

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Indian River County (IRC) Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee (MPOTAC) was held at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, October 27, 2006, in the First Floor Conference Room "A", County Administration Building, 1840 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were members: Chairman Robert Keating, IRC Community Development Director; James Davis, IRC Public Works Director; Chris Mora, IRC Assistant Public Works Director; Jason Brown, IRC Office of Management and Budget Director; Sergeant James Stewart, IRC Sheriff's Department (arrived at 10:04 a.m.); Maria Aguilar, Town Manager, Town of Orchid; Monte Falls, Public Works and Engineering Director; Tim McGarry, Planning Director, City of Vero Beach; Jason Nunemaker, City Manager, City of Fellsmere; William Schauman, Public Safety Director, Town of Indian River Shores; Brian Grzesiak, Engineering Department, City of Sebastian (arrived at 10:10 a.m.); Todd Shear, Vero Beach Municipal Airport; Karen Wood, Council on Aging (COA); Min-Tang Li and Vicki Gatanis, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), District 4.

Absent were Eric Menger, Airport Director, City of Vero Beach; Joseph Griffin, Airport Director, Sebastian Municipal Airport; Kathleen Geyer, IRC Transportation Director, School Board; Rebecca Grohall, Growth Management Director, City of Sebastian; and Thomas Mulligan, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (all excused).

Also present were IRC staff: Joseph Baird, County Administrator, Phil Matson, Staff Director; Sharon Schalm, Staff Assistant III, MPO; and Terri Collins-Lister, Staff Assistant IV. Others present Sabin Abell, Vice Mayor, Todd Young, Senior Engineering Designer and Rob Bolton, Manager of Planning, Engineering and Support Operations, City of Vero Beach; Karen Deigl, COA; Greg Kyle, Lisa Frazier and Brian Good, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.; Jeff Easley, Reynolds, Smith and Hill; Nicholas Danu, FDOT; Joe Paladin, President, Growth Awareness Committee; Judith and Richard Martin, Herb Whittall, Kathryn B. Self, Gary L. Beatty, Interested Citizens; and Ed Bierschenk, Press Journal.

**Call to Order**

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

## **Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Keating asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of August 25, 2006. There were none.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Falls, SECONDED BY Ms. Wood, the members voted unanimously (13-0) to approve the minutes of August 25, 2006 as presented.**

## **Status Report of Other MPO Advisory Committees**

Mr. Phil Matson, IRC MPO Staff Director, stated the MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on September 5, 2006 to discuss the 2006 Priority Projects Report and after considering this item, the MPOCAC recommended approval of the report. The MPO met on September 13, 2006 to consider and recommended approval of the 2006 Priority Projects Report with some modifications. These modifications included adding State Road (S.R.) 60 from 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to Interstate (I-95) as top priority; however the discussion did not include S.R. 60 from 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-95 and was the subject of an advance construction agreement between the County and FDOT. He concluded after some deliberation, it was determined to put the project back on the priority list. He noted these discussions were still outstanding and the County would deliberate for approximately 45 days on whether or not to advance S.R. 60 or whether not to.

Mr. Matson reported there would be a joint MPOCAC and MPOTAC meeting on December 12, 2006 and the out of state consultant, Alta Planning and Design, was planning a visit to IRC and would give a presentation on Greenways.

Mr. Stewart arrived at 10:04 a.m.

## **Consideration of Corridor Study for the Extension of Aviation Boulevard (U.S. 1 – Indian River Boulevard)**

Mr. Greg Kyle, Transportation Planner, Kimley-Horn and Associates, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Corridor Study for the Extension of Aviation Boulevard to Indian River Boulevard, a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office. He reported the objective of the project was to four lane Aviation Boulevard to the west of U.S. 1, therefore improving the traffic flow on the east/west corridor. He mentioned the County had inquired if there would be an opportunity to better link that corridor with the Merrill Barber Bridge and as

MPOTAC –Approved

2

October 27, 2006

C:\Documents and Settings\sjohnson\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLK347\10-27-06.doc

part of this analysis identified four potential alignments for the new corridor, an environmental impact review and a preliminary estimate of both the mitigation and construction costs for each proposed alignment.

Mr. Kyle summarized the results from the assessment and determined there would be some impact to the ecological or cultural environment in all of the alignments and it was determined that construction to any of the connections to the Merrill Barber Bridge, east of the Indian River Boulevard would be cost prohibitive due to the potentially extensive impacts to wetlands. He detailed any type of alignment to the west of U.S. 1 was eliminated due to an archeological site located in the area.

The report touched on the potential alignments and the costs associated with any of the alternatives due to the environmentally sensitive areas and the community impacts within any of these alignments therefore would raise the mitigation required to offset the environmental impacts and the conceptual costs could range from approximately \$29,000,000 up to \$70,000,000.

Mr. Grzesiak arrived at 10:10 a.m.

Mr. Kyle discussed the No-Build Alternative for the existing roadways as an option, if no new roadway corridors were implemented. He explained the improvements would include: implementing a turbo lane on the Merrill Barber Bridge for the westbound right turn movement; widening Indian River Boulevard between Merrill Barber Bridge and 37<sup>th</sup> Street from four lanes to six lanes; implementing dual left turn lanes for the northbound approach at the intersection of Indian River Boulevard and 37<sup>th</sup> Street; and widening 37<sup>th</sup> Street between Indian River Boulevard and U.S. 1 from three lanes to four lanes. He noted the conceptual cost for the No-Build Alternative would be approximately \$15,000,000.

A discussion ensued about four laning 37<sup>th</sup> Street and the No-Build Alternative. Ms. Gatani inquired on how the costs were derived for the proposed alignments and the No-Build Alternative. Mr. Kyle explained the cost estimates were detailed and included the cost of the environmental mitigation, right-of-way costs, roadway construction costs, costs of design, and other contingency factors.

Mr. Matson summarized the Corridor Study for the Extension of Aviation Boulevard was structured as a two tiered study and any of the alignments within the corridor would have a substantial cash flow impact to the cost affordable transportation plan, and the recommendation was not to proceed on the Corridor Study for the Extension of Aviation Boulevard. He noted to proceed with Phase II

of the study and develop one of the corridors to the point that it would be ready for design would cost \$80,000, and the outlay for the study so far was \$35,000. He noted staff's recommendation would be not to proceed, to consider the consultant's presentation on October 27, 2006, and recommend the MPO not authorize the consultant to undertake Phase II of the study.

Mr. Falls questioned what the \$30,000,000 Corridor 1A would do to the work program, and recommended accepting the plan as presented and delay any action on the Phase II for additional information. A discussion followed.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Falls, SECONDED BY Mr. Davis, the Committee voted unanimously (15-0) to recommend the Metropolitan Planning Organization Committee accept the Corridor Study for the Extension of Aviation Boulevard as presented and direct the Indian River County staff to perform more analysis of the No-Build Alternative in Corridor 1A and further look at the affects it may have on the work program.**

### **Status Report on Oslo Road Interchange Justification Report (IJR)**

Mr. Matson briefly stated the top Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) priority as referred to the Interstate System by the FDOT, was the Oslo Road Interchange and the FDOT embarked on an IJR starting several months ago using the firm of Reynolds, Smith and Hills.

Mr. Matson introduced Mr. Jeff Easley from Reynolds, Smith and Hills to give the committee an update of the new interchange at Oslo Road and explained there was a Project Development & Environmental (PD&E) Study being conducted on the Oslo Road Interchange and I-95 through Indian River County. He mentioned as part of the PD&E study, they would recommend widening I-95 from four lanes to six lanes and noted there was a PD&E study being done in St. Lucie County from S.R. 70 up to Indrio Road and the traffic projections showed going from four lanes to eight lanes.

Mr. Easley discussed the Cloud Grove development project in St. Lucie County and reported he had met with individuals at St. Lucie County to get an update on where the project stood and would it be worthwhile to add the Cloud Grove Development project to the network and traffic projections to see how it would affect the interchange at Oslo Road. He explained this project consisted of four phases with a proposed new interchange at the Florida Turnpike and included in Phase IV of the project was a proposed connection to Oslo Road

coming up from IRC which would require Oslo Road to be extended to the west. He mentioned Phase I would start around the year 2008 and Phase IV in the year 2025.

Mr. Easley remarked Reynolds, Smith and Hills were going back and looking at the land uses that had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Lucie County, but had yet to be approved by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). He said the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) would not allow the Cloud Grove Development Project to be included in the official IJR until it had been approved by the DCA. He felt once the Cloud Grove Development land uses were included in the IJR, the extension of Oslo Road to the west with an access road from that development up to Oslo, the interchange would be justified.

Mr. Easley expressed there was no indication when the Cloud Grove Development Project would get DCA approval and it could take up to one year, but he stated they could not wait to move forward with the interchange. He pointed out the plan was to decouple the IJR from the PD&E and move forward with the widening to the public hearing in May, 2007 with hopes of getting location design approval from the FHWA in November, 2007. He opined the interchange would be on its separate path and as soon as DCA approved the Cloud Grove Development, the IJR would be submitted to FHWA for their approval.

A discussion ensued and Mr. Easley mentioned a public workshop to detail the concept of the interchange was scheduled for November 2, 2006 at the Best Western Hotel in Vero Beach from 5 p.m. until 8 p.m.

Chairman Keating wanted to clarify that the IJR Analysis done so far by Reynolds, Smith and Hills on the Oslo Road Interchange opined the interchange would not be justified. A discussion followed.

### **Consideration of 2006 Transit Development Plan Update Report**

Mr. Matson reported for every dollar the County funded for the Transit System, the County received two dollars from federal and one dollar from state funds to operate the bus system. He noted to receive the funds from the state would require an annual report card exercise called the Transit Development Plan Report (TDP), a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office. He highlighted a few items found in the TDP and acknowledged Ms. Karen Deigl, CEO, Council on Aging and Sabin Abell, Jr., MPO Chairman.

Mr. Matson summarized on page 2.6 of the TDP, was the System Performance and Ridership by Route for 2005. He noted some of the lagging routes had increased in ridership which was good news. He stated on page 3.1 of the TDP, was the Performance Evaluation of past year's accomplishments and Implementation Plan which tracks progress on recommendations made in the TDP major update. He specified the TDP major update was a major system analysis which was performed and audited by the federal and the state government every three years and would soon be changed to every five years. He briefed that it had been recommended to adjust Route 5 and eliminate Route 9 to meet service thresholds. He remarked more emphasis had been placed in marketing Route 9 and the ridership responded, so the route would remain for the time being.

Mr. Matson briefed the Committee on the Bikes on Buses Program and noted it was still being studied and it was not as easy as it sounded. He brought up the issue of some cities requiring a license or a card to put the bike on the bus as a liability waiver. He felt IRC being a small community, putting a bike rack on the bus might be an option.

Mr. Matson reported all the goals and objectives for 2006 and 2007 had been achieved. He reported the County had been looking into adding service between Indian River and St. Lucie Counties and had applied for a grant with the FDOT which was not funded, but would reapply again.

Mr. Matson pointed out one of the sub-objectives was to provide transit infrastructure and discussed the type of shelter proposed. He noted the proposed shelter was open to bid on November 9, 2006 and the first shelter would be installed at the Gifford Health Center.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Davis, SECONDED BY Mr. Brown, the Committee voted unanimously (15-0) to recommend the Metropolitan Planning Organization approve the 2006 Transit Development Plan Report as presented.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.