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I. Call to Order / Roll Call / Determination of Quorum / Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chairperson Bob Storke. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Public Comment/Participation

There were no press/citizen comments.

III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of November 8, 2017 BPAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Leisen to approve the November 8, 2017 BPAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of the Resolution 2018-## Adopting Safety Targets for the River to Sea TPO

Ms. Nicoulin gave a PowerPoint presentation on safety targets for the River to Sea TPO. These safety targets have been discussed at the last few meetings and the available data has been looked at. The safety targets have to be adopted by February 27, 2018 which is the day before the TPO Board meeting so they will be adopted this month. She reviewed the five performance measures that the safety targets have to be adopted for. She showed the data, what the TPO is predicting and what is included in the resolution. She reviewed the data with a 2% reduction for the TPO planning area for all the safety targets. It is important to note that the fatality rate is calculated by vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Since the TPO’s planning area does not cover all of Flagler County, the VMT data currently available is countywide so the data represents all of Volusia County and all of Flagler County. There is a footnote within the safety targets established that explains this. The VMT data is supposed to be provided to the TPO by the state in June for our planning area. The serious injury rate is calculated the same way. The non-motorized category for fatalities and injuries includes both bicycle and pedestrians and is specific to the planning area. There are two options to establish these targets; one option is to adopt FDOT’s safety targets. They have adopted a target of zero for 2018 but they also have adopted an interim performance measure based on a forecast. The intent of these safety targets is to reduce serious injuries and fatalities. The TPO believes that a reduction based on data, a 2% reduction, is meeting the intent of adopting these targets. The first option is the TPO can adopt FDOT’s safety targets of zero with the interim performance number but the TPO is not sure how that will apply; or adopt independent targets which is what is in the resolution, a 2% reduction per year for each of the targets for 2018. The resolution and justification for each target was sent out today via email.

Mr. Aufdenberg commented that as a standalone document it is hard to know what years are covered in the five-year average and what year applies to the number. She continued reviewing the data and what a 2% rolling average reduction would like.

Ms. Nicoulin asked if he was referring to the Exhibit A with the resolution.

Mr. Aufdenberg replied yes; it was easy to understand on the PowerPoint slide but as a standalone document it was hard to see exactly what years were included in the rolling average. He asked if FDOT made any estimate for miles travelled walking or biking.

Ms. Nicoulin replied she did not think so; the TPO is not required to report VMTs for bicycles or pedestrians; the measure is just the number. She does not know if FDOT tracks that.
Mr. Ziarnek stated FDOT does have a bicycle count but would have to speak to Mr. Harris about counts done in Daytona Beach.

Mr. Harris replied the TPO has in the past. The bicycle/pedestrian counts were not automated; they were manual counts at selected intersections of two state roads. Mr. Ziarnek’s predecessor, Ms. Deborah Tyrone, headed up that program in this area and shared the information with the TPO.

Mr. Aufdenberg commented he participated in that. He did his own counts that went into the national database but he was not sure if that trickled down the planning areas.

Mr. Harris replied he did not have any information on counts taken in 2017.

Mr. Ziarnek stated he did not believe any counts were done in 2017 but asked Mr. Aufdenberg to email him and he would look into it.

Mr. Elk stated the targets look good but he is curious about the consistency across the targets and asked how the determination was made that 2% is a reasonable percentage as a reduction.

Ms. Nicoulin replied when the TPO looked at reductions, they looked at different percentages and what each would look like. The TPO thought that 2% was attainable across the different performance measures and that it could be achieved in 2018. The TPO feels strongly about working toward FDOT’s goal of zero as an aspiration but for something attainable in 2018 it was that felt 2% was appropriate. This is a 2018 target and can be evaluated at the end of 2018 with a different target set for 2019. It may be appropriate then to establish different targets for different measures. It is an unknown right now and the TPO felt comfortable that it could achieve a 2% reduction.

Mr. Elk commented that his heart wants to go with what FDOT is doing but his head says that is not attainable.

Ms. Belin stated she had the same question of how the target was chosen and noted 2% is somewhat an arbitrary number; greater than zero but less than ten. She asked if population growth was taken into consideration and if the TPO just looked at aggregate numbers. These are great goals and she asked how the TPO proposed to reach them.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the TPO looked at a number of different rates and also at what other MPOs in the area were doing as well as other states; some states identified a 2% reduction and a few identified 5%. Since this is new, the TPO thought 2% was an attainable goal. As far as population growth, this is a target for this year; population growth over one year is not that significant. Once the data is received it can be evaluated to see if the goal was achieved, how it was achieved and if the goal was surpassed. The TPO can take into account all the factors that played a role in whether the goal was met and what affected a particular target. The TPO has always tried to program projects with safety in mind and that will continue. This will require looking further into how a particular project meets a particular target.

Ms. Belin asked if there were specific procedures on how the TPO was going to achieve that because each target is different. She asked if the TPO would do anything different to address this since projects have always been programmed based on safety.

Ms. Nicoulin replied everything has been programmed through 2018 for construction. Projects programmed in the future do not have a lot of impact on the 2018 goal. The intent is to program projects that specifically meet the targets and goals set. It is something that could be included in the Call for Projects; criteria within the project applications.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Winsett stated she is optimistic but cynical; overall the county is always trying to address safety issues and does everything it can do to resolve them. Right now, traffic volumes are growing and with that come
fatalities and injuries. This is why she likes a percentage better than a number. There is a lot of development in the cities affecting our roads that may have an impact on the targets. She likes 2% as a planner but does not like to fail either.

Mr. Ziarnek stated from FDOT’s perspective, they approach it three ways; engineering, education and enforcement. If it cannot be covered by engineering, it might be covered by educating our roadway users. If that does not work, rely on law enforcement to enforce our goals.

Mr. Mostert stated as aviator, he has found it effective to look at the historical context to identify where the biggest impacts are to pinpoint the problems rather than taking a global attack. Take the top three or five and focus on them. He likes the 2% target and is not a fan of zero as that is an impossible target. He hopes future studies will categorize what causes specific crashes.

Ms. Nicolin reminded the committee of the TPO’s crash analysis report done a few months back that identified the top ten intersections with the highest crashes and the ten highest roadway segments with crashes. The TPO is now ready to take the next step to look into those locations and determine what the causes are for crashes and what can be done to fix it.

Mr. Blais referred to bicycle safety and asked if any of the crashes were due to drugs or substance abuse. Senior citizens can be overmedicated which can cause their reactions to be slow. There is a lack of law enforcement when it comes to bicycles.

Ms. Nicolin replied there are a lot of factors that go into the data that the TPO does not have control over. The TPO is trying to program for what it can control and fix.

Ms. Winsett referred to Mr. Blais’s comment and stated safety issues are more difficult than ever because we are dealing with a different type of population. Law enforcement cannot be in all places and it creates an issue that we cannot solve. The county says it can engineer solutions but cannot engineer respect. As long as people have no respect there will be more crashes and it is out of the TPO’s control.

Mr. Villanella asked if the data collected comes from law enforcement and tickets.

Ms. Nicolin replied the data is from the Crash Analysis Report and the data sources are from the state. There are two sources; one is the Crash Analysis Reporting Statistics, which is an FDOT database. The other database is maintained by the University of Florida, called Signal Four Analytics.

Discussion continued.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Villanella to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## adopting safety targets for the River to Sea TPO. The motion was seconded by Ms. Burgess-Hall and carried unanimously.

**IV. Presentation and Discussion Items**

**A. Presentation and Discussion of the SR 40 Ormond Beach Trail Gap Study**

Ms. Julia Holtzhausen, in-house consultant with FDOT District 5, stated the SR 40 Ormond Beach Trail Gap Study was awarded SUN Trail money for a planning study of a one-mile gap in the St. Johns River to Sea Loop. She introduced Mr. Kevin Freeman, VHB, Inc. to give the presentation. They hope to wrap up this study by February 1, 2018 and present a final concept that is design ready pending future funding.

Mr. Freeman gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated this study is a mile segment from Cassan Park on the west side of the Halifax River to SR A1A. He reviewed the existing trail facilities on the west side and stated the existing trail gap is on the east side. This study started in December 2016 and was kicked off with a
walking tour with the stakeholders to identify potential trail routes. They looked at the different trail options and came up with three alternatives. He reviewed the three options including the preferred option, Alternative 3, which stays south, utilizing city right-of-way and a lower volume, slower speed roadway. This was supported by the city, the stakeholders and the public. This study will be completed at the end of the month and the next phases, design, right-of-way and construction, are currently not funded.

Mr. Mostert asked if the main reason Alternative 3 was selected was because it was more cost effective.

Mr. Freeman replied cost and impact were huge factors. It is a trail route that is already being used and is in a lower volume setting. He reviewed some of the concept plans and noted they plan to use the existing facilities going over the bridge.

Mr. Aufdenberg commented he appreciated the public meeting in July; he attended and rode the purple route. He would like the trail around the parking lot to connect under the bridge. He wants to advocate for the removal of the barrier to include the bike lane and sidewalk.

Ms. Ardito stated that was an official recommendation from the St. Johns River to Sea Alliance to move that barrier.

Mr. Mostert stated he was looking at the 260 mile multi-use trail and commented going north from Granada Boulevard toward Flagler Beach he had to get off of SR A1A a few times due to storm damage. It may need to be re-routed down Central Avenue as it is in pretty bad shape.

Ms. Holthausen stated from SR 40 north into Flagler is approximately 7 miles and FDOT is planning a feasibility study for that. There is an existing sidewalk on the west side of SR A1A but it is substandard.

Mr. Blais referred to signage for bike lanes and commented that Holly Hill does not have bicycle signs. It needs to be coordinated.

Mr. Freeman replied the Coast to Coast Trail has been talking about consistency with signage.

Ms. Holthausen stated this is considered by FDOT as a multi-use trail and is for bicycles and pedestrians.

B. Presentation and Discussion of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Summit

Ms. Ardito introduced herself as the President of the St. Johns River to Sea Alliance. She gave a PowerPoint presentation on the summit and stated it was a three-day event; October 26, 2017 through October 28, 2017. The objectives included to raising awareness of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop 260 mile multi-use trail as a SUN Trail. It is the longest SUN Trail in Florida and one of the top two priorities. She reviewed the events of the three-day summit and stated Friday was the most important as it was the community building event. Mr. Jim Wood, FDOT, was the keynote speaker. There were presentations from all five-counties involved with the Loop. She reviewed the other events of the summit and thanked the TPO for being there and fitting bicycle helmets on Saturday's Family Fun Day. The point of the summit was building partnerships; she reviewed all the different organizations the Alliance interfaces with. The Alliance has started a new program called "Trail Towns in the Loop"; the idea is to get all the towns excited about the Loop and to understand the economic benefits that the Loop can bring to them.

Mr. Blais commented that 100 years ago there was no direct line from St. Augustine to Ormond Beach; you had to go through east Palatka and he asked what happened to that railroad bed. It could be claimed for a bike trail.

Ms. Ardito replied they are working on that; they would really like to get that connection. It is almost complete but there are a few gaps; a lot of the rail bed is now a trail.
Ms. Anderson commented she is the Executive Director for the Friends of SR A1A and asked how to get some of their locations designated as Trail Towns.

Ms. Ardito replied she would give her contact information and talk further about it with her.

**C. Presentation and Discussion of the FDOT Complete Streets Initiative: Design Manual and Context Classification System**

Mr. Cooke gave a PowerPoint presentation on FDOT Complete Streets Initiative: Design Manual and Context Classification System. He stated the Context Classification is part of the Complete Streets Program which includes all modes of transportation. Context Classification is new and the Florida Design Manual (FDM) works with the policies; both the manual and policies were updated. He reviewed that part of Context Classification is trying to get the policies and design criteria in line with the different contexts. FDOT is the agency that determines the Context Classification. They are trying to classify all the roads in the district; however, it will take a couple of years. He explained that FDOT is working closely with local agencies on the scoping of their projects using the context classification. He reviewed what influence the road classifications. Current classification is determined by the conditions today and future changes based on plans for future use. Ms. Jean Parlow, FDOT, is the contact for the Context Classification System and is developing computer tools to mechanize this data.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked if the FDM included speed limits.

Mr. Cooke replied yes.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked if the speed limit would change if the context of a road changed.

Mr. Cooke replied it could; part of the design manual change has been a broader range of speed limits. However, FDOT will not arbitrarily lower speed limits; there needs to be design elements that help reduce operating speeds. Areas like downtown Deland or Beach Street in Daytona Beach are corridors where people do not feel comfortable speeding. If local agencies want lower speeds, they need to make sure the development encourages it.

Mr. Harris asked if the current design projects on the state road system would still use the Plans Preparation Manual.

Mr. Cooke replied the projects that are already designed were grandfathered in; FDOT is only required to use the context classification on projects going forward. They started using the context classification on the projects scoped earlier this year on some of the older projects, such as West International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) and Clyde Morris Boulevard, they incorporated parts of it. FDOT is doing what they have always done for Complete Streets; providing for different modes of transportation. This gives the ability with the design criteria to not have exceptions and variables to adapt to different situations. East International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) is almost done and he does not think the context classification would make much difference.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked for confirmation that Clyde Morris Boulevard transitions from a state road to a county road three times and asked if there was a statewide program to bring Complete Streets to the county level so they can do the same analysis at their level.

Mr. Cooke replied yes; a lot of counties are open to it. It is agency-by-agency and is always a funding issue.

**D. Presentation and Discussion of Votran Bus Stop Improvement Plan**

Mr. Wang gave a PowerPoint presentation on Votran’s Bus Stop Improvement Plan and announced that the presentation is different than the one in the agenda because there was an update to the data since the
agenda went out. He reviewed the background of the scope of the study. He stated there are approximately 2,000 bus stops in Volusia County and there have been issues with bus stop accessibility. Over the years it has been discussed to improve them but a systematic study had not been done. Phase 1 of the study is to update the existing bus stop database system wide and specifically target bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County to offer detailed examinations and improvement strategies for them. There are approximately 176 bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County. The study’s utmost purpose is to better serve the general public with safe and accessible bus stops throughout the whole county.

Mr. Coletti referred to one of the presentation slides depicting a bus stop and commented that a wheelchair would be unable to get over the curb; he does not consider that acceptable.

Mr. Cotton explained the bus stop pictured is an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant bus stop; it is accessible to the sidewalk and has a 5’ x 8’ concrete pad. The only thing wrong with this bus stop is the sign is on the wrong side of the pad; it should be on the far side of the pad. It is level and straight; there does not need to be a curb cut at this location.

Mr. Cotton replied that part of the ADA compliance of a bus stop is that there needs to be a 6” curb at the edge of the road; therefore, when the buses deploy their ramp, it provides an adequately accessible run for someone in a wheelchair or with a walker or cane to access the bus.

Ms. Burgess-Hall commented a friend of hers who is visually impaired has been using the new pad at Nova Road and Beville Road and the pad did not have contrasting colors; where part of it slopes down and the other part is raised. She tripped because she could not discriminate between the two.

Mr. Cotton replied the bus stops between Nova Road and Beville Road were built by FDOT and Votran is in discussions with them now to correct the shortcomings on those bus stop pads; they did not install detectable strips and did not paint the curb. It is not necessary for the curb to be painted but the detectable strip must be in order to make that bus stop ADA compliant. When Votran builds the pads, it paints the curb as a courtesy because the color delineation helps people know there is a slope.

Mr. Wang continued with the PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the five-year implementation plan for unincorporated Volusia County and stated it would serve as a guidebook for improvements. He reviewed the deficiencies of the bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County and stated only half need improvements and half of those can be quick fixes. He stated the total cost estimate for unincorporated Volusia County is $400,000 which does not include right-of-way costs. The improvement strategies for the bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County will be used as examples for the cities. The TPO and Votran will work with the cities if they desire to have improvements to the bus stops in their jurisdictions.

Mr. Mostert asked if this would be something that Votran could get public or private funding on; they could put signs on them so Votran could then do more projects; he would think this would be a good marketing tool.

Mr. Wang replied that is a good idea but not something that has been discussed. There are ways for a private company to put a bench or shelter with advertising but that is something for the cities and Votran to work out an agreement on and is more complicated than the improvement plan. Negotiation would have to occur between the local jurisdictions and private companies.

Mr. Hall asked if the bus stops in the unincorporated area of Volusia County include braille or raised print signage.

Mr. Cotton replied yes, they do. The requirement is that the word “bus” or “bus stop” must be in braille on the post itself at the ADA level; Votran also has the “Vo to Go” tags on the posts, which tells you when the bus will arrive, and the ID numbers are in raised lettering. It is system wide. If someone gets to a bus stop and the “Vo to Go” tag is missing, please have them contact him.
Mr. Hall replied that is a question statewide; a lot of the bus companies do not do that and there is a push for it.

Mr. Blais asked if the bus drivers made reports of bus stops that may need grass cutting or other needed repairs.

Mr. Cotton replied yes. Votran is working with the city of Daytona Beach to fix a bus stop at Bill France and Dunn Avenue. Unfortunately, Votran cannot do work within the city limits; it can only do work in the county. Votran has to contact the cities so they can do the improvement. There is a “Driver Observation Form” that the drivers fill out and he receives.

Ms. Burgess-Hall stated for clarification and so she can report back to the Halifax Council for the Blind, a lot of bus stops used to have shelters or benches and most were removed and she asked who is responsible to put those back. A lot of people cannot stand for periods of time to wait for the bus due to back or leg problems; they call paratransit. She knows that the vagrancy issue compounds this. She asked where people could go to advocate for putting the shelters and benches put back.

Mr. Cotton replied they need to advocate to their municipalities. The shelters and benches are the responsibility of the cities; there are a few shelters that bear the Votran name that were gifted to the cities under the agreement that they now belong to the cities. Votran has never placed benches; the cities had the benches either through a contract with an advertising company or on their own like the coquina benches that used to be in Daytona Beach. Those were removed by the city. Votran’s responsibility according to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is a sign and a post; to designate the stop. Amenities are up to the municipalities. Since Votran is contracted by Volusia County, Votran is in control of the unincorporated Volusia County; that is why all the bus stop improvements and the pads have taken place in the unincorporated areas.

Mr. Blais referred to the benches being removed and commented the homeless were using them as shelters at night. The cities or municipalities should have an ordinance against sleeping on benches.

E. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Report

Mr. Harris gave a PowerPoint presentation of the draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Report. He reviewed the outline of the report. He briefly reviewed each of the nine sections including the performance criteria. The appendix includes existing plans that have been adopted by the TPO such as the Regional Trails Corridor Assessment. This month, TPO staff will be reviewing the draft report and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Subcommittee will meet to review it. Next month, the BPAC will receive a report and then it will go to the TPO Board for review and adoption.

V. Staff Comments

→ 2018 R2CTPO Call for Projects

Mr. Harris stated the annual Call for Projects will open the day after the TPO Board meeting on January 25, 2018 and will run for nine weeks. The TPO had discussed closing the Call for Projects on March 30, 2018 but that is Good Friday and the TPO office is closed. The TPO will be ending the call for projects and the period for accepting applications on either Thursday, March 29, 2018 or Monday, April 2, 2018.

→ 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan

Mr. Harris stated it was time to begin work on the next Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP); it is required by law and is the TPO’s most comprehensive plan; it is a twenty year plan. Work will begin at the start of the next fiscal year in July 2018; it will be adopted in September 2020. It has long and short range strategies, existing transportation systems and addresses current and future transportation needs for the planning area.
It starts at the end of the five-year Work Program and goes out twenty years, ending in 2045. There will be extensive public involvement; staff, the TPO Board and advisory committees will all be involved at some point in the LRTP, including this BPAC.

→ Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs)

Mr. Harris referred to the letter included in the agenda and stated last month the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) rescinded their interim approval of rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) nationwide. That means projects that were in the pipeline in the Work Program will be allowed to finish; two of those projects are in our planning area in Ormond Beach. Ormond Beach submitted projects for RRFBs for downtown Ormond Beach on Granada Boulevard at midblock crossing and for SR A1A at the midblock crossing at Andy Romano Park. Those two projects got in under the wire and are currently being constructed; they will be some of the last ones constructed because no new projects for RRFBs will be going forward. Since FHWA has rescinded their support, the TPO will not be accepting applications for RRFBs in the annual Call for Projects. If they do not have FHWA approval then they are not eligible for federal funding.

Ms. Winsett asked why the RRFBs were rescinded because they are very popular.

Mr. Harris replied there is some sort of patent dispute on the RRFBs; he does not know the details. A copy of the letter from FHWA is in the agenda packet.

Mr. Harris stated TPO staff and the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Subcommittee are working on building the next UPWP; it covers a two-year period: FY 2018/19 and FY 2019/20. The UPWP Subcommittee has held two meetings and a draft UPWP is being developed which will be presented next month. It includes all the activities, projects and programs TPO staff will undertake over the two-year period. He advised the committee if anyone needs more information, to contact staff. It will be on the agenda next month.

Mr. Hall asked if the RRFBs were the units that were recommended to be put in at roundabouts for pedestrians.

Mr. Harris replied he did not know.

Ms. Burgess-Hall asked who advocates should contact to get the RRFBs back in place; this is a safety issue.

Mr. Harris replied the TPO has a regional FHWA contact and could reach out to her. He asked what questions the committee would like him to ask.

Mr. Hall stated he has heard that in the past some advocates and engineers had recommended using the RRFBs for roundabouts to let pedestrians know it is okay to cross and drivers know to stop for a pedestrian crossing. If they are not going to be permitted, he asked what will be used because the RRFBs are better than other pedestrian signals.

Mr. Harris replied there is no question that they work; they are very effective. He is hoping that FHWA will reinstate their support in the future.

VI. Information Items
→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ St. Johns River to Sea Loop PD&E Study
→ TPO Board Meeting Summary
→ TPO Outreach & Activities (November and December 2017)
→ 2018 TPO Board and Committee Meeting Schedule
VII. **BPAC Member Comments**

Chairperson Storke reminded the committee of the information items in the back of the agenda.

Mr. Aufdenberg thanked Mr. Cotton; he referred to the stop that was not shown on Votran’s “My Stop” app and stated Mr. Cotton advised it would be fixed by the end of the month. The comment page on the website states the agency does not accept comments and Ms. Heather Blanck got back to him on that and it is being looked into.

Mr. Ziarnek stated FDOT has very capable engineers in Tallahassee and right before this meeting the State Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator updated him that the state continues to work on the RRFB issue. There are other ideas in the pipeline that are moving forward. FDOT is not going to err on the side of not addressing safety; this is a big issue in the state.

Mr. Blais asked if there was federal funding available for bicycle and pedestrian law enforcement.

Mr. Ziarnek replied he would be happy to get an answer for him and to email him his question.

Mr. Coletti stated he wears a road I.D. when he bicycles or walks; it is attached to his FitBit. He stated a friend had a heart attack while bicycling and by the time he got to the hospital, no one knew his name. When his wife went to the hospital, it took hours to find him as they had him listed as John Doe. On his road I.D. he has his name, address, blood type and any diseases or illnesses he has. He encouraged the committee to wear one and use the application.

Mr. Elk stated he was concerned about the RRFB issue and as part of the agenda next month he would like to hear conversation as to what the BPAC could do to put together a formal letter of recommendation to whomever it would need to go to. He thought he would understand why after today’s meeting and he still does not.

Mr. Harris announced the 2018 “Not so Noisy” Bike Week has expanded to include Daytona State College and Bethune-Cookman University along with Embry Riddle Aeronautical University. He showed the dates and stated more information would be forthcoming.

III. **Adjournment**

The BPAC meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

---

**River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization**

Mr. Robert Storke, Chairman

Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

**CERTIFICATE:**

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the January 10, 2018 regular meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), approved and duly signed this 14th day of February 2018.

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization

---
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WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for Volusia County and portions of Flagler County inclusive of the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that the urbanized area, as a condition to the receipt of federal capital or operating assistance, have a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process that results in plans and programs consistent with the comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA issued a final rule based on section 1203 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and with consideration to provisions in the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), which identified national transportation goals, outlined standards for measuring and reporting safety data and established five safety performance measures; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 23 C.F.R. 490.209(a), the Florida Department for Transportation (FDOT), as part of the annual development of the State Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP), has developed safety targets for each of the five safety performance measures; and

WHEREAS, 23 C.F.R. 490.209(c), requires that each Metropolitan Planning Organization establish safety targets and report progress over time in reaching the adopted targets; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO recognizes certain limitations in the availability of data required to develop data sets for the planning area in Flagler County where the planning area boundaries do not align with the county boundaries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the River to Sea TPO that the:
Fatalities

Basis for Establishing Target:
This target reflects a two percent annual reduction in the number of fatalities from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the annual fatalities to 136 with a resulting five-year rolling average of 123.3 in 2018.

Number: 136
5-Year Rolling Average: 123.3

Serious Injuries

Basis for Establishing Target:
This target reflects a two percent annual reduction in the number of serious injuries from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the annual serious injuries to 743 with a five-year rolling average of 722.0 in 2018.

Number: 743
5-Year Rolling Average: 722.0

Fatalities Rate:* 

Basis for Establishing Target:
This target reflects a two percent annual reduction in the fatalities rate from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the fatality rate to 1.929 with a five-year rolling average of 1.783 in 2018.

Number: 1.929
5-Year Rolling Average: 1.783

*VMT specific to the planning area is not currently available, which includes all of Volusia County and a portion of Flagler County. As such, the fatalities rate was calculated using the data available for the entirety of Volusia and Flagler County, pending the provision of data at the planning area level.

Serious Injuries Rate*

Basis for Establishing Target:
This target reflects a two percent annual reduction in the serious injuries rate from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the serious injuries rate to 10.343 with a five-year rolling average of 10.256 in 2018.

Number: 10.343
5-Year Rolling Average: 10.256

*VMT specific to the planning area is not currently available, which includes all of Volusia County and a portion of Flagler County. As such, the fatalities rate was calculated using the data available for the entirety of Volusia and Flagler County, pending the provision of data at the planning area level.

Non-Motorized Serious Injuries and Fatalities

Basis for Establishing Target:
This target reflects a two percent annual reduction in the number of non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities to 108 with a five-year rolling average of 102.9 in 2018.

Number: 108
5-Year Rolling Average: 102.9
## RIVER TO SEA TPO
### UPWP FY 18/19
#### First Year
##### Estimated Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Salary</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Fringe 40%</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Personnel</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Material</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Consultant</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>General Administration &amp; Program Support</td>
<td>$155,096</td>
<td>$62,039</td>
<td>$217,135</td>
<td>$153,033</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Information Technology Systems &amp; Website Support</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>44,364</td>
<td>52,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>37,999</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>53,199</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>59,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Program Development (UPWP)</td>
<td>24,582</td>
<td>9,833</td>
<td>34,415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development</td>
<td>29,459</td>
<td>11,783</td>
<td>41,242</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>53,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Transportation Data Information Management</td>
<td>35,718</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>50,006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Corridor Studies &amp; Program Support</td>
<td>19,714</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>27,599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>State &amp; Regional Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>21,036</td>
<td>8,415</td>
<td>29,451</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>34,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>ITS/Traffic Operations/Safety Projects/Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>14,275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Community Transportation Survey</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>General Planning Studies &amp; Initiatives</td>
<td>24,283</td>
<td>9,713</td>
<td>33,996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</td>
<td>41,135</td>
<td>16,454</td>
<td>57,588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>317,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Community Safety-Related Program</td>
<td>18,748</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>26,247</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>44,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>25,064</td>
<td>10,026</td>
<td>35,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>5,377</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>7,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Transit Related Activities &amp; TD</td>
<td>47,416</td>
<td>18,966</td>
<td>66,382</td>
<td>50,944</td>
<td>117,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Transit Planning Services-General Consulting</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>$202,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$709,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>$289,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>$629,745</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,629,311</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Costs:
- PL Carryover: $100,000
- PL 18/19: 726,193
- FTA 18/19: 256,142
- TD 18/19: 29,805
- SU 18/19: 517,471

**Total Additional Costs:** $1,629,311

*January 3, 2018*
## RIVER TO SEA TPO
### UPWP FY 19/20
#### Second Year

### Estimated Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>General Administration &amp; Program Support</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Salary</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Fringe 40%</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Personnel</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Material</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Consultant</th>
<th>FY 18/19 Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$152,037</td>
<td>$60,815</td>
<td>$212,851</td>
<td>$153,897</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$370,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Information Technology Systems &amp; Website Support</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>36,264</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>34,443</td>
<td>13,777</td>
<td>48,220</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>54,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Program Development (UPWP)</td>
<td>32,321</td>
<td>12,928</td>
<td>45,249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development</td>
<td>28,183</td>
<td>11,273</td>
<td>39,456</td>
<td>11,850</td>
<td>51,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Transportation Data Information Management</td>
<td>39,347</td>
<td>15,739</td>
<td>55,086</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Corridor Studies &amp; Program Support</td>
<td>17,499</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>24,498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>State &amp; Regional Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>21,667</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>30,334</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>ITS/Traffic Operations/Safety Projects/Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>10,502</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>14,703</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>114,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Community Transportation Survey</td>
<td>8,741</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>12,237</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>52,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>General Planning Studies &amp; Initiatives</td>
<td>25,011</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>35,016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,833</td>
<td>70,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</td>
<td>43,865</td>
<td>17,546</td>
<td>61,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Community Safety-Related Program</td>
<td>16,397</td>
<td>6,559</td>
<td>22,956</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>25,816</td>
<td>10,326</td>
<td>36,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>5,538</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>7,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>107,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Transit Related Activities &amp; TD</td>
<td>50,793</td>
<td>20,317</td>
<td>71,110</td>
<td>59,332</td>
<td>130,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Transit Planning Services-General Consulting</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>5,076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$522,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,832</strong></td>
<td><strong>$730,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>$304,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,326,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes:**

- **PL Carryover**: $75,000
- **PL 19/20**: 726,193
- **FTA 19/20**: 256,142
- **TD 19/20**: 29,505
- **SU 19/20**: 200,000
- **TPO Local**: 40,000

**January 3, 2018**
**2018 “Not So Noisy” Bike Week Events**

**Bicycle Fest Events:** targeted to college/university campus populations to promote biking, safety and community-building

- **Monday, February 19:** Daytona State College Bicycle Fest – 2 hour event
- **Tuesday, February 20:** Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Bicycle Fest – 2 hour event
- **Wednesday, February 21:** Bethune-Cookman University Bicycle Fest – 2 hour event

**Saturday, February 24:** Community Festival and Bicycle Ride – tentatively scheduled for 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. hosted by Bethune-Cookman University at the School of Nursing