

MOBILITY 2040: A Vision for the SR 54/56 Corridor **Phase 2: Corridor Vision & Implementation Plan**

Task Force Workshop Summary and Minutes

Thursday, October 26, 2017 (5:30–8:30 PM)

Pasco County Utilities Administration Building, Cottee Room | 19420 Central Blvd, Land O'Lakes, FL 34637

Task Force Members Present

Debby Catanzaro, Citizen-at-Large
John Copeland, Pasco Alliance of Community Associations (PACA)
Marilynn deChant, MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Rich Dutter, Citizen-at-Large
Sandy Graves, Central Pasco Chamber of Commerce
Steve Henry, Traffic Engineer
Ronald Hubbs, Council of Neighborhood Associations (CONA)
Fred Krauer, Pasco Alliance of Community Associations
Kelly Miller, MPO CAC
Bruce Mills, West Pasco Chamber of Commerce
Tom Ryan, Pasco Economic Development Council (EDC) and MPO CAC
Christie Zimmer, MPO CAC

MPO/County Staff and Consultants Present

Pasco County MPO: Craig Casper, Ali Atefi, Manny Lajmiri, Tanya Archer
Pasco County: David Goldstein, Nectarios Pitos, Chandra Parasa, Kris Hughes
Florida Department of Transportation: Lilliam Escalera, Domingo Noriega (AECOM), Rick Langlass (RS&H)
Tindale Oliver: Rob Cursey, Wally Blain

Citizens

Greg Parsons, Frank Hauser, Kim Brinkley Seyer

Call to Order

- Mr. Ryan called the meeting to order at 5:46 PM and thanked everyone for attending. He provided an overview of the Workshop format by stating that there would not be a public comment period on the agenda, but that comment cards were provided if anyone had any comments they'd like to submit. He indicated that the format was to provide the Task Force members with an opportunity to ask questions regarding the study and continue discussion from the prior meetings.

Meeting Objectives

- Mr. Dutter asked for clarification on the current mission of the Task Force as it moves forward. Mr. Dutter wanted to confirm that the Task Force was still focusing on the entire corridor or only focusing on the two intersections of US 41 and Little Road and how that would translate to the entire corridor.



- Mr. Atefi responded that by saying the alternatives selected by the Task Force for the intersections may have corridor impacts depending on which alternatives are included in a “toolbox of alternatives” moving forward in later phases of the vision study. Mr. Atefi also mentioned the complimentary or alternative intersection designs that could be included with the Task Force recommendation from Phase2: Step 1 that could be implemented throughout the corridor as well.
- Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Atefi confirmed for the Task Force that the survey would include questions about the Little Road and the US 41 intersection. At this time, the Phase2: Step 2 portion would only include analysis of the US 41 intersection.
- Mr. Casper also mentioned that these intersections were selected as representative locations to conduct the Phase 2: Step 1 analysis.
- Ms. Miller also sought clarification regarding the purpose of Phase 2 is to review and evaluate the alternatives for the entire corridor.
- Mr. Atefi provided additional clarification on the history of moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and focusing on two intersections first was partially a financial decision due to the cost of evaluating the entire corridor with so many alternatives. The Task Force recommendation will be used as a fewer number of alternatives to evaluate for the entire corridor when additional funding can be identified.

Step 1 Evaluation Results and Task Force Discussion

- Mr. Blain began discussing the evaluation results by walking the Task Force members through each of the alternatives. He spoke about the concept of each alternative and provided some insight regarding which alternatives had more of a corridor impact versus those that could be implemented at an individual intersection location. Mr. Blain also provided an overview of changes that were made on the alternatives evaluation matrix since the last Task Force meeting. During the discussion of alternatives, the Task Force members asked questions regarding each alternatives configuration, number of lanes, elevation, tolling and transit operations.
- For Alternative 1, Mr. Blain described that the overpass at the intersection would include the six lanes of the SR 54 corridor with turn lanes at-grade at the intersection. This alternative most closely reflects the US 19 style and would be implemented as an intersection solution. Mr. Atefi further stated that the overpass of Alternative 1 includes dedicated transit lanes, which is not on US 19 in Pinellas County.
- Mr. Blain mentioned that Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 all include a form of express lanes in addition to the existing 6-lanes on SR 54. These alternatives would be a corridor vision or concept rather than a single intersection alternative. As express lanes, the assumption for Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 would include tolls to offset the cost. Mr. Blain stated that away from the major intersections that the express lanes for Alternatives 4 and 5 would be at-grade, while for Alternatives 2 and 3 they express lanes would remain elevated.
- Task Force members asked about which intersections would be considered as major where the express lanes would be elevated on Alternatives 4 and 5. Mr. Blain responded by saying that there are about 16 major intersections today and that identifying those major intersections would be part of further review and evaluation. Mr. Casper stated that future traffic volumes will be a factor in identifying those locations.
- Mr. Blain provided a brief synopsis of the first five alternatives and provided guidance on how these alternatives could become part of an Alternative 10 combination.
- Following additional discussion by Task Force members, Mr. Blain discussed the complementary intersection alternatives and the specifics of each.



- Mr. Blain then began discussing revisions to the evaluation summary that had been made since the previous Task Force Meeting. This discussion included a reevaluation of the average delay for alternatives 1 through 5. Mr. Blain highlighted how the average delay being presented increased based on the methodology and assumptions.
- Mr. Atefi emphasized for the Task Force that the analysis completed was a planning analysis and the results should be viewed as a comparative analysis.
- Mr. Noriega presented a series of simulations showing pedestrian crossings for alternatives 1, 3, and 7 as representative alternatives for the overpass concept, express lanes, and alternative intersection designs. He discussed the crossing distance pedestrians would need to traverse to cross the street.
- Task Force members continued discussing the alternatives by asking about opportunities for pedestrian overpasses, confirmation on use of piers rather than walls for the elevated alternatives, safety considerations, and impacts to businesses.

Next Steps

- Mr. Blain discussed the format of the survey with the Task Force members with the goal of having the survey out to the Task Force members in the next week. Task Force members would be asked to rank their top 5 alternatives for each intersection.
- Ms. Zimmer asked if there could be multiple versions of Alternative 10 that the Task Force members could select and rank.
- Task Force members discussed this consideration and Mr. Blain indicated that they would need to change the format of the survey, but it would be possible to make that happen.
- Task Force members discussed the timing of completing the survey and agreed to have surveys completed by November 13th.
- The Task Force members also discussed the date for their next meeting. Staff presented options of possible dates to consider. The Task Force members agreed to hold their next meeting on November 30th.
- The Task Force members finished by discussing the format of the meeting for November 30th and the format of the recommendation going to the MPO Board.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:37 PM.

