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

Chairperson Deyette called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 1:15 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press/citizen comments.

III. Consent Agenda

A. Review and Approval of November 21, 2017 CAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Storke to approve the November 21, 2017 CAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais and carried unanimously.
IV. Action Items

A. Nomination and Election of TCC Chairperson (TCC Only)

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Amending the FY 2017/18 – 2021/22 Transportation Improvement Program

(Handout)

Chairperson Deyette stated this proposed TIP amendment programs current year funding for the Seminole Woods Parkway/SR 100 Intersection Improvement Project.

Ms. Nicoulin stated this particular TIP amendment is one the TPO has been working with the city of Palm Coast on for a while. They have been working with FDOT to get LAP certified and for the cost estimate. They are still finalizing the numbers for the cost estimate so these numbers may adjust. This will be presented to the TPO Board next week for approval it is anticipated we will have the final numbers then. The TPO does not anticipate the numbers changing much but she wanted the committee to be aware that the numbers could shift. Their match would still have to represent at least 10%; currently, their match represents about 14.5% because they paid for the design for this project.

Mr. Peterson asked if the handout was the attachment that was to be provided under separate cover.

Ms. Nicoulin replied yes, the TPO was not able to get that information until today.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Feldman to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## amending the FY 2017/18 – 2021/22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Ms. Jamison and carried unanimously.

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

Chairperson Deyette stated this proposed resolution sets the River to Sea TPO transportation performance measure targets for the year 2018.

Ms. Nicoulin stated there has been a lot of discussion in recent months regarding safety targets and the data that was reviewed. She reviewed the five performance measures that safety targets must be set for and stated the TPO looked at the historical data for each of these measures. The resolution and the supporting attachment reflect a 2% annual reduction from 2016; she reviewed that data.

Mr. Peterson asked if US 1 in its entirety in Flagler County is part of the TPO’s planning area.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the facility of US 1 in its entirety is included in the planning area. The numbers for fatalities do represent the TPO’s planning area boundary; staff extracted the information specific to its planning area. US 1 is the connection between the planning area in Flagler County and Volusia County and is in the planning area in its entirety. She explained the rate for fatalities and serious injuries is calculated by vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Currently, the TPO does not have VMTs specific to its planning area; they were provided countywide. The data shown includes all of Flagler County and all of Volusia County. The VMT data is supposed to be provided to the TPO by the state in June for our planning area.

Mr. Peterson commented he did not expect the numbers to change much because only 2% or 3% of the population of Flagler County live west of US 1. The only people travelling on the roads west of US 1 would be Flagler County or Volusia County residents travelling between DeLand, Bunnell or Palm Coast. He asked why staff picked 2%.
Ms. Nicoulin replied the last slide of the presentation would explain that. She continued to review the data of the performance measures and what the targets would look like at a 2% reduction. The TPO can either adopt what FDOT set for their safety targets or adopt its own. FDOT set a safety target of zero for 2018 and also set interim measures, which is a number for each performance measure that represents something other than zero; this represents a trend. How the interim measures filter down to the TPO’s planning area is unknown. Staff looked at a number of different percent reductions and settled on 2% because staff believes that is attainable. There are a lot of factors that play into the statistics that the TPO has no control over as a planning organization; law enforcement issues, distracted drivers and medical issues while driving, etc. Most of the projects for 2018 are already programmed so what we do now will impact years beyond 2018. The 2% reduction is the target for 2018; there will be targets set for future years. This will give us the opportunity to evaluate the 2% to see if the target was met, if the target was met by more than 2%, or if the target was not met, and understand why. The resolution represents the 2% annual reduction; this is the recommendation staff is making for approval by the board. The TPO wants to ensure the committee is aware there are two options; the TPO can set its own targets at 2% or a different number, or adopt FDOT’s target of zero. Staff’s recommendation is a 2% reduction for this year.

Mr. Feldman asked if the non-motorized fatalities and injuries were pedestrian or bicycle crashes.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the non-motorized category includes both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mr. Feldman commented that the ten-year level of fatalities is an astronomical jump from the preceding five years; 2016 had an increase of 48 fatalities over the prior year. He asked if that increase was looked at and if there was any accountability for it. A 2% decrease gets us nowhere near what it was four years ago.

Ms. Nicoulin replied yes, that stood out to staff as well. One of the questions was if that was a bad year or if the prior years were good years. The TPO does not have the final data for 2017 yet but staff looked at the preliminary data and it did show an increase over the 2016 number. Since that data is not finalized, staff did not include that as a historical number and went with a 2% reduction between 2016 and 2017. There could be more fatalities because people are driving more and the construction in this area, especially in regards to the interstate. The TPO is looking at a trend to continue which is a reduction over the previous years.

Mr. Feldman stated it jumps out that in 2016 there was a 40% increase in fatalities; in 2017, the preliminary number is about the same, a 30% to 40% increase.

Ms. Nicoulin reminded the committee of the Crash Analysis Report presented a few months ago which looked at crashes at particular intersections. The TPO will be taking that a step further and looking into those particular crashes and intersections to determine why they happened and if there are programs or projects that will help to reduce those. That data is an ongoing set of information staff continues to review.

Ms. Lipovsky asked what FDOT is recommending.

Ms. Nicoulin replied FDOT is setting a target of zero but is providing interim measures based on a forecast for each performance measure.

Ms. Lendian asked if this was based on a population increase or decrease in comparing them.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the only type of comparison being done is the rates; the number of fatalities divided by vehicle miles driven and is not based on population.

Mr. Peterson referred to the number of miles driven and asked how the TPO got that number; how the TPO knew how many miles were driven and if it was based on amount of gas sold.

Ms. Nicoulin replied that number is provided by FDOT and they use a methodology to determine it.
Mr. Peterson asked what happens if the TPO does not meet its goal.

Ms. Nicoulin replied right now there is no penalty for MPOs if they do not meet the target. That is not to say in five years there might be an impact on funding; that is unknown. This is a 2018 target that is being established and there is no penalty if the 2018 target is not met.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Cheney commented that a 2% reduction is a reasonable and pragmatic approach until more is known from FDOT. Volusia County does look at VMT in their studies; typically that is the number of cars on the road multiplied by center line miles. The issue with regards to risk on the road is a function of how many lanes and how many cars are on the road. Driving on International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) has more risk than driving on Pioneer Trail. At the same time, if we look at population as factor for the overall fatality rate, there is the issue of the Dangerous by Design study where Volusia County ranked high and it is what population to count; just residents or do we add for tourists and snowbirds. To settle on a 2% reduction is reasonable.

Mr. Feldman asked for clarification on the rates; if the statistics for fatalities and serious injuries included all of Flagler County and all of Volusia County.

Ms. Nicoulin replied for those two rates, yes. The requirement from the federal government is that VMT is looked at on all roads including local roads. This is one reason why the information being provided is taking a while; this information is being provided to the TPO so the methodology is consistent with how it is calculated across the state.

Discussion continued.

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

D. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Confirming the River to Sea TPO’s Priorities for the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)

Ms. Nicoulin stated FDOT is currently developing their SIS Cost Feasible Plan and the purpose of this resolution is to provide clarification to FDOT on the TPO’s priorities for inclusion in this plan. The resolution has an attachment with three interchanges described; these interchanges are currently included in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as unfunded needs. This resolution puts on record the TPO’s desire for FDOT to include these three interchanges in their SIS Cost Feasible Plan.

Ms. Foltz asked if the interchanges were listed in order of priority.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the TPO is asking for inclusion for all three interchanges. Currently, there is some sort of study going on with all three interchanges that FDOT is undertaking.

Mr. Feldman asked for clarification of the approximate mile marker for the new Pioneer Trail interchange.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the Pioneer Trail interchange is south of the Dunlawton Avenue but north of SR 44 in New Smyrna; about halfway between.

Mr. Blais commented the Pioneer Trail interchange has been talked about for the last ten years and that there is an area of sensitive land there and developers will likely build there. He asked if there would be some control of the growth around that interchange.
Ms. Nicoulin replied that Pioneer Trail falls along the lines of Port Orange and New Smyrna Beach and the growth management in that area would fall on the cities. Currently, FDOT is doing a PD&E study there and looking at developing concepts for the interchange.

Mr. Blais asked if that was a watershed to the Spruce Creek basin.

Ms. Gillespie replied no and there has previously been a presentation of what was planned.

Mr. Cheney commented he did not see any expansion of roads beyond the interchanges and asked if it was because those were already on the list or if there was another reason why this is only including the interchanges.

Ms. Bollenback replied FDOT is updating their plan and usually the TPO uses that as it starts its long range planning. Currently in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the TPO has interchanges identified as needs; one as a new interchange and modification and upgrades on the other two. The TPO wants to make sure FDOT is clear that these are identified as needs not currently included in the plan; all of the other projects are. Since these do not show on the TPO’s Priority List, the TPO wants to make it clear they are underway and important to the area.

Mr. Cheney suggested the resolution may want to also include language that the TPO supports the existing projects on the current plan and desires for these three interchanges to be included in any future update so the elected officials do not question what happened to all the other projects.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ms. Jamison to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## confirming the River to Sea TPO’s priorities for the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) including language that it supports the existing projects on the list and desires these three interchanges be included in any future update to the plan. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bledsoe and carried unanimously.

V. Presentation Items

A. Presentation and Discussion of Planning Projects Under Consideration for the Two-Year FY 2018/19 to 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Ms. Bollenback stated every other year the TPO develops a two-year work program that identifies the funding available to the TPO to undertake different planning efforts. We are in the second year of the current work program that governs what the TPO does and is working to develop one that will govern its work starting in July 2018. The UPWP Subcommittee, which included CAC members Mr. Gilles Blais and Ms. Terry Bledsoe, met twice and reviewed what the TPO is doing now and what revenue sources may be available. She reviewed the different funding sources and stated this information is in the agenda; she referred to the tables that show the different state and federal funds available to the TPO for the first and second year of the UPWP. She stated once the amount of funding is known, the TPO will forecast the costs to run the operation including staff and utilities. She reviewed the draft task outline and the projects that will be completed this year. The big addition is the development of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). She reviewed the other tasks, projects, activities and studies for year one and year two. A good portion of staff time will be devoted to developing the LRTP. She stated if anyone on the committee thinks something is missing from the draft UPWP to please let her know. One activity that has been discussed is regional studies; the TPO does the long range plan and small corridor studies but not in the southeast region or northeast region. We know that development activity does not just influence a corridor but influences an area. After the next LRTP is completed, it was suggested doing a series of regional studies that would eventually feed back into the LRTP.

Mr. Peterson referred to the list of estimated expenses asked how these numbers were generated.
Ms. Bollenback replied the TPO goes through an exercise where we list out the rent, which is based on a lease, forecast the utilities and allocate staff time. Once a general list is created, each staff member assigns how much time they expect to spend on each of the tasks; this is based off previous work programs to make sure they are reasonable. It is also based on actual salary and benefits. The TPO does a fairly detailed forecast with this information and what may be left over goes into the tasks that are more flexible; general planning studies and transit planning studies. A draft document will be presented next month; the timeline is to submit to FDOT and FHWA by March 15, 2018.

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

Mr. Harris gave a PowerPoint presentation on the outline of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Report. He stated the report is being drafted and reviewed by TPO staff and will be presented next month. He explained how the report is laid out; a summary, nine sections and appendix. TPO staff thought it would be beneficial to include a section on regional trails. He briefly reviewed the sections of the report.

The next step after TPO staff completes drafting and reviewing the plan is to present it to the BPAC for review and a recommendation of approval and then the TPO Board will review and adopt the report.

Ms. Foltz asked if the master plan was GIS supported; if all the graphics were GIS based.

Mr. Harris replied yes.

Ms. Foltz asked if she could look at a particular road or area, or overlay it onto a city or county GIS system.

Mr. Harris replied yes, the city and county GIS systems were used to develop the TPO’s plan. There is an electronic version on the TPO website with sections that have been zeroed in on.

Mr. Cheney stated he highly recommends that the TCC also review this plan so they are in concurrence since they will be the ones in supporting moving the bulk of these projects forward.

Mr. Harris replied a significant part of this plan came from adopted bicycle/pedestrian plans from the cities.

C. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Findings for the Volusia County Bus Stop Improvement Plan

Mr. Wang introduced Mr. Brian Weinstein, Tindale-Oliver, to give the presentation.

Mr. Weinstein gave a PowerPoint presentation on the draft findings for the Volusia County Bus Stop Improvement Plan and stated Votran has over 2,000 bus stops throughout the county. The goal was to update the database of existing bus stops throughout the county in a more systematic format, help identify roles for maintenance for the bus stops and offer general improvement strategies based upon the county and cities corresponding needs. A report has been prepared and Votran’s database has been updated based on the results of the study; it identifies the infrastructure needs of each bus stop and what may be lacking at them. Phase 1 was for unincorporated Volusia County; Phase 2 would include the participation of each of the municipalities that wish to have their bus stops evaluated and improvements suggested. He reviewed the study outcomes and stated that the unincorporated county profile would be used as an example for the municipalities. He reviewed examples of both urban and rural bus stops and the requirements of each.

Mr. Cheney commented that typically curbs are not introduced into rural sections per FDOT and asked if they are now allowing this.

Mr. Weinstein replied the curbs are only at the boarding area and have to be sloped down at either end to allow for vehicles that might swerve off onto the shoulder.

Mr. Cheney asked for confirmation that it is allowed per FDOT standards.
Mr. Weinstein replied yes.

Ms. Gillespie asked what the total size of the pad is.

Mr. Weinstein replied the boarding and alighting area is 5’ x 8’ with the ramp on either end.

Mr. Cotton stated from the boarding and alighting area to the end of the detectable strip is 20’.

Ms. Lipovsky asked if there would be bus benches at any of these stops.

Mr. Cotton replied the bus benches are the responsibility of the municipalities. Votran is currently only upgrading bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County and Volusia County has not decided to put benches at the bus stops in the unincorporated areas. If the cities wish to place benches at the bus stops they may do so as long as they are accessible and ADA compliant.

Ms. Foltz asked if the bus stop improvements were being coordinated with the Complete Streets initiative.

Mr. Cotton replied that he could not speak for FDOT but transit is bundled into the Complete Streets program.

Mr. Weinstein replied they are aware of the guidelines of Complete Streets but right now they are inventorying the existing infrastructure and making the bare minimum recommendations to make things compliant and accessible. If the different municipalities want to go above and beyond that, they can. When Phase 2 is done, the different municipalities can ask for more, but that would be up to each individual municipality. He continued his presentation and reviewed accessible and non-accessible bus stops.

Mr. Peterson asked what happens when there is a non-compliant bus stop.

Mr. Weinstein replied different options would be recommended; a cheap and easy option would be to relocate the bus stop; it depends on each individual location.

Mr. Peterson asked what happens if nothing is done; if the bus stop would be eliminated.

Mr. Weinstein replied they are not making any recommendations to eliminate any bus stops at this point.

Mr. Cheney commented that they would likely get sued but would be protected because there would be a plan to identify it as noncompliant and Votran is working toward fixing it.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Weinstein stated this plan is to make the bus stops ADA compliant; however, any improvements made to the bus stops to make them compliant helps all Votran riders. He continued with the presentation and reviewed the deficiencies of the 175 bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County. He explained how the bus stop improvements were prioritized. He reviewed an example of a detailed individual bus stop inventory sheet.

Mr. Cheney asked for confirmation that 175 bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County were looked at out of a total of 2,000 within the county, and if this study identifies the deficient ones out of that subset of bus stops.

Mr. Weinstein replied yes; they did look at all the bus stops in the county and did a quick analysis of them but not as detailed as this. The goal of Phase 1 was the detailed analysis of the 175 bus stops in unincorporated Volusia County.
Mr. Cotton commented that of the 58 noncompliant bus stops shown on the deficiency list, 27 of them are in line to be improved on US 17, from the northern border of DeLand up to the Putnam/Volusia County line. Starting at the end of January that number will be cut in half when they will begin laying concrete.

Mr. Cheney asked if Votran has the budget to bring the bus stops into compliance.

Mr. Cotton replied yes.

Mr. Cheney asked what that annual budget was.

Mr. Cotton replied he did not know that number right off.

Mr. Cheney commented ad valorem taxes go into Votran’s budget and asked if to bring everything into compliance was minor or major.

Mr. Cotton replied minor; if the bus stop is outside the city limits and an urban area, it is built with a grant from the state of Florida and not coming out of county money. Votran has found enough grant money to build all the bus stops and improve them in the unincorporated areas without touching their operating money from the county.

Mr. Weinstein commented he has done studies like this before and Votran has done a fantastic job making improvements even before the report is finalized. The general cost for improvements to the bus stops in the unincorporated areas of Volusia County is $400,000 but that does not include right-of-way; however, Votran does have committed funding. He reviewed the next steps and stated Phase 1 would be used as an example to the cities.

D. Presentation and Discussion of the FDOT Context Classification and Design

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 sensitive solutions involve looking at what is going on along a corridor and the uniqueness of each community it passes through. 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 influences 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. Cheney commented Orange City wants to do Complete Streets on US 17/92; the current speed limit is anywhere from 40 miles per hour (mph) to 55 mph and they would like it to be 35 mph. He asked if they could just tell FDOT to change it to 35 mph because it is their vision or if it would have to be part of their Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) when redeveloping and design it for 35 mph; that is a SIS facility.

Mr. Cooke replied FDOT will not arbitrarily lower a speed limit; a municipality would have to do things to encourage lower operating speeds such as building closer to the road or raising the median. There are speed ranges for each of the classifications. It is up to the city to discourage higher speeds.

Ms. Gillespie commented New Smyrna Beach and Edgewater have a new CRA for all of US 1 and asked if they had gone to Complete Streets and if it was automatic on a state road.

Mr. Cooke replied that would be up to the CRA; FDOT looks at all streets from a Complete Streets standpoint.
Discussion continued.

Mr. Cooke replied FDOT did outreach last year through the MPOs and agencies to seek input for the criteria and the classifications. FDOT has already been doing a lot of this; incorporating the design criteria. Previously, there were only two sets of criteria; rural or urban and FDOT was getting a lot of requests for variations and exceptions. With the new criteria and classifications, they do not have to do that.

Ms. Bledsoe asked what happens if not every municipality signs on for Complete Streets.

Mr. Cooke replied FDOT would continue as they have been; they are still going to look at all the modes of transportation and accommodate bicycles and pedestrians. The problem they run into is how to reduce operating speeds.

Mr. Peterson asked if this affected only state roads.

Mr. Cooke yes, it only affects the state road system. However, local governments can choose to adopt it if they want. This applies only to the state highway system excluding the interstate and expressways.

Mr. Peterson asked who would pay for required upgrades if there is a major development on a state road that changes it from rural to suburban.

Mr. Cooke replied FDOT pays for Complete Streets; everything within the right-of-way would be part of the project.

Discussion continued.

E. **FDOT Report**

Ms. Wyche stated there are two new projects that began in December; the resurfacing of Nova Road and SR 44 concrete slab replacement between Boundary and Hill Avenues.

F. **Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports**

Mr. Cheney referred to page 79 of the agenda packet for the Volusia County Construction Report and highlighted the projects with recent activity. Under design, the Spring to Spring Trail, Segment 3A, the agreement with Duke Energy goes to the Volusia County Council this Thursday. The three-laning of Park Avenue in Edgewater is nearing completion. Design is underway for the Howland Boulevard four-lane widening and for the Orange Camp Road four-lane widening. The county is still working with the railroad to get the interlocal agreement for the 10th Street widening; they are also working with a land owner for a land swap on this project. They are still waiting for the city of DeLand and the owners to provide the right-of-way for the Beresford Avenue extension. This Thursday’s Volusia County Council agenda includes a quarterly capital projects update which lists all capital projects; each has a one page project sheet with detailed information.

The Flagler County Construction Report was provided in the agenda.

VI. **Staff Comments**

→ **Update on FY 2017/18 SU Funding**

There was no update.

→ **Update on Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials – Transportation Committee Activity**
Ms. Nicoulin stated the Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials met on January 8, 2018 and received a presentation on the half-cent sales tax. There is support for an infrastructure tax. They have not taken action yet, but are still looking at having it on the ballot in the fall.

→ **Save the Date for the 2018 R2CTPO Annual Planning Retreat**

Ms. Nicoulin announced the 2018 R2CTPO Annual Planning Retreat will be on Friday, March 23, 2018. The TPO will have more information next month.

→ **Legislative Update**

Ms. Nicoulin stated House Bill 575 affects MPOs; it will reduce the number of voting members on the TPO Board, eliminate the weighted vote and set term limits. The TPO will continue to monitor this particular bill and provide updates.

→ **TIP Information Sheet and Priority Process Information Sheet**

→ **Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) Memo**

Ms. Nicoulin referred to the memo regarding the rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) and stated the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has rescinded their interim approval of RRFBs. The TPO does have a couple of projects currently on the priority list and programmed for installation of RRFBs.

VII. **CAC Member Comments**

Mr. Peterson referred to page 89 of the agenda, the TPO Board report, and the follow-up item of the request for information on local matching funds for other MPOs. He asked if this meant the issue of the local match has come back.

Ms. Nicoulin replied that is the summary from last month’s TPO Board meeting; the board decided to stay with the 10% local match.

Mr. Cheney added that information was provided to board members because there was discussion that no other MPOs do not require local matches.

VIII. **Information Items**

→ CAC & TCC Attendance Records
→ December 6, 2017 River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
→ November and December TPO Outreach and Events
→ TPO Memo regarding FDOT request for TIP modification
→ 2018 R2CTPO Meeting Calendar

IX. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the CAC meeting adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

---

River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization

Ms. Janette Deyette, Chairperson
Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC)
CERTIFICATE:
The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the January 16, 2018 regular meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC), approved and duly signed this 20th day of February 2018.

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
### Seminole Woods at SR 100

**Work Summary:** INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT

**From:** Seminole Woods at SR 100

**To:**

**Lead Agency:** City of Palm Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>36,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>160,385</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 196,801

**Prior Cost < 2017/18:** 28,984

**Future Cost > 2021/22:** 0

**Total Project Cost:** 225,785

**Project Description:** This is an intersection improvement project to provide a dedicated northbound right turn lane as well as pedestrian crosswalks and signals on the southside and westside of the intersection. The traffic signals will be realigned with the new traffic lanes. (Reference page 63 and table 31 on page 72 of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.)