

## TREASURE COAST TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TCTAC)

### Regular Meeting

**Date:** February 9, 2023

**Time:** 2:00 pm

**Location:** St. Lucie TPO Boardroom  
Coco Vista Centre  
466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Suite 111  
Port St. Lucie, Florida

---

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Sanders called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm.

#### 2. Roll Call

Self-introductions were made, and a quorum was noted with the following members present:

##### Members Present

Marty Sanders (Chair)  
Adolfo Covelli  
Rich Szpyrka  
Chris Stephenson  
Jim Gorton  
Lisa Wichser

##### Others Present

Peter Buchwald  
Beth Beltran  
Brian Freeman  
Jim Mann  
Teresa Lane  
Christine Fasiska  
Stewart Robertson  
Ricardo Vazquez  
James Brown

##### Representing

St. Lucie TPO  
St. Lucie TPO  
Indian River MPO  
Indian River MPO  
Martin MPO  
Martin MPO

##### Representing

St. Lucie TPO  
Martin MPO  
Indian River MPO  
Indian River MPO  
Recording Specialist  
FDOT  
Kimley-Horn  
Martin MPO  
Florida's Turnpike

---

Saige Killion

Kimley-Horn

**3. Comments from the Public – None.**

**4. Approval of Agenda**

\* **MOTION** by Mr. Szyrka to approve the agenda.

\*\* **SECONDED** by Ms. Wichser Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. Approval of Meeting Summary**

- March 29, 2021 Regular Meeting

\* **MOTION** by Mr. Szyrka to approve the Meeting Summary.

\*\* **SECONDED** by Mr. Gorton Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. Action Items**

**6a. 2045 Treasure Coast Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (2045 RL RTP):** Review of the proposed Regional Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures and the Regional Multimodal Transportation System for the 2045 RL RTP.

Mr. Buchwald explained that at its March 2021 meeting, the TCTAC reviewed the draft Scope of Services for the development of the 2045 RL RTP for the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC). He added that the documents were finalized based on the comments received from the TCTAC, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the MPOs was executed. Mr. Buchwald further explained that upon execution of the MOU, as agreed to by all three MPOs of the Treasure Coast, the Martin MPO contracted Kimley Horn for the development of the 2045 RL RTP and after working through timing issues with our respective Unified Planning Work Programs and MPO Board Meetings, the Scope of Services was initiated late last year.

Mr. Buchwald asked Ms. Beltran or Mr. Freeman if they had anything to add before bringing up Mr. Robertson to make the presentation.

Ms. Beltran and Mr. Freeman both thanked Mr. Buchwald and the St. Lucie TPO for hosting the meeting. Ms. Beltran added that she was glad we are moving forward with this project.

Mr. Robertson provided a summary of the technical reports included in the TCTAC agenda packet which covers the first few tasks of the project.

Mr. Robertson described the RL RTP purpose, regional trends and conditions, regional goals, objectives, and performance measures, and regional multimodal transportation system. He also presented a fact sheet that had been developed for the project and the next steps in the process.

Mr. Robertson stated that we are in the beginning half of the RL RTP and we are developing an overlay to combine area regional projects from each M/TPO local plan and to create one long-term vision for mobility. The objective, he stated, is to ensure continuity and connectivity between facilities throughout the counties as well as to prioritize funding for regional projects.

Mr. Robertson stated that the population of the Treasure Coast is expected to increase significantly, with St. Lucie County experiencing most of this growth; employment also will grow significantly, again, with St. Lucie County leading the way. Mr. Robertson highlighted the single-occupancy vehicle commuting rate is higher in the Treasure Coast than in Florida or the nation and we also have lower percentages of walking and transit use.

Mr. Robertson noted that the goals, objectives and policies of each M/TPO local plans are consistent with federal guidelines, suggesting five goals be established for the RL RTP with each goal having corresponding objectives and performance measures. Mr. Robertson provided a detailed description of the proposed goals, objectives, and performance measures.

Mr. Robertson described Task 4 in which the regional transportation network of significance is identified; the network is organized into primary regional and secondary regional. Mr. Robertson stated terms were being changed, instead of "emerging" the term "future" has been substituted. He noted the addition of Aviation Boulevard extension to the regional network and other changes, such as secondary facilities upgraded to primary facilities and some facilities added as well. Mr. Robertson described the regional map in the report which shows the network and the availability of the map online.

Mr. Robertson described the public involvement component of the project which consists of a fact sheet which could be used by M/TPO staff; the fact sheet summarizes the project. He stated no additional public meetings are proposed.

Mr. Robertson then described the next steps in the process. He said Task 6 would involve establishing a regional prioritization process, conducting an assessment of the multimodal needs network, and prioritizing projects for regional investment.

In response to Mr. Buchwald's request to summarize the additions to the regional network that were not itemized in the report, Mr. Robertson listed Fox Brown Road from SR 714 to Martin Highway being added as a secondary regional network, 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Martin Highway to Citrus Boulevard added as a planned secondary, and Indian Street from US 1 to Dixie Highway added as a secondary.

In answer to Ms. Wichser's question regarding how secondary and primary were determined, Mr. Robertson said it was according to the number of criteria that were met; a secondary doesn't have as many criteria met. He added that the way the M/TPOs have used these lists in the past is a project is eligible for funding whether it's primary or secondary. Mr. Buchwald noted we will be considering a tiered system for the prioritization as the next step in the process.

In answer to Ms. Wichser's question regarding the population/jobs growth imbalance, Mr. Robertson noted the differences in growth horizons as a contributing factor. He noted there's definitely more population growth than employment which is consistent with the presence of a significant number of retirees.

Mr. Buchwald initiated a discussion based on his observation of how the mode split in the Treasure Coast region is relatively low, at what point do we start including multimodal facilities on the regional transportation network and ultimately developing projects eligible for funding? Discussion ensued. Comments included ranking roadways with bike lanes higher, the need for growing the transit system, and ranking our top M/TPO projects regionally also. Mr. Robertson agreed this was a worthwhile discussion and added that we already include the regional greenways and trails system.

Mr. Robertson initiated a discussion of roadway projects and nonmotorized connections. Mr. Buchwald described the pushback received on trail projects so it's important to emphasize that these trails are regional projects. Mr. Robertson described the East Coast Greenway projects in the region that are part of the SUN Trail network which passes through all three counties. Mr. Buchwald stated Kimley-Horn could move forward with these based on the direction of the TCTAC; he encouraged the TCTAC to consider adding the East Coast Greenway. In answer to Mr. Freeman's question regarding the East Coast Greenway

boundaries, Mr. Robertson and Mr. Buchwald described the alignment of the trail through the three counties and the status of construction and public opposition versus benefits of various sections of SUN Trail.

\* **MOTION** by Mr. Stephenson to add the East Coast Greenway to the multi-modal plan.

\*\* **SECONDED** by Ms. Wichser Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

## 7. **Discussion Items**

### 7a. **Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) 2023**

**Update:** An update of the TRIP for 2023 was provided by the Florida Department of Transportation District 4.

Mr. Buchwald said TRIP provides State funds through an annual grant cycle to improve regionally significant transportation facilities, including transit facilities, in regional transportation areas such as the Treasure Coast which is under the stewardship of the Treasure Coast Transportation Council to which you advise. He noted that TRIP will pay for up to 50 percent of the project costs of regional projects that relieve congestion on the State System. He further noted that projects considered for TRIP funding must be identified as Regional Needs in the Treasure Coast RL RTP that was just discussed but that to date, FDOT D4 has not identified the TRIP funding that is available to the District for this year's grant cycle.

Ms. Fasiska provided an update on this year's TRIP grant cycle. Although she did not have the exact figures for the TRIP allocation, she shared general information about TRIP to assist the TCTAC in meeting District expectations. She said the District is looking for a prioritized list; in general she said the entire District receives approximately \$8 or \$9 million each year. Ms. Fasiska said the numbers have shrunk a lot. One of the challenges, she said, many projects can't be fully funded with TRIP and the District cannot program a project until it is fully funded so we have to pull in other revenue sources and funding types. She said we have to make sure all the moving parts are aligned. She noted that TRIP funds are for one year, so if the project is not ready to receive the TRIP funds in that year then the project is not a good candidate for TRIP. Ms. Fasiska noted the District encourages all MPOs to oversubscribe; start thinking of projects that are smaller in scale because they are easier to insert in the Work Program if an opening arises. She added it's also easier to find local match for smaller projects since TRIP is 50/50 local match.

Ms. Fasiska said she has a list of projects and as long as that project is on your list the District will continue to fund future phases, no need to reapply. Ms. Fasiska said different phases can receive TRIP. She said you can submit a draft list; the sooner we get them the better as long as they are program ready by March 1, that's when the District vetting starts. She acknowledged this is an early cycle this year.

Mr. Buchwald described the projects submitted in the last cycle: Port St. Lucie Boulevard, 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Cove Road. Ms. Fasiska described the funding status of each. She also stated Midway Road in St. Lucie County is fully funded. Mr. Buchwald mentioned it's Cove Road's turn.

Mr. Buchwald said it's a challenge to apply for funding if you don't have a sense of how much is available. Ms. Fasiska reiterated the \$8 or \$9 million available each year; she described the District's process of allocating the funding. Ms. Fasiska again noted that a project the size of \$2 million offers more flexibility in funding options; projects of this size are easier to plug into the Work Program.

Mr. Buchwald noted the challenge of finding projects small enough to fit the \$2 million criteria; roadways cost much more so you might only be looking at sidewalks, none of which are in the RL RTP.

Ms. Beltran said Cove Road is Martin County's number one priority. Ms. Fasiska said there's no need to submit another application for Cove Road; but since Cove Road is not yet fully funded is there another project that could be used for leftover funds?

Ms. Fasiska again described the District's process of understanding the local rankings but if we cannot fully fund a phase then we look to the next project and ask, what can we fund there? She said it's about what project, what phase is ready, where it falls on the priority list; if it has a certain phase funded it's in the pipeline, it's going to continue to move through.

In answer to Ms. Wichser's question regarding whether there were smaller projects on the list, Ms. Beltran noted that capital transit projects had been funded in South Florida. Ms. Beltran said the number one project in our 2040 plan is US 1; is there a way for the three transit agencies in the Treasure Coast region to each buy a bus and dedicate the bus to the US 1 corridor? Mr. Buchwald opined this could be worthwhile.

A discussion of this concept ensued. Mr. Freeman reminded the local share could be an issue since it has to be nonfederal funds. Mr. Buchwald

asked, could this double the capital acquired? Mr. Freeman said the funding constraints are on the operating side not the capital side, but we can use toll revenue credits so federal funding is 100 percent. Mr. Freeman said for electrifying the fleet and charging infrastructure, TRIP funds might be potentially useful. He said maybe in combination with certain grants; we would have to look at the year of the allocation as well, FY 2029 is too far to project in terms of vehicle replacement. Mr. Freeman conceded the concept has potential.

Ms. Fasiska said if there's money in an earlier year, leftover money could possibly be used. She said we do that a lot in South Florida, money can be flexed for buses more quickly than for roadways since there is no need to wait for design as with roadway projects.

Mr. Buchwald said we should be thinking about that for the 2045 plan; all the MPOs should be thinking in terms of TRIP funding.

Ms. Fasiska said if thinking about buses, put on list and submit by March 1; we can work out the details later, this helps us work through it, so we would have the programming ready.

Mr. Buchwald recapped we don't need a letter for Cove Road; right now we could submit the multimodal list with buses but we need to know if it works for the transit agencies. Ms. Fasiska said just a general cost estimate will do.

Discussion ensued regarding the cost of buses. Costs are higher for electric buses on the capital side Mr. Freeman said, and their policy is not to be an early adopter of technology. He shared they are learning more about this technology through webinars offered by FTA and other means. Mr. Sanders noted the School District had looked into CNG buses but the costs of support infrastructure was significant.

In answer to Wichser's question, Ms. Fasiska said the projects could be endorsed by the TCTC after the TCTAC list is submitted as we work through the details.

All agreed that the transit agencies would look into the purchase of buses to be added to the TRIP list.

\* **MOTION** by Mr. Szpyrka to have Cove Road and three buses for the US 1 route added to this cycle for TRIP with the understanding that the bus additions would require further evaluation.

\*\* **SECONDED** by Mr. Stephenson

Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

**8. Recommendations/Comments by Members – None**

**9. Staff Comments** – Mr. Buchwald stated the next TCTAC meeting would be hosted by Martin. Ms. Beltran mentioned there might be the need to meet more frequently as part of the RL RTP process before final recommendation of adoption of the plan.

**10. Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved by:

*Teresa Lane*  
for \_\_\_\_\_  
Teresa Lane  
Recording Specialist

11-3-2023

*Jim Gorton*  
\_\_\_\_\_   
Jim Gorton  
Chairman