Coordination Summaries

Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) Master Plan

CONTENTS

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS (TSM&O)
MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING #1: VISION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 (2:30 PM – 4:00 PM)

LOCATION: MetroPlan Orlando Board Room – David L. Grovdahl Board Room
250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32801

MEETING SUMMARY:

AGENDA

I. **Welcome and Introductions**
II. **Public Comments**
III. **Master Plan Schedule**
- Proposed Steering Committee Schedule
IV. **Steering Committee Roles & Responsibilities**
V. **Scope of Work Overview**
- Task 1 – Goals and Objectives
- Task 2 – Existing Conditions/Infrastructure/Inventory
- Task 3 – TSM&O Needs
- Task 4 – Applicable Strategies and Funding Sources
- Task 5 – Regional Architecture (RITSA)
- Task 6 – Prioritization Support Matrix
- Task 7 – Agency and Public Participation
- Task 8 – Project Meetings and Board/Committee Presentations
- Task 9 – TSM&O Master Plan
- Task 10 – Project Administration
VI. **Summary of Key Documents**
VII. **Draft Vision, Goals, and Objectives**
- Interactive Discussion
VIII. **Next Steps and Action Items**
- Future Meeting Dates
IX. **Adjournment**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Bryan Homayouni (Virtual)	Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Ms. Katie King (for Jeremy Dilmore)	Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
Mr. Eric Gordin (Virtual)	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE)
Mr. Doug Jamison	LYNX
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Steven Kane	Osceola County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Others in Attendance	
Ms. Virginia Whittington	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Lara Bouck (Virtual)	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Alex Trauger	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford (Virtual)	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Maile Spang	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Simone Burns	Kimley-Horn

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
    - It was noted by Mr. Steven Kane that Ms. Lindsey Giovinazzo will be serving on the Steering Committee for Osceola County in the future.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

MASTER PLAN SCHEDULE

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the project, reviewed the General Schedule, and the schedule for Steering Committee meetings.
- The schedule was displayed on the screen.
- There were no questions regarding schedule.

STEERING COMMITTEE ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

- Mr. Wood introduced the topic of steering committee member roles, responsibilities, and general expectations (document in agenda packet).
- Mr. Jonathan Ford covered the purpose of the RITSA and asked for input from the steering committee regarding updates to the provided RITSA.
- Mr. Eric Gordin asked what the starting point for the RITSA section was because there were a lot of Turnpike projects and elements missing.
- Mr. Ford stated that the list began with the D5 service packages. He noted that the packages specific to Turnpike tolling were not captured in the list and that he would go back and add these.
- Mr. Hill mentioned that MetroPlan Orlando does not have a RITSA and that they rely on D5 to account for them in their list.
- Regarding Orange County, Mr. Hazem El-Assar mentioned that the Orange County ATMS Phase 4 is completed and should be removed, the D5 upgrades project are missing (which includes Orange County), and that the traffic signal mast arm upgrades, traffic signal cabinet upgrades, and International Drive adaptive signal system projects should be added. He also mentioned that they have a white paper available that details sales tax and future projects.
- Ms. Katie King mentioned that she manages the system engineering internally for Mr. Jeremy Dilmore. She asked Mr. El-Assar if the projects that were missing from the list were submitted through the proper forms by the May 13 deadline.
- Mr. El-Assar mentioned that he did submit a form for ATMS Phase 4 but that he didn't submit one for the D5 upgrades because he thought the District would handle it. He just submitted the form for the three new projects.
- Ms. King mentioned that the next cycle for updates ends June 1st and that Iteris (the Department's consultant) would take updates to the list anytime up to the deadline of June 1st.
- Mr. Bryan Homayouni noted that the FDOT BTU segments from CFX's list should be removed and that the PTSU (Part-time Shoulder Use) should be added (which has already been submitted through the proper form).
- Mr. Kane mentioned that the all-electronic toll reconstruction project along Osceola parkway is currently in construction and should be implemented within the next 12 months. He also mentioned that Ms. Tawny Olore was inspired by Altamonte Springs Autonomous Vehicle Project that was presented at MetroPlan TSM&O this past Friday and is interested in moving forward with a similar project in the long term.

- Mr. Charlie Wetzel asked what the Greater Orlando Signal Priority and Preemption project listed under Seminole County was, to which Ms. King mentioned it is likely TSP Phases 1, 2, and 3. Mr. El-Assar pointed out that that project has been completed and Mr. Hill questioned if it should be removed from the list for this study. Jonathan mentioned that once a project is completed, it should get retired to be represented as an existing system. Once a project is complete the systems implemented by the project will be represented, not the individual project itself.
- Mr. Doug Jamison mentioned that the LYNX ITS Master Plan was completed this year. Specifically, that "fair payment" was added along with "open payment" to provide for interoperability (besides the use of credit cards). Mr. Jamison mentioned that he provided the updated version of the plan to the team prior to the meeting.
- Mr. Hill asked why the PedSafe Program is included under LYNX's list. Mr. Ford mentioned that is how it is currently represented in RITSA and that it also comes up under D5 as well. Ms. King explained that the PedSafe Program is specifically for creating pedestrian safety messages and pushing them out to on-board units (OBU). She mentioned that it is listed under any agency that was considered a stakeholder in the grant application.
- It was mentioned that there is a transit application currently being tested regarding right turn conflicts with buses where vehicles will get warning messaged.

SCOPE OF WORK OVERVIEW

- Mr. Wood noted that Task 1 will be the focus of a later part of the meeting.
- Mr. Ford covered Task 2 through Task 6.
  - *Task 2 - Are there any opportunities to leverage existing infrastructure? If your agency has a specific resource/file that we can utilize, please consider sharing it with the Master Plan team. Mr. Ford added that another piece of information that the Master Plan would like to consider is what data sets are currently available to each stakeholder. Mr. Ford to confirm what data sets can be shared during Task 2.*
  - *Task 3 – Look to the steering committee to confirm the needs of the projects listed in the RITSA and what additional needs you have in the future that you may not have a solution for yet (long term issues).*
  - *Task 4 – Identify available which funding sources and potential partnerships to strengthen going after grants/funding opportunities.*
  - *Task 5 – We'd like to capture any updates you need*
  - *Task 6 – How do we want to define what projects should be prioritized over others? Safety, mobility, transit needs, etc. All based on data that we already have and leveraging existing infrastructure. How are we going to prioritize those projects, per agency basis and/or regionally?*
- Mr. Wood covered Task 7, sharing that in lieu of an open house, a transportation technology event will be held to convey how non-capacity improvements can have a positive impact on the traveling public. He also summarized Task 8.

- Mr. Ford covered Task 9 which is a culmination of these efforts to develop the Master Plan which is the final deliverable as a resource for project prioritization.
- Mr. El-Assar mentioned that he believed two of the main goals that we are trying to accomplish through this effort is to fill the gaps in the MTP (as it currently only allows for prioritization of corridor projects and not ITS/intersection projects) and develop criteria to evaluate these types of projects.
- Mr. Homayouni mentioned that CFX can provide their ITS Master Plan which they recently completed.
- Mr. Wood reiterated that the intent of this effort is to prioritize projects as we move into the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

SUMMARY OF KEY DOCUMENTS

- Mr. Ford referred the Steering Committee to the document listed in Task 1 of the Scope of Work and discussed how the documents listed are being used in development of the Master Plan. He asked the Steering Committee members to review the list and provide any other documents that might be appropriate for consideration.
- Mr. Jamison asked if these plans capture Brightline and if we are capturing the effects of the tax revenue, to which Mr. El-Assar mentioned that he didn't believe so.

DRAFT VISION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

- Mr. Wood opened by describing how the Vision, Goals, and Objectives were developed and that the intent for today is to collect preliminary comments from the Steering Committee. He stated that the Steering Committee will also have a period of two weeks after the meeting to provide additional feedback.
- Mr. El-Assar asked what the horizon year will be, to which Jim mentioned that we are attempting to align with the future 2050 MTP. Mr. El-Assar asked if cost feasibility would be a consideration as well, to which Mr. Wood mentioned that ultimately, yes.
- Mr. Alex Trauger agreed that MetroPlan intends for this document, once finalized, to amend the 2045 plan and assist in preparing for the 2050 MTP's cost feasible plan. For this exercise, what's most important is to understand the local partners priorities and be more specific.
- Mr. El-Assar mentioned that for planning, the tools they have are not applicable to TSM&O specific projects. Which is why this is a good opportunity to properly define those projects and replace these projects in the plan.
- Mr. Trauger agreed and mentioned that this will allow us to have these projects already identified so that next time we are prepared with our list of projects.
- Mr. El-Assar mentioned that LYNX and SunRail Master Plans should also be incorporated.
- Mr. Homayouni asked what the intended relationship between the ITS Master Plan and the TSM&O Master Plan is to be, to which Mr. Hill responded that the TSM&O Master Plan will encompass and build upon the ITS Master Plan, bringing it forward for the next five years.

- Mr. Ford mentioned that the TSM&O Master Plan will not just cover ITS systems but other TSM&O strategies as well. With the intent to make sure we can get programmatic funding and not just standalone projects on their own.
- Mr. El-Assar mentioned that he agreed with this approach and that when we previously worked on the ITS Master Plan, TSM&O was a relatively new term.
- Mr. Hill elaborated that ITS is more technical while TSM&O is talking approach.
- Mr. Wood walked the group through the VISION.
  - *Ms. King mentioned that in existing column, the D5 TSM&O implementation plan is an old document and there are newer ones that are more applicable. There are a lot of documents available on the CFL smart roads website. These documents define how we are looking at TSM&O as a whole and offered to provide these. Mr. Jamison mentioned that we should make it clear that "system performance" is not only regarding to vehicle movement. Ms. King mentioned that "mobility" may be a better term. Mr. Homayouni recommended adding a note regarding "equity".*
- Mr. Wood walked the group through the GOALS.
  - *Ms. King recommended modifying the statement to something along the lines of "leveraging innovative solutions to optimize multimodal goals and utilize technology to make better data driven decisions through safety and mobility". To which Mr. Hill agreed we need to make it clear that we are moving people, not vehicles, with a focus on mobility, reliability, and performance.*
  - *Mr. Jamison mentioned providing better access and connectivity to make informed decisions.*
  - *Ms. King stated that this applies to both the vision and the goal.*
  - *Mr. Kane mentioned that under Investment and Economy, it looks like we're trying to say create economic equality, but we also want to consider if something is cost feasible. Mr. Ford mentioned that in the reliability and performance section we could include representation to maintenance.*
  - *Mr. Jamison questioned where we are capturing preparing for Connected and Automated Vehicles (CAV) to which Mr. Ford mentioned CAV will rely on what Metro Plan put together for their CAV readiness study and will leverage what came out of that. He also mentioned that a technical memorandum will be drafted that includes a summary of each of these documents.*
  - *Mr. Jamison asked where we fit CAV in the goals, maybe under Investment in technology and interoperability. Jonathan mentioned maybe reliability and performance. Mr. Hill asked Mr. Jamison if he's also speaking to emerging technologies and disruptions from these. Mr. Jamison said yes, disruptions in a coordinated fashion.*
  - *Mr. Homayouni asked if investment and economy could be expanded to include "equity for all users". Mr. Ford mentioned that access and connectivity may be a good place to add that as well. Mr. Hill mentioned that equity, not only regarding access but also areas of obstacles as well, stating that we*

don't want technology to be a burden. To which Mr. Ford mentioned that under the access goal we could add "disparity".

- Mr. Wood walked the group through the OBJECTIVES.
  - *Mr. Homayouni asked if we should consider adding mention to target zero/vision zero under the safety objective. Ms. King shared that target zero is "how" to achieve goals while vision zero is the goal.*
  - *Mr. Jamison mentioned under health and environment that we mention fuel consumption but maybe the use of other words would be better.*
  - *Mr. Hill noted that the EV Master Plan will run in parallel to the TSM&O Master Plan.*
  - *Ms. King asked if under S&S, have cybersecurity risks been considered? Mr. Wood mentioned that it's implied but not specifically stated. It could also be listed as a strategy under this objective or its own objective. Ms. King mentioned that it's a big topic that we may want to consider adding but Mr. Hill reminded the group that we are operating at a higher level, where cybersecurity is more of an owner/operator concern. The MPO may not get down to this level of detail.*
  - *Mr. Gordin asked if under A&C, do we solely want to focus on tourists or make it broader to regular users as well? Mr. Wood mentioned that we could expand but that there is also a certain dimension that visitors experience this travel differently. Mr. Gordin noted that he understands the need to assist tourists but that we may want to consider a more inclusive statement. Mr. Ford mentioned that Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) is a great example of how something can be intended to specifically help tourists but that all users benefit.*
  - *Mr. Homayouni mentioned that under H&E, it is often the underserved & marginalized communities that are impacted. That it may be worth making specific reference to underserved communities, the concept of equity, within this objective. Which applies to both. That understanding that more work needs to be done and putting emphasis on it.*

NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

- Steering Committee # 2 will be held sometime between August 29th to September 23rd. Mr. Wood will send a follow-up email to discuss availability for potential meeting dates. If you are unable to attend, please have an alternate attend in your place.

ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Wood asked for any final questions from attendees. After no additional comments, Mr. Hill thanked those in attendance for their participation.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS (TSM&O)
MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING #2: EXISTING CONDITIONS

DATE & TIME: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 (1:30 PM - 3:00 PM)

LOCATION: MetroPlan Orlando Board Room – David L. Grovdahl Board Room
250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32801

MEETING SUMMARY:

AGENDA

    I.   Welcome and Introductions
    II.   Public Comments
    III.   Review of Steering Committee Meeting #1
    IV.   Master Plan and Steering Committee Schedule
    V.   Existing Conditions Update
- Results of Request for Information (RFI)

    VI.   Input on TSM&O Needs
- Facilitated discussion

    VII.   Looking Ahead
- Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Architecture (RITSA)

    VIII.   Steering Committee Member Comments/Updates
    IX.   Next Steps and Action Items
- Future Meeting Dates

    X.   Adjournment

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Bryan Homayouni (Virtual)	Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Jeremy Dilmore	Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
Mr. Eric Gordin	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE)
Mr. Doug Jamison	LYNX
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Lindsey Giovinazzo (Virtual)	Osceola County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel (Virtual)	Seminole County
Others in Attendance	
Mr. Slate Downs	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jason Sartorio	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Mike Vaudo (Virtual)	Kimley-Horn

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

- Mr. Wood went over the handout packet from Steering Committee Meeting #1 which included the Meeting Summary, the Final Vision, Goals, and Objectives, and the Documentation Review.

- Meeting Summary
  - This is a draft document and was provided for Steering Committee members to review and comment by the end of the week (October 7th, 2022).
  - Mr. Doug Jamison commented that he had "no comments".
- Vision, Goals, and Objectives
  - This is the final version of the document which incorporates all comments made during Steering Committee Meeting #1 and any comments received following the meeting. Moving forward, the information will be formatted with the goals referenced to the ITS Masterplan.
  - There was a highlight missing on page 4 of the document which will be updated accordingly.
  - There were no comments from attendees.
- Documentation Review
  - This is a draft document and will continue to be updated throughout the life of project. Mr. Wood asked for Steering Committee members to continue to provide comments.
  - There were no comments from attendees.

MASTER PLAN AND STEERING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the project schedule for the upcoming Steering Committee meetings.
- The schedule was displayed on the screen and there were no comments.

EXISTING CONDITIONS UPDATE

- Mr. Jonathan Ford summarized the responses to the request for information that was distributed to Steering Committee members before the meeting.
- A "check" reflects that data received and nothing else is needed. An "N/A" reflects that the item is not applicable. An "X" reflects that data is still needed. An "O" reflects that data was received but additional data is needed, potentially in a different format (i.e. KMZ or shapefile versus a PDF).
  - Mr. Hazem El-Assar mentioned that Orange County's existing asset infrastructure was included as PDF map and will confirm if he can provide the data in a different format.
- CARS and/or Signal 4 Analytics will be utilized to collect safety data. Mr. Ford asked for the Steering Committee members to share any safety data that their agency collects.
- Incident management data is primarily managed by the freeway/expressway agencies. Mr. Ford asked the Steering Committee members to provide any incident management data that they collect.
  - Mr. Jamison commented that LYNX does not collect incident management data.

- o Mr. Eric Gordin asked if the data provided previously by the Florida's Turnpike was sufficient and Mr. Ford confirmed that it was.
- Mr. Ford is still looking for Seminole County, City of Orlando, and LYNX to provide Agency Data. At a minimum, looking for the organizational chart and contractual resources with the intent of assisting with resource planning and prioritization of needs in the future.
- The "*" beside Osceola, Orange, and Seminole County indicates that there are individual signal maintaining agencies within these jurisdictions. Mr. Ford requested for the County representatives to provide contact information for these agencies so he can reach out and request information, as needed.
  - o Mr. El-Assar confirmed that all cities within Orange County maintain their own signals. Mr. Charlie Wetzel shared that Seminole County maintains all the signals within the County. Mr. El-Assar shared that CFX maintains their own signals. Ms. Lindsey Giovinazzo shared that Osceola County maintains all the signals within the County.
  - o Mr. Jeremy Dilmore offered to provide a list of all signal maintaining agencies within the entire District.
  - o Mr. Hill asked how freight data is being addressed. Mr. Ford mentioned that freight will be addressed within the strategic intermodal system (SIS) plan but also asked the Steering Committee members to provide any freight information they have available. Mr. Dilmore mentioned that SR 436 and CR 423 are not identified as SIS facilities but are regional corridors of freight significance and stated that there are high volumes of freight activity on non-SIS roadways within the district.

INPUT ON TSM&O NEEDS

- Mr. Ford covered the definition of TSM&O needs and the FDOT TSM&O Strategy Guide which is a tool that provides multiple TSM&O strategies to address a given issue. A link to the tool is included in the presentation.
  - o Mr. Dilmore mentioned that it was created for the purpose of supporting PD&E projects and is required as part of a PD&E. The intent of the tool is a first level screening of strategies for arterial and multimodal roadways, with strategies detailed out based on cost. During the PD&E stage, the individual runs through the tool, coordinates with the maintaining agency, and brings the information back to FDOT to be used to develop new concepts. The guidebook may be used by other Districts, but it is not confirmed.
  - o Mr. Gordin noted that this is not applicable for the Florida's Turnpike so they developed their own guidebook for this purpose.
  - o Mr. El-Assar mentioned that the tool is specialized for ITS projects, but not intersection projects, and that intersections are not covered by RITSA either and would like to see intersection data added to the documentation information.

- o Mr. Akil Toussaint, Mr. El-Assar, Mr. Jamison, and Ms. Giovinazzo noted that they have not used this guidebook. Mr. Bryan Homayouni did not have any comments.
  - o Mr. Dilmore will provide a link to the JIRA page where logs of FDOT retiming, resurfacing, and widening projects are kept. It also includes a list of corridors where they can't solve the existing issue with a standard signal retiming.
- Mr. Ford asked for input on Operations Effectiveness.
  - o Mr. Ford mentioned that systems and technology, performance measurement, and collaboration are all items that will be considered in terms of this planning effort while organization and workforce, business process, and culture are more of an internal process that less consideration will be given to. These sections come directly from the capability and maturity model. Mr. Dilmore mentioned that the capability and maturity model were updated in 2014, 2017, and 2020. Mr. Ford asked the Steering Committee members if they found this to be a useful tool and assessment and if there were any takeaways that resonated with the group. Mr. Dilmore mentioned that the tool is most useful when people share honest truths because what matters most is the discussion and action items that come out of the process. Mr. Dilmore filled in this information on the region's behalf on scale updates.
  - o Mr. Hill mentioned that Metroplan can't comment on the system and technology section as it does not apply; however, Metroplan has made progress in all the other sections. Specifically, the culture has changed within Metroplan to now have many council members who now are champions of traffic incident management.
  - o Mr. Ford will send out the link for the 1-minute AASHTO assessment for each Steering Committee member to complete if desired.
  - o Mr. Ford asked the Steering Committee members to share an update on their agency's organization and workforce, in reference to TSM&O.
    - ▪ Mr. Gordin shared that the Florida's Turnpike has a new individual in their TSM&O position. They work in close partnership with planning and intermodal systems development. In terms of production, sometimes different groups take the lead on the TSM&O portion of a project and sometimes they work together. Overall, he feels they have a good handle on technology but could improve their business processes.
    - ▪ Mr. Toussaint is growing staff at the City and is looking for resources for training staff in TSM&O.
    - ▪ Mr. El-Assar has struggled to retain staff but has found success in hiring consultants to support TSM&O. The County is about to advertise a new union contract that has an increased pay structure for technicians.
    - ▪ Mr. Jamison shared that LYNX has longevity in staff but a very small number of staff (3).

- Mr. Dilmore mentioned they have champions in TSM&O and are looking to train design staff so that more individuals can share the workload.
- Mr. Wetzel shared that the County Board recently increased pay bands to be more competitive with private sector rates but that they're struggling to find individuals with experience in the traffic area. They've continually lost technicians to the private sector. They have the FDOT ICM program, which is an extension of County staff, and a retiming contract with support service components which has been successful.
- Ms. Giovinazzo shared that they are losing technicians to the private sector. TSM&O, and ITS, have historically not been a heavy emphasis at the County. Recently, though, the County has become more proactive and there is an uptick in consultants coordinating with the County during planning and design.
- Mr. Homayouni shared that their internal group is three (3) people in size with a stable internal culture and consultant support contracts. CFX has developed processes and platforms for employees, contractors, and inspectors to gain exposure to TSM&O via training manuals and courses.
- Mr. Ford shared that the CITE consortium offers online trainings through the University of Maryland and will provide a link. Mr. Ford also mentioned that succession planning, and collaborating with various departments, are very important items to consider.
- Mr. Hill is a graduate of the TSM&O Academy, as well as Mr. Dilmore, and encouraged others to apply for this program.
- Mr. Ford turned to the topic of Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) as a case study under Operations Effectiveness.
  - Mr. Ford asked Mr. Dilmore, with his experience deploying an ICM system, if the Department felt like they excel at some sections more than others (leftmost columns). Mr. Dilmore shared that he felt they do a good job with inter-agency cooperation, data fusion, and providing funding opportunities.
  - Mr. Dilmore provided an update on the ICM system where he mentioned that they do a good job of coordinating efforts with express lanes, they could improve upon connecting to LYNX and understanding how ICM impacts LYNX routes, and a challenge they run into is getting data from the I-4 corridor, along with performance management (impossible to provide a true benefit cost analysis as if the system wasn't there previously).
- Mr. Ford closed the discussion by mentioning the RITSA ICM Service Package.
  - Mr. Ford provided an example of the current RITSA which appears to be missing traffic signal maintaining agencies. Mr. Dilmore explained that the City of Apopka, City of Winter Garden, and the Cities within Orange County are not included as FDOT operates the ATMS. He also noted that Brevard County

has two agencies breaking off into their own ATMS and are currently working through how to modify the architecture.

LOOKING AHEAD

- Next Steering Committee Meeting #3 will gather input on the Regional ITS Architecture (RITSA).

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/UPDATES

- Mr. Wood asked the group for any final comments.
- Mr. Gordin shared that the Florida's Turnpike has a separate RITSA as they are located within multiple regions.
- Mr. Homayouni mentioned that CFX needs to be included in the ICM diagram of the RITSA.
- Mr. Toussaint, Mr. El-Assar, Mr. Jamison, Mr. Dilmore, Mr. Wetzel, and Ms. Giovinazzo did not have any comments.
- Mr. Hill notes that he will be giving an update at the November/December rounds of Metroplan committee meetings.

NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

- Steering Committee # 3 will be held on January 24th or the 31st from 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM. Mr. Wood will send a follow-up email to discuss availability for potential meeting dates. If members are unable to attend, please have an alternate attend in your place.
  - o Mr. Gordin confirmed he is available.
  - o Mr. Dilmore mentioned that these dates need to be cross-referenced with TRB.

ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Wood asked for any final questions from attendees. After no additional comments, Mr. Hill thanked those in attendance for their participation.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #3

Meeting Summary

DATE & TIME: Tuesday, January 24, 2023, at 1:30 PM

LOCATION: MetroPlan Orlando Board Room – David L. Grovdahl Board Room
250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32801

MEETING SUMMARY:

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Introductions
II. Public Comments
III. Master Plan and Steering Committee Schedule
IV. Review of Steering Committee Meeting #2
- Meeting Summary
- Existing Conditions Review – Final Draft
V. Needs Assessment Status
- Summary of key points and interviews
- Follow-up questions
VI. Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Architecture (RITSA)
- Project-based vs. System-based approach
- Project Inventory
- Future Requests
VII. Look Ahead – Prioritization Support Matrix
VIII. Steering Committee Member Comments/Updates
IX. Next Steps and Action Items
- Future Meeting Dates
X. Adjournment

MEETING ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Bryan Homayouni	Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Doug Jamison	LYNX
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Lindsey Giovinazzo	Osceola County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Others in Attendance	
Mr. Alex Trauger	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Cynthia Lambert	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Mike Vaudo	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Simone Burns	Kimley-Horn

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

III. MASTER PLAN AND STEERING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the project schedule for the upcoming Steering Committee meetings.
- The schedule was displayed on the screen and there were no comments.

IV. REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #2

- Mr. Wood went over the handout packet from Steering Committee Meeting #2 which included the meeting summary and existing conditions review.
- Meeting Summary for Steering Committee Meeting #2
  - This draft document was provided to Steering Committee members prior to the meeting to review.
  - No comments were provided. The members were invited to send comments, if any, by the end of the week (January 27, 2023).
- Existing Conditions Review
  - The draft Existing Conditions Review was updated based on previous stakeholder comments. This document will be revisited before it's included in the master plan documentation.
  - Mr. Hazem El-Assar asked if Orange County's maps had been updated to which Mr. Wood confirmed that he believed they had been updated.

V. NEEDS ASSESSMENT STATUS

- Mr. Wood thanked the attendees for their involvement in the needs assessment interviews. The assessments with Orange County, Osceola County, Seminole County, FDOT, and CFX have been completed. The interviews with Florida's Turnpike Enterprise, City of Orlando, and LYNX are forthcoming.
- Mr. Jonathan Ford provided an overview of the needs assessment interviews. The interviews included a programmatic review of each agency's TSM&O program which followed the FHWA capability and maturity model process. The interviews included a review of the six "focus areas" which included business processes, systems and technology, performance measurement, organization and workforce, collaboration, and culture.
  - Mr. Hill asked how the "current situation" and "desired outcomes" were developed in the table (slide 12). Mr. Ford answered that those came from the "framework" and are very broad, non-agency specific, terms.
  - There were no additional comments on the needs assessment.
- Mr. Ford reviewed the needs assessment themes, existing conditions inventory, planned project review, and needs standards and benchmarking (slide 13).
- Needs Assessment Themes - During the needs assessment interviews, certain "themes" were identified which included infrastructure and projects, strategies and services, and agency and organization.
  - Mr. Ford asked if any additional themes should be added to the list to which there were no comments.
- Existing Conditions Inventory – This effort has been completed and comments have been incorporated. Stakeholders should reach out if they have any additional comments regarding this document. This is a living document and will be a component of the master plan documentation.

- Planned Project Review – Mr. Ford shared that this information was collected via available documents such as the RITSA and capital improvement programs work programs. He asked the stakeholders to provide any available information on planned projects to the team.
    - o Mr. El-Assar commented that the Orange County lists of projects on the RITSA are outdated. Mr. Ford shared that a review of each agency's RITSA will be completed (regarding projects and agreements) and updated accordingly.
    - o Ms. Lindsey Giovinazzo asked if she should only denote funded projects versus unfunded ones. Mr. Ford answered that the intent is to develop an all-encompassing list of desired projects, funded and unfunded, with the intent to identify new funding sources to assist with funding needs.
- Needs Standards & Benchmarking – This information will be used to define the TSM&O strategic network for the region and prioritize projects. The three categories for prioritizing the network are congestion or mobility, safety, and transit use.
    - o Mr. El Assar asked what tools are being used to develop the prioritization of needs list as he hopes to get a comprehensive list of all available tools. Mr. Ford shared that the primary items considered during the development of this list will be the stakeholders' feedback, the RITSA update, and regional projects. A scoring system will be established, and projects will be prioritized based on various metrics (V/C ratio, population density, multimodal, and signal density).
    - o Mr. Doug Jamison shared that the three categories are intertwined.
    - o Mr. Hill mentioned that typically we're considering vehicles in these prioritizations when we need to consider all modes (including bicyclists and pedestrians). Mr. Ford agreed that available data is typically prioritized for the vehicles, not the other users.
        - ▪ Mr. El-Assar mentioned that Mr. Jeremy Dilmore has offered to give an overview of the FDOT tools available for use by each agency (i.e. Wejo data) and asked where this demonstration/overview should take place. He shared that this data can be used for capacity and TSM&O strategies. Mr. Hill felt that a committee meeting would be the best place for this to occur.
        - ▪ Mr. Hill brought up equity and shared that we need to be mindful that low-income areas aren't "connected" and that their information isn't being captured. Mr. Alex Trauger shared that MetroPlan recently used Street Light data (travel time data that is location based utilizing cellular data) and Wejo probe data and ran into similar issues of certain communities not being accounted for in the data sets. Some of these data collection services are being diminished because of this issue. Mr. Ford questioned if we also need to consider low tech solutions for data collection to ensure all communities are accounted for. Mr. El-Assar was concerned about project schedule delays due to data collection lead time.

- Mr. Ford noted that work zone management wasn't considered in the interviews and asked for agency feedback regarding this topic.
    - Ms. Giovinazzo shared that the County would be interested as they're running into issues during construction where they're unaware of the construction conditions until it's already a problem.
    - Mr. Charlie Wetzel mentioned they put it on the contractor. He also shared that county roads have lane restrictions. He also said if there are any during the day, they keep an eye on it. Typically, the County stays out of it. Mr. Ford asked if they've ever investigated changing signal timings prior to changes. Mr. Wetzel mentioned that if something comes up when construction is occurring, they'll address it as needed. They don't typically investigate in advance of construction.
    - Mr. Bryan Homayouni shared that they account for this in their work plan (specifically, smart work zone applications). They are actively looking at different options to improve the data being released publicly, the line of communication, and the data they're collecting. Currently, CFX is spending upwards of $40M monthly on construction costs regarding large trucks entering their highways. They are looking into a smart work zone application which detects large trucks trying to enter and notifies mainline vehicles before the truck enters with a warning zone sign. The other side is figuring out how to document and share lane closure information with the traveling public. They're currently looking at different solutions and applications for formatting the data. FDOT is piloting a project (lane closure notification system) of an application that communicates closure information into Waze/Google Maps, which CFX is interested in leveraging for lane closure management. There is also the smart work zone application through Central Office FDOT (queue warning through work zone).
    - Mr. El-Assar mentioned that Orange County is interested but they also put this on the contractor. They are also looking for best practices to incorporate into future procurement. Mr. Homayouni mentioned that FDOT organizes a statewide training for this purpose.
    - Mr. Akil Toussaint shared they are interested in different applications for work zone management. When contractors submit their maintenance of traffic plans, the City relies heavily on inspectors to confirm its operating according to plan. They do get requests for lane closures and to modify signal timings.
    - Mr. Hill shared that sometimes low technology options are required, maintenance of traffic needs to be considered by all groups, and that proper communication is key (specifically, between divisions within agencies). He shared a personal recent example related to this topic.

VI. REGIONAL INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE (RITSA)

- Mr. Ford shared that the RITSA has a project-based approach versus a system-based approach. He then asked the stakeholders to review their section and provide input regarding their project inventory and any additional needs/requests.
- Orange County
  - Mr. El-Assar noted that the Orange County ATMS Phase 4 is complete and several projects are not listed, such as the countywide signal cabinet upgrades, International Drive adaptative control system, FEMA signal mast arm upgrades, and an FDOT project that is upgrading Bluetooth readers to RSUs for the region.
  - The County has been using adaptive control since 2000 but is currently reviewing new technology related to the adaptive control system. They are the primary maintenance agency for traffic signals in the County and remotely maintain signals for CFX. They have eight dynamic message signs (DMS) within the County that are no longer operational and need to be upgraded. Regarding incident management along I-4 and the expressways, the County supports FDOT and helps to implement the detour plans.
- Seminole County
  - Mr. Wetzel asked for the title of the Greater Orlando "Signal Priority and Preemption" project to be reworded to "Transit Signal Priority"; "Bluetooth Expansion" reworded to "Bluetooth Expansion/Upgrade"; "DMS and CCTV Replacement" reworded to "DMS and CCTV Replacement/Upgrade"; and "Seminole Countywide SPaT Deployment" reworded to "Seminole Countywide Connected Vehicle," which is going to push out safety messages (SPaT, traveler information, etc.).
  - The County does have a new potential emergency preemption project with public safety group. The FDOT Active Arterial Management System (along US 17/92) and FDOT Integrated Corridor Management System are ongoing, in perpetuity. FDOT I-4 BTU Segments 3/4 are forthcoming. The County plans to use the same architecture for the adaptive traffic signal system expansion. The County's Bluetooth Expansion (upgrades to RSU combo units) is ongoing. The ATMS phase 3 project is complete and was only focused on a DMS expansion. The County operates and maintains the DMS signs within the County and displays mostly SunGuide information.
  - No changes are needed to roles and responsibilities.
- Osceola County
  - Ms. Giovinazzo mentioned that the August notes haven't translated to the updated RITSA. The "Traffic Operations Center" name should be titled "Traffic Management Center." The FDOT Active Arterial Management System and the Regional Integrated Corridor Management System are systems where the County integrated with SunGuide and the District helps with arterial roadway management. It's not a project but an ongoing partnership/service. FDOT

District Five I-4 FRAME is still ongoing. FDOT I-4 BTU is ongoing. Greater Orlando signal priority TSP is almost complete. Osceola County ATMS Expansion is always ongoing, and the County is currently working on a couple of projects for which they've filed out 4P applications.

- o The County is looking to upgrade controllers to Vector Next (software upgrade). The County is going to be installing an adaptive system along Osceola Parkway from Dyer Blvd to Florida's Turnpike in FY 2024/25 (programmed). This project does not have any involvement from Orange County. They have constructed ATMS 4 and have been working on a 4P application for up to ATMS 9. The County is completing a pilot program for connected vehicle technology and working through the testing plan at nine locations, three located along US 17-92.
- o Even if FDOT initially funds it, the County operates and maintains the DMS signs within the County, adheres to the FDOT library for messaging, and displays travel times.
- o No changes are needed to roles and responsibilities.
- City of Orlando
  - o Mr. Toussaint was unfamiliar with and will investigate the status of the ATTAIN Central Florida, City of Orlando Airport Traveler Information, Parking Management, and Travel Time System projects. The City is currently working on the ongoing ATMS Upgrade, CCTV Expansion, DMS Expansion, Multimodal CV and Pedestrian Safety Solutions projects. All others are FDOT-led.
  - o Mr. Toussaint shared that the City has been approached to complete a pilot project partnering with Beep and FDOT.
  - o Mr. Ford mentioned he would investigate breaking out projects from services.
  - o Mr. Hill asked if LYMMO is covered under the City or LYNX. Mr. Jamison shared that the vehicles are covered under LYNX, but the City covers the infrastructure (including signalization).
  - o Mr. Ford shared that the current RITSA update includes a SunRail project, the TMC Citywide project, and the Smart Corridor Technologies project. Mr. Toussaint was unfamiliar with these projects.
  - o A discussion was had regarding the Greenway Program, which is part of ATTAIN and is associated with PedSafe and the SunStore program. However, it's also the name for an initiative associated with the arterial management system, coordination of traffic signals, and data collection. Therefore, this name needs to be clarified.
  - o No changes are needed to roles and responsibilities.
- CFX
  - o Mr. Homayouni shared that some items need to be removed, and some need to be modified. An example is the FDOT I-4 BTU Segments, which don't apply to the CFX system. He wasn't certain about the CCTV/DMS/VDS/Tolling project but thought it might be a catch-all that is applicable as they always have ongoing ITS projects.

- o The part-time shoulder project currently under construction will need to be added and has a lot of interagency roles and responsibilities. Need to add the smart work zone project. Continually completing life cycle replacements of transportation technology with five to six ongoing ITS projects at one time.
  - o CFX owns, operates, and maintains its own DMS.
- Florida's Turnpike and FDOT were skipped as a representative was not in attendance. Mr. Trauger believes they are missing some initiatives in their list (related to wrong-way driving). Mr. Ford confirmed that coordination with the Turnpike and FDOT will be completed to cover this information.
- LYNX
  - o Mr. Jamison shared that the Virtual Travel Planning Center is a catch-all to utilize the software for users to manage their own trips. He was unaware of what the Private Bike Share Equipment entailed and would not be a LYNX element. Regarding the LYNX AV Concept, he shared that LYNX was working on a pilot project for Concept of Operations that is moving from a concept to a pilot project (demonstration). Mr. Ford asked what their overarching goals associated with the pilot were. Mr. Jamison shared that the Concept of Operations evaluated how it fits within the system, how much it costs, investigated if it meets rules and regulations, and determined customers' needs. Fare Integration would be integration between LYNX and other transit providers. Additionally, they are looking to upgrade the fare system this year into open payments (visa, wearables, etc.). The Signal Priority and Preemption and TSP/CAV could be renamed "TSP," which covers the entire project without separating the two. Website Integration could be combined with Website, which is where a lot of the ridership data comes from and is a catch-all that the data is there and available to be used.
  - o For the roles and responsibilities, he noted that they are missing emergency support and integration with the emergency operations center. These lines of communication are open between LYNX and all organizations.
- Mr. Hill asked how micro transit will be reflected. Mr. Ford shared that an additional consideration area can be added to capture this element.
- Mr. Hill asked about electric vehicle support, which is a jurisdictional area, and if that should also go into an additional considerations group. Mr. Ford mentioned this is something that can be considered.
- Mr. Wetzel asked if they will have to go through this same process with the RITSA process, to which Mr. Ford shared that he will follow up with Iteris to see if we can use our final document to guide the RITSA update. He is following up with the RITSA team to make sure our structure of the information is correct so it is useable.
- Mr. Jamison mentioned that Brightline might need to be captured in the RITSA since SunRail is captured, and it could impact stakeholder agencies via preemption of traffic signals.
- Mr. Hill brought up the SunRail issues at certain crossing locations in the City of Longwood. Mr. Wetzel suggested that having an AVL on the SunRail trains (a non-

tech workaround) may be a solution. Mr. Trauger mentioned they'll be coordinating with Seminole County and the City of Longwood regarding the Ronald Reagan Blvd and SR 434 intersection.
- Mr. Ford shared that the purpose of this exercise is to ensure this information is useful to the stakeholders and that, hopefully, it will guide the RITSA update this summer. Moving forward, we'll distinguish between a project and a service.
  - Inventory elements are pieces of a system that support the elements – CCTV, signal equipment

VII. LOOK AHEAD – PRIORITIZATION SUPPORT MATRIX

- Next Steering Committee Meeting #4 will be focused on the prioritization approach.

VIII. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/UPDATES

- Mr. Wood asked the group for any final comments.
- Mr. Hill noted that he would give an update on January 25th to the Community Advisory Committee, another update at the Transportation Advisory Committee on January 27th, and the following Thursday at the Municipal Advisory Committee.

IX. NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

- Steering Committee #4 will be held on March 28th from 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM. Mr. Wood will send a follow-up email to discuss availability for potential meeting dates. If members cannot attend, an alternate should participate in their place.
  - Ms. Giovinazzo and Mr. Wetzel confirmed they were available.

X. ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Wood asked for any final questions from attendees. After no additional comments, Mr. Hill and Mr. Trauger thanked those in attendance for participating.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS
MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING #4

DATE & TIME: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 at 1:30 PM

LOCATION: Zoom Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY:

AGENDA

I.   Introductions
II.   Public Comments
III.   Master Plan and Steering Committee Schedule
IV.   Review of Steering Committee Meeting #3
   - Meeting Summary
   - Draft Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum
   - Draft Regional ITS Architecture (RITSA) Technical Memorandum
V.   Prioritization Support Status
   - General Approach and Framework
   - Potential Criteria
   - Discussion
VI.   Look Ahead – Project Prioritization
VII.   Steering Committee Member Comments/Updates
VIII. Next Steps and Action Items
IX.   Adjournment

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Bryan Homayouni	Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Jeremy Dilmore	Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Lindsey Giovinazzo	Osceola County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Others in Attendance	
Mr. Alex Trauger	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Taylor Laurent	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Cynthia Lambert	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Lisa Smith	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Virginia Whittington	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Slade Downs	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Filip Toth	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Kathrin Tellez	Fehr & Peers
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Mike Vaudo	Kimley-Horn

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
- Mr. Hill provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Mike Vaudo provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

III. MASTER PLAN AND STEERING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

- Mr. Vaudo provided an overview of the project schedule for the upcoming Steering Committee meetings.
- The schedule was displayed on the screen.

IV. REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #3

- Mr. Jonathan Ford went over the handout packet from Steering Committee Meeting #3 which included the meeting summary, draft needs assessment technical memorandum, and RITSA.
- Meeting Summary
  - The draft document was provided to Steering Committee members to review and comment. There were no comments on the meeting summary #3.
- Draft Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum
  - In the process of drafting the technical memorandum based on the on-going and completed needs assessment meetings.
- RITSA
  - This effort includes completing an update to the RITSA based on provided information from the steering committee.
  - Mr. Bryan Homayouni asked for clarification on the intent of the RITSA update as historically agencies have made their updates through coordination with FDOT. Mr. Hill and Mr. Ford shared that the purpose is to confirm and provide recommendations to FDOT to be used when completing their formal update.
  - Mr. Jeremy Dilmore reminded the group that you must provide completed documentation to Iteris to have an update made to the RITSA and that typically updates are made to the statewide architecture between mid to late November.

V. RELATED ACTIVITIES AND TOPICS

- Mr. Hill shared an update on other plans and programs being completed by MetroPlan Orlando which includes the following:
  - Active Transportation Plan - Ms. Taylor Laurent (project manager) shared an overview of the plan. Ms. Katherin Tellez is the consultant PM and Mr. Slade Downs is the deputy PM.

- o Safe Streets for All Grant – MetroPlan Orlando's application was accepted and was awarded 3.8 million dollars for the region which includes Orange, Osceola, and Seminole County as well as 18 local plans.
  - o FHWA Emerging Technology – Leverage investments previously made in pedestrian safety utilizing the ATTAIN grant and PedSafe work to improve safety at intersections.
  - o Accessibility for Vulnerable Populations – How can we improve accessibility for audibly challenged individuals at intersections?
  - o Digital Roadway Infrastructure - Mr. Hill is attending a workshop this week where he hopes to find out how we can leverage data being developed on the private side and how can the MPOs be involved at a local level.

VI. PRIORITIZATION SUPPORT MATRIX STATUS

- Mr. Ford provided an overview on the framework for the TSM&O Master Plan which includes the goals and objectives, existing conditions, needs assessment, prioritization, strategies and funding, and action plan.
- Mr. Ford then covered the approach and considerations when developing the prioritization criteria which will aid in developing the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The initial recommendations were primarily based on the rubric developed through the Central Florida Alliance for TSM&O evaluation as well as the MetroPlan Orlando's ITS Master Plan.
- Mr. Ford covered the elements on how the projects will be prioritized. This effort will include a review of programmed versus planned projects, review of the gap analysis performed during the needs assessment, on-system versus off-system categorization, as well as input from each of the maintaining agencies on the prioritized list. This will also take into consideration the MTP and Prioritized Project List (PPL) evaluation criteria, the Central Florida MPO Alliance TSM&O Project evaluation rubric, the ITS Master Plan prioritization criteria, and other factors and themes. Mr. Hill shared that they are currently refining the Central Florida MPO Alliance TSM&O project evaluation rubric for ranking of regional TSM&O projects.
- Mr. Ford covered the five common themes of the prioritization criteria: safety, reliability and performance, investment and economy, access and connectivity, and health and environment. Mr. Hazem El-Assar commented that consideration for the weight, parameters, and metrics of the criteria being developed should be discussed. Mr. Ford agreed and noted that the intention is to do this during the next steering committee meeting.
- Safety
  - o Mr. El-Assar agreed with using crash rate as a metric but recommended replacing fatalities and serious injuries and bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the KABCO injury classification scale and that the evacuation route designation shouldn't be considered within the safety criteria. Mr. Vaudo shared that it was included under Safety based on the MTP/PPL criteria. Mr.

Alex Trauger shared that in the MTP/PPL, this criterion was included under the safety and security criteria to capture security and emergency response data. Mr. El-Assar recommended moving it to be part of the reliability criteria. Ms. Lindsey Giovinazzo shared that evacuation routes should fall under the safety criteria once they're in effect but otherwise could be considered under the reliability criteria prior to when it's enacted. Mr. Ford shared that evacuation routes will be evaluated under both criteria to determine the impact prior to selecting the criteria it is placed under.

- Reliability and Performance
    - Mr. El-Assar recommended to change the name from "fiber optic presence" to "end user communication presence" to not limit it to only fiber so that we're not limiting ourselves to primarily urban areas. Mr. Ford shared that this will be considered.
    - Mr. Hill asked to include "freight" along with the "auto" designation under "travel time reliability". Mr. Trauger shared that it's a federal performance measure applicable to the state highway system. Mr. Ford noted that historically these vehicles were considered based on the percent of heavy vehicles along a roadway but that we could utilize the RITIS application to evaluate the travel times as well. Mr. Ford noted this change will be made.
    - Mr. El-Assar shared that the "volume to capacity" ratio is outdated and that we should consider using "average delay" for the intersection as this is the metric that the Highway Capacity Manual uses for level of service.
    - Mr. Homayouni asked if it would make sense to add "interconnect-ability" to capture the connections between fiber and wireless, connection between agencies. Mr. Ford shared that this is considered under the "fiber optic presence" as well as during the gap analysis.
    - Mr. Hill shared that based on the Central Florida MPO Alliance TSM&O Project evaluation rubric, over 60% of projects are located within MetroPlan Orlando thus we're not capturing the need for projects within the rural communities. Additionally, we may need to consider building projects that may not rank high on their own, as a single project, but if bundled would rank high. Mr. Ford agreed that certain projects could be bundled.
- Investment and Economy
    - Mr. Trauger cautioned use of the "percentage of visitor traffic" dataset from the 2018 FDOT visitor study has not been updated since when developed and replicating the original FDOT analysis may not be possible.
    - Mr. El-Assar agreed it's important to consider "park and ride locations" but that Orange County does not have many existing locations at this time. Mr. Homayouni recommended updating the term to be "multimodal hubs" and Mr. El-Assar offered up the term "transit centers" to make sure SunRail is accounted for. Ms. Giovinazzo asked for clarification regarding the park and ride lot service to which Mr. Trauger shared that the park and ride lots are still in operation (four existing lots existing within MetroPlan) and are owned and

operated by FDOT. Mr. Trauger and Mr. Dilmore agreed that if park and ride lots are being considered, other intermodal transit uses like SunRail stations and key transit super stops should be considered. LYNX van pool will not be captured.

- Access and Connectivity
    - o Mr. Vaudo shared that they have been, and will continue to be, in coordination with Ms. Laurent's team regarding how the TSM&O Master Plan and the Active Transportation Plan work in tandem.
- Health and Environment
    - o Mr. El-Assar had no comments on the criteria but reiterated that we need to discuss how categories will be weighted.
    - o Ms. Cynthia Lambert shared that MetroPlan is going to be using new federal index/tools, including the historically disadvantaged data tool that is planned to be released in Spring 2024, for their Equity Plan that we might be able to leverage. Mr. El-Assar asked if the tools mentioned would be in addition to the criteria listed currently or a replacement to these to which Ms. Lambert responded that she wasn't certain at this time. Mr. Ford confirmed that evaluation of the tool will be made once it is released. Mr. Hill noted that these new federal index/tools will be utilized in the next MTP. Ms. Laurent confirmed that the update to the 2050 MTP will include discussions on how to weight projects on the different criteria being developed as part of this effort. The weighting will be based on the type of project by understanding the needs and which plan it would be prioritized as (TSM&O Master Plan or the Active Transportation Plan). Mr. Trauger shared that they will also survey groups/individuals to gather opinions on the actual prioritization. Mr. El-Assar asked for confirmation that this list of prioritized projects will be used to guide the MTP update to which Mr. Hill agreed.
    - o Mr. Dilmore added that LYNX has designated some routes as critical routes based upon utilization and should be considered under the "express route" criteria. Additionally, that consideration should be made to ensure we are not double counting certain criteria.
    - o Mr. Trauger shared that all the criteria are based on current conditions and doesn't consider future growth opportunities. Mr. Ford confirmed that he is evaluating additional criteria to prioritize future growth. Mr. Dilmore shared that while identifying needs can be completed currently, it's much harder to identify future strategies to address the needs because technologies are ever evolving. Mr. Hill asked Mr. Dilmore his opinion on the question "if the project was identified now, or in the future, do you think it could be applied to the current criteria" to which Mr. Dilmore replied he believes it can be accomplished because most of the criteria is based on identifying needs. Mr. El-Assar stated that for the Prioritized Project List we must consider specific projects.

VII. LOOK AHEAD – PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

- Mr. Ford shared that the next steps will be to develop a scoring criteria approach, finalize the list of projects for scoring, score the different projects, and review the approach and results at Steering Committee Meeting #5.

VIII. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/UPDATES

- Mr. Hill shared that the Orange County needs assessment and gaps have been provided to Orange County and asked if other agencies will be receiving a similar document to which Mr. Ford confirmed that they will.
- Mr. Hill shared that he's going to update the Transportation Advisory Committee on April 28th with today's discussion/topic and will provide the additional MetroPlan committees an update in May.

IX. NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

- Mr. Vaudo shared that the tentative date for Steering Committee #5 is June 27th from 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM. A follow up email will be sent to the Steering Committee to confirm availability for this next meeting.
    - Mr. Charlie Wetzel and Mr. El-Assar confirmed they were available.
    - Mr. Wetzel requested that Mr. Hill provide the MPO Alliance TSM&O Project evaluation rubric and how did you weigh different factors. Mr. Hill shared that it will be distributed to the group but while recognizing that it is a draft document.

X. ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Ford asked for any final questions from attendees. After no additional comments, Mr. Hill thanked those in attendance for participating.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5

DATE & TIME: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 at 1:30 PM

LOCATION: MetroPlan Orlando Board Room – David L. Grovdahl Board Room
250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32801

PUBLIC ACCESS: To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone, please use this link:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86974905295?pwd=YW5scHNpeW5XRit0SjFOMEFEOU0xUT09

Passcode: 302128

To dial in, please see the calendar item for this meeting:
https://metroplanorlando.org/meetings/tsmo-master-plan-steering-committee-meeting-08-08-23/

MEETING SUMMARY:

AGENDA

  I.   Introductions
 II.   Public Comments
III.   Master Plan and Steering Committee Schedule
 IV.   Review of Steering Committee Meeting #4
- Meeting Summary
- Draft Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum
- Draft Regional ITS Architecture (RITSA) Technical Memorandum
  V.   Prioritization Support Status
- Approach and Framework
- Criteria and Weighting
- Pilot Prioritization – Example Projects
 VI.   Look Ahead – Draft TSM&O Master Plan
VII.   Steering Committee Member Comments/Updates
VIII.   Next Steps
 IX.   Adjournment

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Gary Yeager	Osceola County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Mr. Doug Jamison	LYNX
Others in Attendance	
Mr. Alex Trauger	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Rachel Frederick	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Slade Downs	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Mike Vaudo	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Shayna Eaton	Kimley-Horn

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

III. MASTER PLAN AND STEERING COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the project schedule for the upcoming Steering Committee meeting.
- The schedule was displayed on the screen.

IV. REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #4

- Mr. Wood and Mr. Jonathan Ford highlighted the main items discussed as part of Steering Committee Meeting #4 which included a summary of the previous steering committee meeting, the needs assessment technical memorandum, and the RITSA review technical memorandum.
- Requested all comments on these three (3) documents be provided to Kimley-Horn by August 21, 2023.
- Mr. Charlie Wetzel asked for clarification on what has been updated. Mr. Ford noted that the modifications include highlighting emerging technologies and necessary connections for data flow and information sharing to support the identified service packages.
- Mr. Ford also noted that each of the agency's comments will be added as an attachment, or included in the RITSA technical memorandum, for documentation purposes.

Mr. Wood shared that coordination with the active transportation plan is on-going and we're evaluating opportunities for overlap within the prioritization of these two plans.

Mr. Hill shared that there has been a couple meetings with the active transportation plan project team, and the TSM&O master plan team, to ensure we are working in parallel. A couple of weeks ago, the team also attended a workshop for the active transportation plan where we evaluated different projects which could be deployed with the goal being to ensure that what is included in the TSM&O master plan can also be accommodated for in the active transportation plan.

V. PRIORITIZATION SUPPORT STATUS

- Mr. Wood covered an overview of the discussion topics which included the approach and framework and the prioritization criteria and weighting.
- Mr. Ford went over the criteria and weighting for each masterplan goal to help prioritize the projects and strategies.
    - Safety – Completed a five-year review of crash data on a per mile basis with additional points given if the crash related in a serious injury or fatality, or with a bicycle or pedestrian crash.
    - Relativity and Performance – Based on travel times, fiber optic presence, volume to capacity ratio derived through the regional model, and evacuation route designation for the roadway.
        - Mr. Hazem El-Assar noted that fiber optic presence is not necessarily an indication of a "need" as fiber is not always installed based on the context of the corridor such as in rural area where wireless communication is better suited.
    - Investment and Economy – Utilized the MetroPlan data viewer to develop values for Commercial Vehicle Traffic, Metro Plan Truck Bottleneck, and

Multimodal Hub/Regional Activity Centers (airports, regional malls, Brightline stations, etc). Utilized the Central Florida MPO Alliance TSM&O scoring rubric to determine if there was a regional need for the project. Reviewed truck parking locations knowing that this is a focus of the FDOT.

- o Access and Connectivity - LYNX System Headway, Express Route/Critical Routes, Stop Density, consideration for proximity to Sun Rail Stations/Crossings, and giving priority for projects included on the Active Transportation Corridor once the active transportation plan prioritization is finalized (no points currently awarded until the active transportation plan is complete).
  - ▪ Mr. Doug Jamison asked for clarification on what "Sun Rail Stations/Crossings" stands for and Mr. Ford shared that this is regarding proximity to the combination of station and crossings.
- o Health & Environment –Consider Public Health Indicator Rates and Intensity and Proximity utilizing the Environmental Justice 40 tool to ensure equity throughout.
- • Mr. Wood then opened the floor for comments on the criteria and weighting.
  - o Safety – No comments
  - o Reliability and Performance –
    - ▪ Mr. El-Assar asked if we could change "fiber optic presence" to "communication presence" as the County's current approach is that fiber is installed if the signal spacing is less than ½ mile but over the ½ mile distance the recommendation is to utilize cellular/wireless. Mr. Ford confirmed that no other agencies have a similar approach.
    - ▪ Mr. Yeager asked for clarification on the fiber weighting. Mr. Ford shared that the intent is to prioritize projects so we can maximize potential opportunities to use the infrastructure. Using this approach, we are losing the ability to identify the need for fiber in general and will investigate adjusting the weighting and scoring into two components.
    - ▪ Mr. Hill agreed we need to change the title to "communications" and recommended to break the current section into two separate sections and to re-evaluate the points for each: one for fiber and one for wireless.
    - ▪ Mr. El-Assar stated that the weighting should be on a case-by-case basis and that the 8 points for no communication should be removed.
    - ▪ The final decision was made to re-title the section as "communication presence" and allot 0 points if there is no fiber within the project limits, 4 points if there are existing communications adjacent to the project limits (within ½ mile), and 8 points if there are existing fiber presence within the project limits with the opportunity to expand.
  - o Investment and Economy
    - ▪ Mr. Wetzel asked for clarification on the truck parking scale for points. Mr. Ford explained that the allocated number of points are based on

proximity of the truck parking facility to the project corridor. If the project corridor is located within 2.5 miles of an existing truck parking facility, the maximum number of points is allotted because there's an opportunity to implement various TSM&O improvements to support the parking facility. If the project corridor is located between 2.5 to 5 miles of an existing truck parking facility, 1.5 points is allotted. If the project corridor is located greater than 5 miles to an existing truck parking facility, 1.0 point is allotted as there is less opportunity to implement various TSM&O improvements to support the parking facility.

- Mr. Hill stated that the regional project criteria is driven by the strategic intermodal system plan and the purpose is to identify projects that support that system (i.e. hubs, corridors, connectors).
- Mr. Wood recommended revising the truck parking location logic to state "closer to facility, the greater the points".

o Access and Connectivity

- Mr. Jamison wants to ensure that the LYNX on-demand transit system called NeighborLink is covered within the current prioritization criteria and scale. That when scoring, this is considered as the maximum amount of access points and not considered ineligible. This system runs beyond a fixed route and is a point-to-point system, from one address to another address, with no set bus stops.
- Mr. Jamison also requested the criteria to be clearly defined that this only considers public access and not private access (university shuttles, neighborhood circulators, specific population transportation, etc).
- Mr. Jamison stated that he believes the current criteria supports and benefits the LYNX system because it prioritizes an investment, such as transit signal priority, which supports transit and connectivity in the area through enhancing the entire existing transit system.
- Mr. Alex Trauger suggested evaluating both station proximity, and ridership at stations, to support transit routes in areas that have higher transit usage. MetroPlan completed this analysis previously as part of the critical sidewalk gap methodology and has this data readily available to be utilized as needed.
- Mr. Wood recommended, and Mr. El-Assar agreed, that the Priority Active Transportation Plan criteria will be changed from 0 points to "TBD" until the Active Transportation Plan is completed.
- Mr. Jamison asked for clarification on the "Express Route/Critical Routes" criteria as he was concerned that Orange Blossom Trail or International Drive would not qualify, even though there are a substantial number of bus stops and a large number of people utilizing transit, but that I-4 would qualify even though there are no bus stops. Mr. Ford shared that this criteria will consider the efficiency of moving

               people quickly through a corridor identified during the gap analysis. It will consider the intersections and ramps that limited access facilities tie into but it will not consider limited access facilities.

- Mr. Wetzel noted that "SunRail Stations/Crossings" criteria should be modified to "closer to facility, the greater the points".

     o Health and Environment

- Mr. Ford shared that these come from the resources made available through USDOT and the Environmental Justice initiative and give consideration for disadvantaged populations and public health indicators, which is outside of the consideration of the Active Transportation Plan.
- Mr. Jamison recommended including "Justice 40" terminology to clarify which exactly was considered.

     o Mr. Wood summarized the comments (noted above) to be incorporated in the criteria to which no one objected.

- Pilot Prioritization – Example Projects
  - Mr. Wood asked the committee members to provide a full summary of their comments on their respective lists, and the results of applying the criteria and scoring, after this meeting. Mr. Ford clarified that the projects included on the list come out of the existing conditions and needs assessments reviews.
  - Mr. Wetzel commented that the limits for the SR 46 fiber project should be from Lake Mary Blvd to CR 426 and CR 426 to Volusia County line. Mr. Ford shared that he would follow up with Mr. Wetzel to confirm the modifications required.
  - Mr. Ford stated that the "local agency" column is in regard to the location of the project and is not indicative of responsibility. Mr. Wood recommended changing the label to be "City Location" to make it clear it's not talking about who is managing/maintaining.
  - Mr. Wetzel requested for the "Gap Type" category to be expanded to include signalized intersection (ex: IMC, Cabinets), ITS (ex: CCTV, DMS), CAV (ex: cutting edge or future strategies which could also be applied to a corridor or intersection) to closely follow the gap analysis criteria. Mr. Ford noted that the intent of the "Gap Type" category is to allow the agency to group and bundle together intersections into one project. Mr. Wetzel noted that the County is not likely to install additional arterial DMS devices beyond what they have recently installed.
  - Mr. Yeager asked to include "distance" for limits/mileage to which Mr. Ford agreed that a "distance" column will be included in the updated version.
  - Mr. Wetzel asked to add a column which specifies the exact improvement (i.e. IMC, cabinet, EVP) to which Mr. Ford agreed that a column would be included in the updated version.
  - Mr. Ford stated that the project list is intended to be a 20-year snapshot that is in line with the regional ITS architecture. He also noted that projects to be

implemented in 5-years or less will get a higher priority. Mr. El-Assar noted he was expecting a larger more comprehensive list for a 20-year duration.

o Mr. Al-Essar noted that the ITS projects can be lumped together and not listed as separate projects. Additionally, that the fiber projects need to be reprioritized based on the updated criteria and scoring discussion from todays meeting. Lastly, that Orange County does not have any CAV projects on their list to which Mr. Ford stated that this will be re-evaluated.

o Mr. El-Assar commented that "intersection improvement" projects i.e. turn lanes, signal modifications, etc. are not included on this list and that there is no mechanism to get funding for these style of projects because only corridor projects are included in the MTP, and the prioritized project list. Mr. Hill noted that there will likely not be enough time before the next MTP update to account for these types of projects but agreed that intersection improvement projects need to be evaluated for inclusion in the TSM&O master plan. Mr. Wood stated that he would follow up with Mr. Hill to determine how to include these projects.

o Mr. Ford stated that high level planning cost estimates will be assigned to each project (PE, construction, CEI, etc).

o Mr. Akil Toussaint had no comments at this time, beyond noting that he believes they may have more gaps then identified on the current list, but will review and provide comments at a later date.

o Mr. Ford shared that LYNX does not have its own individual project list as their projects will come through strategies associated with the projects.

o Mr. Yeager asked what will happen if one municipality has all their projects prioritized with higher points than all other municipalities. Mr. Hill mentioned that he hopes to have a better plan on how to make sure that doesn't happen, and that the priorities are balanced, as we move further along in this process. The goal is for these projects to be included into the MTP and will consider amending the current plan to get projects funded.

VI. LOOK AHEAD – PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

- Mr. Wood shared that the next step will be to review the strategies developed. Additionally, a workshop with the community advisory committee at RTMC will be held on September 27th, 2023 at 10:00 AM with the intent being for the public to gain a better understanding on TSM&O topics and for us to better understand what the user sees as important.
- Mr. Wood requested that comments on the prioritized project list be provided by August 15th and comments on the three (3) documents from Steering Committee Meeting #4 be provided by August 21st.

VII. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/UPDATES

- No comments.

VIII. <u>NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS</u>

- Mr. Vaudo shared that the tentative date for Steering Committee #6 is September 19th at 1:30 PM or September 20 at 1:30PM. A follow up email will be sent to the Steering Committee to confirm availability for this next meeting.
  - o Mr. Wetzel shared that the FDOT D5 regional working group basic network training is on September 19th.

IX. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

- Mr. Hill thanked those in attendance for participating.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

INTERSECTION/TURN LANE PROJECT COORDINATION MEETING
(STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6)

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, September 27, 2023 at 2:30 PM

LOCATION: Zoom Meeting

PUBLIC ACCESS: Join meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone using this link:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81360272071?pwd=OFlIUkM1TEJMYTZZVlpIbnp0c3luZz09
Passcode: 146145

To dial in, please see the calendar item for this meeting:
https://metroplanorlando.gov/meetings/tsmo-master-plan-steering-committee-intersection-turn-lane-project-coordination-meeting-09-27-23/

MEETING SUMMARY:

<u>AGENDA</u>

I.   Introductions

II.   Public Comments

III.   Intersection/Turn Lane Project Scope

- Overview and Timeline
- Approach to Coordination
- Open Discussion

IV.   Next Steps

V.   Adjournment

MEETING ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Bryan Homayouni	Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Mr. Eric Gordin	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise
Mr. Gary Yeager	Osceola County
Mr. Doug Jamison	LYNX
Others in Attendance	
Lara Bouck	MetroPlan Orlando
Ms. Taylor Laurent	MetroPlan Orlando
Rachel Frederick	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Nicole Heck	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Mike Vaudo	Kimley-Horn

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Those in attendance introduced themselves.
- Mr. Hill provided a recap of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) visit to the RTMC and noted it was a good opportunity for the committee to see the facility. Valuable feedback was received from the CAC, including their suggestion of presenting the TSMO Master Plan to other community groups. Other comments from the CAC were related to Event Management, TSMO solutions related to bike/ped safety, and providing travelers with improved wayfinding and signage.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda and noted it was important to bring the Steering Committee together to review the approach to the additional scope.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

III. SCOPE REVIEW

- Mr. Wood and Mr. Jonathan Ford provided an overview of the scope and steps associated with the Intersection/Turn Lane assessment to be included as part of the TSM&O Master Plan.
- Mr. Ford asked for questions or comments from the Steering Committee
    - o Mr. Doug Jamison asked about how intersection modifications could also cause challenges for pedestrians crossing the road.
        - Mr. Ford responded that the intent would be to avoid proposing expansions of intersections and optimize existing infrastructure. He asked that agencies provide any available pedestrian-specific information associated with intersections.
    - o Mr. Hazem El-Assar expressed support for the scope and asked how the 20 intersections would be identified for analysis.
        - Mr. Ford asked for direct input from the respective agencies and any available accompanying data.
            - Mr. El-Assar suggested looking at 3 years of signal timing reports and find those with highest average delay along with those with the highest crash rates. He wants to have a defensible approach to explain the selection of intersections to the public.
    - o Mr. Toussaint asked if each agency would be submitting only 5 intersections.
        - Mr. Ford responded that more intersections could be identified if necessary.
    - o Mr. El-Assar Hazem suggested that the number of intersections analyzed for each agency be proportionate.
    - o Mr. Gary Yeager noted that Osceola County had previous studies on intersection improvements and asked how to submit those to the project team.
        - Mr. Wood said they should be sent in as soon as possible to maintain project schedule.
    - o Mr. Charlie Wetzel asked about proportionate allocation of intersections for this effort and noted that some intersections identified may not be feasible for future improvements or are in their ultimate configuration.
        - Mr. Wood responded that it would be a synthesis of the data analysis and input from the respective agencies.
    - o Mr. Hill noted that there is limited flexibility in the 20 total intersections in the scope given the limited schedule. The expectation is that 5 intersections per jurisdiction could be identified.

- o Mr. El-Assar suggested using available data and Synchro files to identify potential improvements. He noted that it would not be fair to include 5 intersections per jurisdiction based on their respective difference in size.
  - ▪ Eric noted that this initial intersection assessment would be a baseline and that it could be expanded in the future.
- o Mr. Yeager noted that Osceola County had identified intersections previously and that this effort would support their pursuit for funding.
- o Mr. Wetzel noted that Seminole County is developing its 2045 Transportation Plan which would help to identify 5 locations and suggested providing 5-7 intersections. The County would have to put in the work to vet viability of projects.
- o Mr. Toussaint supported equitable approach to make sure City or Orlando is represented.
- o Mr. Hill suggested including 7 intersections for Orange County, 5 for City of Orlando, 4 for Seminole County, and 4 for Osceola and Orlando respectively.
  - ▪ The Committee responded favorably to this approach.
- o Mr. Wetzel and Mr. El-Assam suggested providing a larger set of intersections to start from (Top 20 from crashes, Top 20 for delay) to identify their respective list of viable intersections.
  - ▪ Mr. Hill confirmed that the Top 10 in each category would be provided.
- o Mr. Yeager state that Osceola County had already identified 8 intersections.
- o Mr. Hill said that it was important to also identify intersections with high pedestrian activity.
  - ▪ Ms. Lara Bouck noted that that intersections for consideration may be included in Active Transportation Plan

I. ADJOURNMENT

- Mr. Wood provided a summary of the forthcoming schedule and noted that the next Steering Committee that meeting would be anticipated first two weeks of December.
- Mr. Hill asked for any final questions from attendees. After no additional comments.
- Mr. Hill thanked those in attendance for participating.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS
MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
FINAL MEETING (#7)

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 at 1:30 PM

LOCATION: MetroPlan Orlando Board Room – David L. Grovdahl Board Room
250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200, Orlando, FL 32801

PUBLIC ACCESS: To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone, please use this link:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81386566966?pwd=RE94TkpCNTZtTUNGRkIIakdOSFBXUT09
Passcode: 646358

To dial in, please see the calendar item for this meeting:
https://metroplanorlando.gov/meetings/tsmo-master-plan-steering-committee-final-meeting-03-20-24/

MEETING SUMMARY:

<u>AGENDA</u>

I.   **Introductions**

II.   **Public Comments**

III.   **Prior Steering Committee Meeting Summaries**

IV.   **Overview of Remaining Master Plan Schedule**

- Steering Committee Review Deadline
- Presentation of Draft Master Plan to Committees and Board
- Finalization of Master Plan

V.   **Draft Master Plan – REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

- Summary Document – Overview of Content
    i. Gaps, Intersections, Advanced TSM&O
    ii. Regionwide Strategies
    iii. Further Considerations

- Appendices

VI.   Related Topics

- Traffic Signal Performance Measures
- Others

VII.   Steering Committee Member Comments/Updates
VIII.   Next Steps

IX.   Adjournment

MEETING ATTENDEES

Steering Committee Members in Attendance	
Mr. Eric Hill	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Akil Toussaint	City of Orlando
Mr. Hazem El-Assar	Orange County
Mr. Charlie Wetzel	Seminole County
Mr. Eric Gordin	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise
Mr. Gary Yeager	Osceola County
Others in Attendance	
Rachel Frederick	MetroPlan Orlando
Alex Trauger	MetroPlan Orlando
Mr. Jim Wood	Kimley-Horn
Mr. Jonathan Ford	Kimley-Horn
Ms. Shayna Eaton	Kimley-Horn

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- Mr. Eric Hill provided introductory remarks and welcomed attendees.
- Mr. Jim Wood provided an outline of the meeting agenda.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Mr. Wood provided the opportunity for attendees to provide comments or questions.
- There were no public comments.

III. PRIOR STEERING COMMITTEE SUMMARIES

- Mr. Wood provided an opportunity for comments to be made on Steering Committee #5 and #6 meeting summaries and stated that comments can be provided until March 28.
- No comments were provided.

IV. OVERVIEW OF REMAINING MASTER PLAN SCHEDULE

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the remaining dates of the Master Plan schedule.
  - Steering Committee comments are due March 28.
  - The draft Master Plan is being presented on the following dates:
    - April 24 – Community Advisory Committee
    - April 26 – Transportation Systems Management and Operations Advisory Committee
    - April 26 – Technical Advisory Committee
    - May 2 – Municipal Advisory Committee
    - May 8 – Governing Board
  - The Master Plan will be finalized in May/June 2024.

V. DRAFT MASTER PLAN – REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

- Mr. Wood provided an overview of the documents provided in the Master Plan, including the Summary Document and Appendices.
- Mr. Wood provided focused discussion topics on specific documents and asked for comments.
- Mr. Hazem El-Assar commented that "Advanced TSM&O" should be changed to "Advanced ITS."
- Mr. Gary Yeager commented that he had several minor comments, primarily relating to road names, that will be sent separately.

VI. RELATED TOPICS

- Mr. Hill introduced the pilot program being offered to the agencies to provide access to INRIX through an FDOT contract. This would provide intersection, approach, and movement level metrics at each agency's signals that they maintain.
- Mr. Hill confirmed that each agency would want to be included.
- Mr. El-Assar asked if all corridors would be included in the program.
  - Mr. Hill stated that it would depend on the signal retiming priorities. When a budget is defined, intersections will be identified for the demonstration. The pilot will last nine to ten months to determine if the tool brings value. If the pilot is successful, an amendment to the 2045 MTP will be pursued to add a line-item allocation to fund an annual subscription.

- Mr. Yeagar stated that FDOT roads can be viewed within the program, so choosing non-FDOT roads through the pilot would be more beneficial to be able to use more of the data than what is already provided.
    - Mr. Charlie Wetzel stated state roads are more congested than local roads in Seminole County.
    - Mr. Hill said each county can choose which roadways they would like to be included in the program.
- Mr. Wetzel asked what dollar amount might be provided for the program.
    - Mr. Trauger stated that it depends on how it gets planned.
    - Mr. Wetzel stated they were quoted for $55,000 by FDOT for Seminole County's intersections. He suggested allocating the money using proportions based on the proportions of signals between each county.

VII. <u>STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS COMMENTS/UPDATES</u>

- No members had comments or updates.

VIII. <u>NEXT STEPS</u>

- Mr. Wood stated the next steps include comments being submitted by March 28 and the Master Plan draft being presented to Committees and the Board in April/May.

IX. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

- Mr. Hill thanked the members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

MetroPlanOrlando.gov
250 S. Orange Ave., Suite 200
Orlando, FL 32801

MTP@MetroPlanOrlando.gov

(407) 481-5672