



September 2, 2025

COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM 3A

MINUTES

TYPE OF ITEM: Consent

The minutes from the June 3, 2025, CMAC meeting is provided as ***Attachment 1***.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Option 1: Approve the minutes of the June 3, 2025, CMAC meeting.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1: June 3, 2025, CMAC Minutes



CITIZENS MULTIMODAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CMAC)

MEETING OF TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2025
(11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.)

TALLAHASSEE ROOM (2ND FLOOR)
CITY HALL
300 S. ADAMS STREET
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32301

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Chad Hanson, Chair; John Dunn; Mary Kay Falconer; Christie Hale; Roger Holdener; Hans van Tol; Wanda Carter; Dan Beaty; Julie Christensen; George Reynolds; Amie Longstreet

Staff and Others: Jack Kostrzewa, CRTPA; Greg Burke, CRTPA; Suzanne Lex, CRTPA; Yulonda Mitchell, CRTPA; Tyrone Scorsone, Kittelson & Associates; Cassidy Haney, Florida Office of Greenways and Trails; Corey Adamyk (Attendee/future appointee)

1. **AGENDA MODIFICATIONS**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA**
3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
 - A. **Minutes of the April 1, 2025, CMAC Meeting**
 - B. **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**
 - C. **CRTPA Safe Streets and Roadways for All (SS4A) Safety Action Plan Update**

Ms. Lex noted the Agenda Item 3B Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was sent to the committee. She explained the item was reviewed in April, but the information provided included final changes shown in Attachment 2, with full details.

Ms. Falconer asked if there were any updates to the Safe Streets and Roadways grant program provided by the federal government. Mr. Burke explained that in June there was a new solicitation for applications. He stated the CRTPA would be resubmitting the W. Tennessee Street-Planning Study application (from Monroe Street to Aenon Church Road) and that the N. Monroe Street SS4A application would also be resubmitted with Leon County taking the lead on the application.

Committee Action: Mr. van Tol made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Ms. Carter seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously passed.

4. CONSENT ITEMS PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

5. PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/ACTION

A. Fiscal Year (FY) 2026– FY 2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The FY 2026 – FY 2030 TIP identifying the projects that have received funding in the Florida Department of Transportation Work Program has been developed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend the CRTPA Board adopt the FY 2026 – FY 2030 Transportation Improvement Program.

B. Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 – FY 2031 Project Priority Lists (PPLs)

The FY 2027 – 2031 Project Priority Lists have been developed:

1. Regional Mobility Plan (Capacity) Project Priority List
2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Priority List
3. Regional Shared Use Paths (Trails) Project Priority List
4. StarMetro Project Priority List
5. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Project Priority List
6. Tallahassee International Airport Project Priority List

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend the CRTPA adopt the FY 2027 – FY 2031 Project Priority Lists.

Ms. Lex provided information on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026– FY 2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 – FY 2031 Project Priority Lists (PPLs). She noted the TIP and the PPLs would be provided in one presentation.

Ms. Lex explained this was the annual process for adopting the five-year TIP and the PPLs were developed for the next year's five-year work program. The PPLs are provided to FDOT for consideration for funding. She noted this was a fiscally constrained document; recognizes state and local funds; includes any roadways of regional significance; and includes all modes of transportation.

Ms. Lex explained the PPLs were the identified priority projects, and the lists are developed in cooperation with the local governments and FDOT. Ms. Lex noted the interactive TIP includes all information for each project by type, provide comments and view street conditions prior to improvement and includes cost of maintenance, operating costs, and types of funding available. The TIP and PPLs would be reflecting all the 2050 RMP projects for consistency. She noted both documents require public engagement and noted the dates were on the website. In-person Thursday, June 5,

2025, at 10 AM and 4:30 PM and virtual, Wednesday, June 4, 2025, at 11:30 AM and 4:30 PM and Thursday, June 12, 2025, at 11:30 AM. Ms. Lex stated staff was seeking the recommendation to approve Resolution 2025-06-6A.

Ms. Falconer stated the TIP listing of Regional Trails list shows one trail and asked if that would be the only project on the list. Ms. Lex explained last year, there was a Legislative action to fund the SUN Trails program, which provided a large sum of funding. She noted there were three projects in the TIP (FY 25), and noted the current TIP (FY 26) was amended and would not include any projects that were funded and moving forward through the SUN Trails program. Ms. Falconer noted the large amount of funding spent on resurfacing and would like to see the distribution of funds by county and show use of fundings. Ms. Lex stated she would pull together a chart to show the distribution of funding between the different modes and noted the resurfacing was a FDOT priority to maintain the existing roadway network. Ms. Falconer requested more specific information be provided for the new roadways improvements to include the type of multimodal that will be a part the improvements. Ms. Lex explained when a project is at the point of seeking design funding, there would be general information simply stating, "includes multimodal improvements". She further explained, when the project design phase reaches about 60% completion, there would be specifics on what type of multimodal improvements would be included in the project. Mr. Hanson asked about the funding per County and wanted clarification of what that includes specifically funding for trails (SUN Trails and Feasibility studies). Ms. Lex explained those projects funded by the SUN Trails program are not shown in the total for Wakulla. She noted those funds shown are mostly for resurfacing in the surrounding counties in the region. Ms. Lex stated she would provide the committee information how the funding has fluctuated in the past few years.

Committee Action: Ms. Carter made a motion to recommend approval of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026–FY 2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Hale seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously passed.

Committee Action: Ms. Carter made a motion to recommend approval of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 – FY 2031 Project Priority Lists (PPLs). Ms. Hale seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously passed.

C. Regional Mobility Plan (RMP) Update

An update on the development of the CRTPA's RMP will be provided.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information Only.

Mr. Kostrzewa introduced the Regional Mobility Plan (RMP) Update and Tyrone Scorsone from Kittleson and Associates. He stated the last update regarding the RMP was in February at which time the discussion centered around the Goals and Objectives for the project.

Mr. Scorsone provided information on the schedule and tasks that were being worked on or completed including the establishment of goals and objectives; modeling components; analysis of mobility and safety; public engagement and coordination; needs assessment and beginning of the priority

prioritization task and revenues to determine cost feasibility. He noted that many of the tasks run concurrently during the RMP update process. Additionally, he noted that the online survey was available for comments until June 13, 2025.

Ms. Falconer expressed concerns with the survey not working properly. She noted the maps would not allow for comments to be submitted at a specific location and others have had same results. Mr. van Tol stated he had issues with survey as well. Mr. Kostrzewa stated there have been discussions regarding technological issues with iPad and iPhone and there would be language added to the site regarding completing the survey on a computer instead of a phone. Mr. Kostrzewa also noted there would be some upgrades to include additional information in the description on the projects and the survey could be extended by a week.

Mr. Scorsone briefly discussed the findings from the community events noting, for example, the citizens of Panacea expressed concerns US 319, ongoing construction and the need to complete all the phases to complete the corridor. Mr. Kostrzewa noted there were many comments about the trails and citizens like the Coastal Trail.

Mr. Kostrzewa discussed the transportation model, and the steps involved with developing a base-year model that reflects current conditions. He explained the next step was an “Existing Plus Committed” model, which uses the base-year model plus any project that built or committed to be built in the next five years with the result being an E+C model. He continued, concurrently year 2050 data is completed and includes projected population, employment and future land use to use as inputs for the E+C model that will produce a Year 2050 model. He stated the product of the Year 2050 is a “needs” model to determine where current and future issues may occur. He continued by stating, after CRTPA Board adoption of the Cost Feasible Plan a final cost feasible plan model would be produced. This cost feasible plan model would add in the projects in the plan and determine the impacts to the system.

Mr. Kostrzewa discussed “constraints” that inhibit or prohibit the ability to provide additional capacity that are related to physical, fiscal, or policies. He explained physical constraints are those that will make it extremely difficult to widen a road. Mr. Kostrzewa stated fiscal constraints relate to the ability to fund a project due to the estimated cost of the improvements. Lastly, he explained, policy constraints are those based on the protection of the environment, businesses or residences along a corridor.

Mr. Kostrzewa stated after the models are completed, the results create the needs assessment. Mr. Kostrzewa briefly explained the “volume to capacity” ratio, or V/C ratio. He noted this was utilized to determine how well a road is being used compared to its maximum capacity. He further explained a V/C ratio of 1.0 or greater indicates congestion, while values below 1.0 suggest the facility has more capacity than demand. He discussed the projects, and updated the CMAC on project costs, which are currently at \$412 million dollars. Additionally, he stated that efforts also focused on coordinating the RMP with the PPLs for consistency. Mr. Kostrzewa also discussed the revenue decrease from the 2045 RMP and impact that is having on the Year 2050 RMP. Ms. Falconer asked how decisions will be made due to lack of funding to address multimodal improvements. Mr. Kostrzewa stated the safety program would be used to address the needs of constrained facilities by applying for SS4A funding to potentially expand sidewalks and include multimodal improvements on the (constrained) corridors.

Mr. Kostrzewa detailed the potential draft cost feasible plan process. He stated the revenues are used to determine where projects can be funded during the 2030 to 2050 time period. Mr. Dunn asked if the lack of revenues was a localized issue. Mr. Kostrzewa stated this was a state and national issue and the benefit that Leon County has, is that Blueprint can address some issues but noted costs are rising for everyone.

Committee Action: This item was information only; therefore, no action was taken.

6. INFORMATION

A. Future Meeting Dates (Next Meeting: September 2, 2025)

7. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS OR STAFF

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:03 pm.