terry Hill, Public Works Director; Rebecca Grohall, Growth Management Director, Jason Milewski, Airport Director, City of Sebastian, and Thomas Mulligan, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (excused).

Call to Order

Chairman Keating called the meeting to order, at which time it was determined a quorum was present.

Annual Election of Officers

ON MOTION by Mr. Davis, SECONDED by Mr. Menger, the members voted unanimously (14-0) to reelect Bob Keating Chairman of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee for 2006.

ON MOTION by Sgt. Stewart, SECONDED by Ms. Aguilar, the members voted unanimously (14-0) to reelect Chris Mora Vice Chairman of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee for 2006.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Keating asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the joint meeting of the MPO Citizens Advisory Committee and the MPOTAC of December 6, 2005. There were none.

ON MOTION by Mr. Falls, SECONDED by Mr. Menger, the members voted unanimously (14-0) to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2005 joint meeting of the MPO Citizens Advisory Committee and the MPO Technical Advisory Committee as presented.

Review of Scope of Services for Central Indian River County/Vero Beach Greenways Plan

Mr. Matson came forward with a PowerPoint presentation of the Central County Greenways Plan, a copy of which is on file in the County Commission Office. He explained a greenway was a corridor of linear open space protected or regulated for public interest purposes, and value was added by putting in a trail or paved bicycle path.

Mr. Hymowitz wondered if the consultant was going to define the difference between greenbelts versus greenways as part of the Scope and come up with typical sections. He felt it was important so that everyone could see the type of facilities which could fit in according to the location. Mr. Matson said he would like to have a certain level of specificity from the consultant, such as a map showing the amount of right-of-way, to determine whether a bicycle path could be put in.

Mr. Nunemaker remarked it was a very good project, and wondered what was going to be done to coordinate existing improvements into the system, and if there was going to be a greenbelt along State Road (S.R.) 60. Mr. Matson explained the Bicycle Pedestrian (Bikeped) Plan limited itself to existing roadways, but if a developer wanted to build, the Bikeped Plan would indicate a sidewalk or bicycle lane needed to be added.

Mr. Keating interjected one of the opportunities identified was the 82nd Avenue project, from County Road 510 down to S.R. 60, because the existing

travel way was going to be abandoned and an attractive greenway could go along the canal.

Mr. Hymowitz inquired if the project was going to be issued under one of the General Planning Consultants (GPCs). Mr. Matson responded he thought it would be going out to bid because he was not sure any of the GPCs had that type of expertise. He remarked after doing some research, it seemed the cost would be around \$80,000.

Mr. Hymowitz asked when the project was going to be advertised. Mr. Matson informed him it would be within a couple of days after the February 8th MPO meeting.

Mr. Nunemaker wondered if the County's recreation impact fees could be used to pay for the consultant. Mr. Keating remarked this would have to be looked into because it was an excellent suggestion. Mr. Matson stated funding sources were a big part of it, and he would specifically add recreational impact fees to the Scope.

Mr. Davis inquired if Florida Power & Light's easement corridors would be checked into. Mr. Matson responded affirmatively, and remarked he had a list of interested parties which he believed included public utilities; however, he would double check to make sure.

Mr. Davis asked about the Mosquito Control District impoundment dikes. Mr. Keating stated staff had been looking into it with respect to many of the conservation areas the County owned to the south of the City; however, most were located outside of the geographic area of this particular project.

ON MOTION by Mr. Falls, SECONDED by Mr. Nunemaker, the members voted unanimously (14-0) to recommend the MPO approve the Scope of Services for Central Indian River County/Vero Beach Greenways Plan as presented.

Status Report of Other MPO Advisory Committees

Included in the backup on file in the County Commission Office. He indicated the next MPO Citizens Advisory Committee meeting was going to be a joint meeting with the MPO Bicycle Advisory Committee (MPOBAC).

Other Business

Mr. Nunemaker wondered if any discussions had taken place about passenger rail service. Mr. Matson related five years ago, Amtrak had proposed a very ambitious growth plan, but part of the funding had been taken away by the federal government. He explained Amtrak had never operated at a profit and always required a very large public subsidy.

Mr. Matson commented since Amtrak now was going to consolidate its resources into the more profitable routes, the prospects of Amtrak's growth were very dim.

Mr. Matson explained the Florida East Coast Railroad (FEC) had been looking into passenger rail service. He noted for years they did not want to consider it because it had presented an obstacle to their logistics of running their freight, there were liability issues, and it was not profitable. Mr. Matson commented the southeast Florida FEC authority had been established by the legislature to run Tri-Rail and study FEC utilization in South Florida.

Mr. Matson indicated Tri-Rail was in negotiation stages with Martin County, but it would not occur before 2010 at the very earliest, and eventually, there was the possibility of Tri-Rail becoming an FEC-type regional rail service.

Mr. Matson continued a couple of the MPOCAC members had raised the prospect of FEC playing a small role in running a passenger line to downtown Sebastian, Vero Beach and Ft. Pierce. He felt it was a very innovative idea, and even if it had a lot of logistical obstacles, it could be studied at some point in time.

A discussion followed.

Mr. Matson believed FEC wanted a few sections of double tracking somewhere between Vero Beach and Sebastian in order to keep operating, and he understood FDOT had been setting aside money for station improvements on the FEC. Mr. Hymowitz remarked to the best of his knowledge the funds were still there, but if something was going to be done, FDOT would have acknowledged that to the MPO. Mr. Matson indicated it was about \$500,000 which FDOT had set aside for Indian River County, Stuart, Ft. Pierce and a couple of other communities to make station improvements, and keeping it aside for Tri-Rail extension might not be a bad idea.

Mr. Hymowitz recommended if the counties and cities were serious about developing plans for stations around those areas, it should be identified as a potential strategy to capture the rails, because it would be unlikely funds would be obtained without some type of strategy.

Comments from the Public

None

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (MPOTAC)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP *AMK*
Community Development Director

FROM: Phillip J. Matson *Matson*
MPO Staff Director

DATE: February 9, 2006

**SUBJECT: REVIEW OF PROPOSED AVIATION BOULEVARD EXTENSION
CORRIDOR STUDY SCOPE OF SERVICES**

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County MPO Technical Advisory Committee (MPOTAC) at the meeting of February 24, 2006.

SUMMARY

Task 4.7 of the FY 2005/06 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) indicates that, throughout the year, the Indian River County MPO will engage in corridor studies as warranted by the Long Range Plan or other sources. One of the projects listed in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan was the extension of Aviation Boulevard between US 1 and Indian River Boulevard. In order to determine whether the proposed extension is feasible and to identify a preferred alignment for the new road, the MPO has developed the attached draft scope of services for a corridor study for the Aviation Boulevard extension. If the MPO approves the scope of services, a work order will be issued to the MPO's Highway General Planning Consultant, Kimley-Horn and Associates. Staff recommends that the TAC review the draft scope of services for the study, make necessary changes, and recommend that the MPO approve the scope of services.

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

Task 4.7 of the 2005/2006 UPWP indicates that, throughout the year, the MPO will engage in corridor studies as warranted by the Long Range Plan or other sources. Examples of studies that the MPO has undertaken in the past include congestion management analyses of Miracle Mile and of the five points intersection (Royal Palm Point at Indian River Boulevard).

Included in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan was an extension of 26th Street/Aviation Boulevard. That extension would lengthen Indian River Boulevard by approximately one mile to the east of US 1, providing a continuous highway from 66th Avenue to Indian River Boulevard. According to the LRTP, the new project will provide relief for a number of congested facilities and may also forestall the need to widen parts of Indian River Boulevard.

Since the proposed extension is a completely new alignment, and not the paving or widening of an existing alignment, it is necessary to first perform a study of the underlying corridor. The purpose of the study is twofold: first, to determine whether or not the proposed new roadway is feasible, given environmental, right-of-way, and construction constraints; and second, if it is determined to be feasible, then to recommend a preferred alignment for the new roadway.

ANALYSIS

In order to determine the feasibility of the new roadway and identify the preferred roadway alignment, the MPO has developed the attached draft scope of services. The attached draft scope of services was modeled on similar studies undertaken for various projects in other parts of the state. As described in the scope, a number of detailed tasks will be performed as part of the study, including an analysis of future traffic demand and an analysis of environmental conditions. The study will also incorporate a proactive public outreach process that will involve many of the major stakeholders in the area, including Indian River Memorial Hospital. The budgeted cost for this project is \$116,500. If it is determined that a feasible alignment cannot be developed, then the project will be terminated before any further analysis is conducted, substantially reducing the cost to the MPO. If, however, an alignment proves feasible, the corridor study will provide a plan for an additional east-west alternative in an increasingly congested area of the County.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the TAC review the draft scope of services for the study, make any necessary changes, and recommend that the MPO approve the scope of services.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Aviation Boulevard Corridor Study Scope of Services

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, MPO
SCOPE OF SERVICES**

**CORRIDOR STUDY FOR THE EXTENSION OF
AVIATION BOULEVARD FROM U.S. 1 TO INDIAN RIVER BOULEVARD**

INTRODUCTION

The extension of Aviation Boulevard to the east from U.S. 1 to Indian River Boulevard is a capacity improvement that is included in the Indian River County MPO 2030 Long Range Transportation Cost Feasible Plan. This facility could serve as an alternative east-west roadway alignment in Central Indian River County, relieving congested roadways such as U.S. 1, Indian River Boulevard, and State Road (S.R.) 60, while also providing an alternative route allowing traffic to bypass Downtown Vero Beach. Aviation Boulevard is already in the process of being widened to a four-lane roadway between U.S. 1 and 66th Avenue. Therefore, the Aviation Boulevard extension could potentially provide a continuous multilane corridor between the Merrill Barber Bridge and the Indian River Mall.

I. PURPOSE AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

A. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to conduct a corridor analysis to assess the feasibility of extending Aviation Boulevard to the east from U.S. 1 to Indian River Boulevard. The corridor study will identify critical issues associated with the project. Key components of the study will include traffic analysis, environmental analysis, conceptual alternatives development, cost estimation, right-of-way needs assessment, and public outreach.

B. Study Area Definition

The study area for this project is Aviation Boulevard/26th Street and its extension east of U.S. 1 to Indian River Boulevard within the City of Vero Beach and Indian River County. The stretch of land that will be studied for the extension lies between 37th Street on the north, Royal Palm Place on the south, Indian River Lagoon on the east and Florida East Coast (FEC) Rail Corridor on the west. Impacts on neighboring areas will also be addressed in the study.

II. SERVICES TO BE PERFORMED

The CONSULTANT shall perform all of the following tasks as identified in this section. However, if a conclusion is reached in conjunction with MPO staff after

the completion of Tasks 1 and 2 that the project is not needed or that a feasible alignment does not exist, then Tasks 3 and 4 will not be initiated. In addition, only one (1) round of presentations as outlined in Task 5 will be made to the MPO's Citizen Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and Board, and the report and executive summary outlined in Task 6 will only summarize the services performed in Tasks 1 and 2.

TASK 1 – TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATION OF PROJECT NEED

A. Collect Relevant Data for the Project

Existing readily available traffic data will be collected from Indian River County and the Florida Department of Transportation including roadway volume counts and intersection-turning movement counts. New traffic counts will be collected as necessary to obtain required data for the traffic analysis. Roadway characteristics will be inventoried including corridor cross-sections, geometry at significant intersections, and signal timing data at signalized intersections.

B. Identify Operating Issues

Existing operating conditions will be determined using methodologies consistent with the *Highway Capacity Manual 2000*. In addition, field reviews will be conducted in the peak periods to identify operational issues. Traffic forecasts will be developed for the short-term (2010) and long-term (2030) planning horizons for the study roadways and intersections, and future operating conditions will be determined.

C. Identify Project Needs

Based on the analysis of existing and future traffic data, a description of the study corridor will be prepared and a project need statement will be developed that outlines the purpose for corridor improvements. The project need statement will address how the project addresses area-wide needs including system linkage and transportation demand. The project needs statement will also document any existing or future level of service or capacity deficiencies.

TASK 2 – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Environmental data will be collected and evaluated in sufficient detail to conduct a "fatal-flaw" analysis of conceptual alternatives. The information and data identified below will be collected primarily from existing data sources supplemented by a field visit. The following categories of data will be taken into consideration.

- Wetlands, floodplains, and drainage facilities

Existing information on flood plain and floodway boundaries, wetland boundaries, major drainage ways, available hydrology and hydraulic analysis data within the study area will be collected. Existing information will be collected on surface water in the study area and the potential impact to water resources. Data sources include FEMA maps and local drainage studies/plans.

- Endangered and threatened species and native upland habitat

Known occurrences of listed species including vegetative species and wildlife within the study area will be identified. Existing GIS databases from US Fish and Wildlife Service and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission will be reviewed and information will be requested from Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI).

- Cultural/historic resources

Known properties of cultural and historical significance will be identified including medical facilities, educational facilities, religious institutions, cemeteries, publicly-owned/utilized lands (parks, recreation areas, conservation areas, and archaeological areas and historical sites. A Florida Master Site File review will be requested from the State Historic Preservation Officer.

- Hazardous/regulated materials sites

A database search will be prepared encompassing the minimum search distances as listed in ASTM E1527-00. This report will be reviewed for known and suspect contaminated sites. State and local environmental agency files will also be reviewed for supplemental information and past/pending enforcement actions. Listed below are examples of some of the subject databases: National Priorities List (NPL); Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Inventory System (CERCLIS) Report; Storage Tank Inventory and Petroleum Contamination Cases; Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS); Solid Waste Sites/Landfills/Dumps; and Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS).

- Noise sensitive receptors

Sensitive noise receptors and sites/areas of potential impact will be identified.

TASK 3 – CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES

A. Develop Alternative Plans and Designs

Conceptual alternatives will be developed to a level of detail required to support a screening-level analysis of a maximum of three alternatives, including a no-build alternative. Alternative alignments will be considered based on an analysis of engineering and environmental issues. A typical section will be developed that meets the transportation needs required for the facility. Horizontal and vertical design alignments will be developed according to established design criteria. Conceptual plans will be prepared, including the centerline alignment, proposed right-of-way lines, and intersection layouts.

B. Analyze and Evaluate Alternatives

The viable alternatives will be analyzed in order to select a preferred alternative. The analysis of alternatives will consider the following elements: engineering, traffic circulation, socioeconomic, and environmental. An evaluation matrix will be prepared to compare the results of the analyses of the alternatives.

TASK 4 – COSTS AND RIGHT-OF-WAY REQUIREMENTS

An opinion of costs and right-of-way requirements will be developed for the preferred alternative. The opinion of cost will include design cost, construction cost, enhancement cost, right-of-way cost, and CEI cost. The right-of-way costs will be developed based on information obtained from Indian River County's property appraiser.

TASK 5 – PUBLIC OUTREACH

The intent of the public outreach activities will be to inform and involve interested parties and stakeholders in the development of the project.

A. Conduct Stakeholders Meetings

Up to a maximum of five (5) informational meetings will be held with local stakeholders including elected officials, the hospital district, group meetings (i.e. homeowner's associations), or property/business owners. The purpose of these meetings will be to make these stakeholders aware of the project and obtain input on the conceptual alternatives.

B. Present at TAC, CAC and Board Meetings

Two (2) rounds of formal presentations will be made to the MPO's Citizen Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and Board to present the conceptual alternatives and the preliminary evaluation of these alternatives, and, subsequently, to present the recommended alternative.

C. Hold General Public Meetings

One (1) advertised public meeting will be held to obtain input from the general public before a recommendation of the preferred alternative is finalized. The MPO will be responsible for securing a location and preparing the advertisement for this public meeting.

TASK 6 – REPORT

A draft report will be prepared summarizing the services performed in Tasks 1 through 5. Five (5) copies of the draft report will be provided to the MPO staff for review and comment. Appropriate comments will then be incorporated into a final report, and thirty (30) copies will be provided along with an electronic (PDF) version. A concise executive summary will also be prepared, and thirty (30) copies will be provided along with an electronic (PDF) version.

III. STUDY REQUIREMENTS AND PROVISIONS OF WORK

A. Project Schedule and Billing

The schedule for completion for the project will be nine (9) months from the date of the issuance of the Notice to Proceed. It is anticipated that Tasks 1 and 2 will be completed in approximately four (4) months, and a decision will be made whether to proceed with Tasks 3 and 4. If a decision is made to continue with the project, Tasks 3 and 4 will be completed in approximately six (6) months from the issuance of the Notice to Proceed, and an additional three (3) months may be required to complete the public outreach activities outlined in Task 5.

The CONSULTANT will perform the services described in the Scope of Services for a lump sum fee of \$116,500.00 inclusive of expenses. However, if a decision is made to discontinue the project after the completion of Tasks 1 and 2 and preparation and presentation of documentation as outlined in Section II, the lump sum fee for the services will be \$52,700.00 inclusive of expenses.

B. Meetings and Presentations

The CONSULTANT shall attend a Notice to Proceed meeting with MPO representatives where relevant project information along with procedures for administering the contract shall be provided by the MPO. The CONSULTANT shall also be available, with no more than a three (3) business day notice, to attend meetings or make presentations at the request of the MPO. Such meetings may be held at any hour between 7:00 a.m. and 12:00 midnight on any day of the week. The CONSULTANT may be called upon to provide maps, press releases, advertisements, audiovisual displays and similar material for such meetings. The CONSULTANT shall meet with the MPO's Project Manager as often as is deemed necessary by the MPO. The CONSULTANT shall also provide regular briefings to the general public and other entities as identified in Section II of this document. The CONSULTANT is expected to prepare graphic displays, handouts, and any other appropriate presentation aids for all meetings, as deemed necessary by the MPO.

C. Public Involvement Plan

All public meetings and presentations held or conducted by the CONSULTANT shall adhere to the public involvement component developed for this project and be consistent with, but not limited to, the MPO's current adopted Public Involvement Plan. The CONSULTANT shall utilize the MPO's Public Involvement Plan and complementary public outreach efforts throughout the course of the project as a means to actively involve the general public and all interested persons and entities in the development of the final products.

D. Quality Control

Prior to the submittal of the first invoice, the CONSULTANT shall submit the proposed method or process of providing quality control for all work products to the MPO's Project Manager for approval. The Quality Control Plan shall identify the products to be reviewed, the personnel who will perform the reviews, and the method of documentation.

E. Correspondence

Copies of all written correspondence between the CONSULTANT and any party pertaining specifically to this study shall be provided to the MPO for its records within one (1) week of the receipt or mailing of said correspondence.

F. Progress Reporting and Invoicing

The CONSULTANT shall meet with the MPO, at a minimum, on a monthly basis and provide written progress reports describing the work performed on each task. The CONSULTANT shall submit one copy of a draft invoice package to the MPO's Project Manager for approval prior to submittal of a final version of each invoice package. The final invoice package shall consist of five copies of each invoice, progress report, and project schedule. All copies of the invoice will be originally signed. Judgment on whether work of sufficient quality and quantity has been accomplished will be made by the MPO's Project Manager using a comparison of reported percentage of work completed against actual work accomplished.

G. Submittals

The CONSULTANT shall provide copies of the required documents as listed below and in Section II. These are the anticipated printing requirements for the project. This tabulation shall be used for estimating purposes, and the Project Manager will determine the actual number of copies required prior to each submittal.

Draft Report	5
Final Report	30
Executive Summary	30

All documents, graphics, charts, and supporting material generated during the course of this project will be furnished to the MPO in electronic format at the conclusion of the project. Compatible formats are identified below.

Technical Memoranda and Correspondence - Microsoft Office 2000

Spreadsheets - Microsoft Excel

Graphics - As negotiated

Maps/GIS – ArcGIS.

(Note: Maps should be developed, to the extent possible, with symbologies that enable black & white reproduction)

Final Report - Microsoft Office 2000

Where appropriate, the MPO and the CONSULTANT may agree to utilize electronic mail for the timely, cost-effective submission of interim work products and data files. The MPO and the CONSULTANT will utilize an

Internet email account with binary attachment capability as appropriate to reduce costs and time for work product submissions and reviews.

O:\gkyle\Indian River GPC\Aviation Boulevard\Aviation Scope with Reduced Option.doc

12

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (MPOTAC)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP *AMK*
Community Development Director

FROM: Phillip J. Matsony *Phatony*
MPO Staff Director

DATE: February 13, 2006

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT OF MPO ADVISORY COMMITTEES

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration at the MPOTAC meeting of February 24, 2006.

MPO MEETING

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) met on February 8, 2006. The primary topic of discussion was the Greenways Plan Scope of Services. After considering the Scope of Services, the MPO approved the Scope of Services.

CAC & BAC MEETING

The MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (MPOCAC) met jointly with the MPO Bicycle Advisory Committee (MPOBAC) on February 7, 2006. The primary topic of discussion was the Greenways Plan Scope of Services. After discussing the Scope of Services, the MPOCAC and MPOBAC recommended approval of the Scope of Services to the MPO.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The MPO and its advisory committces will next meet as follows:

- TAC Meeting:** March 24, 2006 – 10:00 am
- CAC Meeting:** February 28, 2006 – 2:00 pm
- MPO Meeting:** March 8, 2006 – 10:00am
- BAC Meeting:** TBA