

Central Florida Regional Planning Model

2045 Socio-Economic Data Development

Flagler County 2045 Population and Employment Projections

Volusia County	A: BEBR Population Projection		B: Woods & Poole Employment Projection	C: Population Projection in CFRPM V7	D: Employment Projection in CFRPM V7
2015	101,353		36,289	101,289	25,805
2045	BEBR Medium Projection	165,800 (Growth Rate: 2.13%)	70,427 (Growth Rate: 3.13%)	182,532 (Growth Rate: 2.67%) ¹	50,077 (Growth Rate: 3.13%) ²
	BEBR High Projection	210,500 (Growth Rate: 3.6%)			

1. Annual population growth rate was based on BEBR 2045 medium to high population projections. Flagler County has observed large amounts of approved large developments growth. It was suggested to use BEBR medium to high projections. Please note the annual growth rate in the CFRPM v7 model was close to (but not exactly at) the middle of annual growth rate between BEBR medium and BEBR high population because of allocation process.
2. Annual employment annual growth rate was based on 2045 Woods & Poole projection.

Volusia County 2045 Population and Employment Projections

Volusia County	A: BEBR Population Projection		B: Woods & Poole Employment Projection	C: Population Projection in CFRPM V7	D: Employment Projection in CFRPM V7
2015	510,494		232,518	503,615	204,694
2045	BEBR Medium Projection	642,400 (Growth Rate: 0.87%)	353,036 (Growth Rate: 1.73%)	700,346 (Growth Rate: 1.3%) ¹	310,775 (Growth Rate: 1.73%) ²
	BEBR High Projection	759,400 (Growth Rate: 1.63%)			

1. Annual population growth rate was based on BEBR 2045 medium to high population projections. The BEBR 2045 medium population projection has the annual growth rate less than 1%. It was suggested by the River to Sea TPO to reference BEBR 2045 medium to high projections. Please note the annual growth rate in the CFRPM v7 model was close to (but not exactly at) the middle of annual growth rate between BEBR medium and BEBR high population because of allocation process.
2. Annual employment growth rate was based on 2045 Woods & Poole projection.



Florida Department of Transportation

RON DESANTIS
GOVERNOR

719 S. Woodland Boulevard
DeLand, Florida 32720-6834

KEVIN J. THIBAUT, P.E.
SECRETARY

POLICY

Effective: February XX, 2019
Review Date: N/A
Office: District Five Program
Management

LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAM

It is the policy of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)/Department to contract with Local Agencies to construct transportation facilities. The Department provides project management and oversight through various Offices, including but not limited to, Planning, Environmental Management, Design, Procurement, Program Management, Right of Way, and Construction.

This Policy provides District Five (hereafter referenced as “District”) specific guidance applicable to Local Agency Programs (LAP). The Department’s programs, procedures and policies promote collaboration with Local Agencies to efficiently and expeditiously implement and manage the programs, and execute projects applicable under LAP.

The objective of said Policy is for the District to effectively plan, implement, and program projects while balancing transportation needs, funding requirements and development of the Five-Year Work Program. In support of the Policy, the District will establish processes and procedures to support the objective. This document outlines the expectations, responsibilities and accountabilities of the District and Local Agency(ies) seeking to solicit and contract consultant/vendor for construction and construction engineering inspection services using Federal funds. Exceptions to provisions set forth within this Policy, shall be submitted to the District for review and consideration; exception requests do not guarantee approval.

Michael Shannon
District Five Secretary

This Policy provides District specific guidance applicable to Local Agency Programs. Topics set forth herein correspond to the Local Agency Program Manual (Department Topic No. 525-010-300).

A. Part 1 – Local Agency Program Process

Chapter 2 – Local Agency Program Certification and Performance Management:

a. Chapter 2, 2.2 Certification Options

Full certification will be reserved for County(ies) within the District that have demonstrated appropriate staff qualifications and capability having met performance expectations required for LAP for the three (3)-year Certification cycle.

Project-specific certification will be granted to County(ies) and City(ies) that have “limited experience” defined as successful administration of three (3) or less federal aid projects within three (3)-year period or, will not produce a consistent number of LAP projects (three (3) or more projects within three (3)-year period).

For full or project-specific certification, an Agency must demonstrate that they meet staff qualifications and have met the performance expectations required for LAP project administration as identified within this policy.

b. Chapter 2, 2.2.1 Certification of Life Cycle

To ensure agencies maintain proper Certification, the District will focus on continuous training and provide educational materials to the Agencies ensuring quality assurance of Project Management is taking place.

c. Chapter 2, 2.2.3 Reimbursement of Services (New)

Counties may submit for District consideration, a reimbursement request for direct costs (defined by 2 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 200) incurred in the administration of LAP project(s) delivered on behalf of city(ies). County(ies) shall provide staff-hours estimates representing project oversight efforts for these services prior to programming.

d. Chapter 2, 2.3 Certification Requirements

- LAP certification shall be obtained by all Counties within the District in order to administer projects.

- Initial Agency certification will be limited to Project-Specific and may be expanded to Full Certification once Agency has demonstrated qualifications, capacity and performance expectations for successful LAP project completion.
- Agency(ies) may utilize District's Continuing Services Contracts (Design and Construction Engineering Inspection (CEI)) to facilitate LAP certification and project administration; consideration for these options shall be discussed with District's Local Agency Program Administrator.

e. Chapter 2, 2.4.2 Compliance (New)

The Agency shall:

- Maintain the staff commitments identified at the onset of each project.
- Inform the District of any staff changes immediately when change(s) has occurred.
- Provide a point of contact and redundancy of project management/coverage, as well as succession planning, in order to ensure continuity of LAP administration.

A Task Team shall be established with participation from the District, County and/or participating Agency, as identified for each project. Regular (quarterly) meetings will be held between District and Agency staff with the intent of maintaining continuity with projects (management and technical) and promoting partnership between Agency and District staff.

Agency attendance/commitment/representation shall be required and maintained throughout project phase(s) in order to fulfill successful LAP performance expectations.

B. Part II – Standards and Practices for Local Agency Projects
Chapter 19 – Preliminary Engineering and Design:

a. Chapter 19, 19.9 Planning and Programming (New) – Preliminary Engineering, Project Development and Environment (PD&E) and Design

Planning and Programming:

New alignment, interchanges and capacity projects shall be identified in the MPO/TPO Cost Feasible Plan of the Long Range Transportation

Plan (LRTP). Operation, enhancement and safety projects must be consistent with MPO/TPO LRTP policies and priorities.

- a. Preliminary Engineering, Study(ies) and/or PD&E (if applicable) (Phase 18 and/or 28)
- b. Design (Phase 38)
- c. Right of Way (ROW) (if applicable) (Phase 48)
- d. Construction (Phase 58)
- e. Construction Engineering Inspection (CEI) (Phase 68) – may be combined with Construction as appropriate

Prior to programming project(s), the following items, at a minimum, must be completed and accepted by the District:

- Complete and thorough Project Application
- Documented Agency commitment for each phase
- Construction (PH 58) and CEI (PH 68) cost estimates
- Identification of project on MPO/TPO Priority List and updated status

The Agency shall have a plan that outlines the commitment to complete **all** phases of project.

Project phase estimates must be provided and approved by the District prior to programming. In addition to the estimate(s), explanation/back up information/level of estimating used to develop cost estimate shall be provided (ie. similar-type project, % of construction cost, detailed units and costs break down, etc.).

1. Preliminary Engineering and PD&E (Phase 18 and/or 28):

Agency(ies) shall perform preliminary engineering activities, PD&E and miscellaneous studies at their own expense. District will provide technical assistance as needed, requested and agreed to.

Exceptions may be warranted; upcoming studies/PD&Es requested to be completed by the District shall be requested with justification for request provided. Submittal of request does not guarantee approval.

Approvals will be provided by District Secretary and/or Director of Transportation Development prior to programming during development of Five Year Work Program.

2. Design (Phase 38): Agency(ies) shall perform design services at their own expense. District will provide technical assistance as needed, requested and agreed to.

Exceptions may be warranted; design services to be completed by District shall be requested with justification for request provided. Submittal of request does not guarantee approval.

Approvals will be provided by District Secretary and/or Director of Transportation Development prior to programming during development of Five Year Work Program. Consideration for exception may require projects to be bundled to the extent possible; ie. geographical proximity, type of improvement.

**C. Part II – Standards and Practices for Local Agency Projects
Chapter 21 - Construction Advertising and Award Procedures**

a. Chapter 21, 21.3.1 Bundling Multiple Projects

- Construction (Phase 58) and CEI (Phase 68) shall be bundled to the extent possible; i.e. geographical proximity, type of improvement.
- Exceptions will be considered by the District with appropriate justification.

b. Chapter 21, 21.8 Planning and Programming (New)

The following will apply for programming of Construction (Phase 58) on LAP projects:

- Minimum threshold for Construction (Phase 58) programming is \$250,000.
 - To meet programming threshold, similar projects shall be bundled to accumulate to \$ 250,000 or above.
- Initial CEI (Phase 68) programming will be based on the current CEI estimate, if available, or on a percentage of the estimated construction cost if a CEI estimate is not available:

Construction Estimate (thousands)	Percent for CEI	Construction Estimate (thousands)	Percent for CEI
1 to 99	21.90%	2,500 to 4,999	10.32%

100 to 249	17.73%	5,000 to 9,999	9.63%
250 to 499	15.48%	10,000 to 14,999	9.15%
500 to 999	13.10%	15,000 to 24,999	8.80%
1,000 to 2,499	11.35%	25,000 and up	8.11%

- Initial programming for construction will be assigned in the later years of Department's Five-Year Plan (Years 2-5). In general, the following year targets will apply depending on when Design (Phase 38) begins and design development progresses:

Design Status (appxt. %)	Programming Year
0 - minimal	4 or 5
30%	3 or after
60%	2 or after
90%	1 or after

- Once programmed, to remain on production path, design status must progress to the completion level shown above (i.e. 30% Design (Phase 38) completed at the end of Year 3, 60% Design (Phase 38) by the end of year 2 and 90% Design (Phase 38) by the end of year 1) including Plans Update(s) (when needed), or, successful progression of plans development as dictated by the project schedule.
- During Department's annual Work Program Development, if project design has not reached the appropriate Design (Phase 38) status as noted above, Construction (Phase 58) will be deferred to the last year of the Five-Year Plan (Year 5)
- Current year programming or First Year construction advancement will not be considered unless approved by the District and until all of the following have been completed and accepted by the District;
 - Contract Plans
 - Approved Plans Specifications & Estimate (PS&E) package
 - Certifications
 - Bid package documents

From: Lois Bollenback

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 4:12 PM

To: Buscher, Lisa; Michael Daniels; Michael Woods; georganna.gillette@brevardcounty.us; GHuttmann@metroplanorlando.org

Cc: Shannon, Mike; Bobo, Loreen; Stettner, Alison; Smith, Kellie; Alexander, Katherine

Subject: RE: District 5 Local Agency Program (LAP) Policy

Good Afternoon Lisa,

The establishment of a policy, set of practices, and/or guidance will benefit the program overall by clarifying the expectations for the effective administration of LAP activities and for the responsible allocation and use of public funds. I appreciate the efforts of FDOT staff in advancing this policy. I also appreciate the opportunity to review an early draft and look forward to sharing a revised version with our local governments for their input as well.

River to Sea TPO staff have reviewed the document provided and have the following comments to offer:

General Comments/Questions:

1. Do the other FDOT Districts have a formal LAP policy? If so, will you please make a few of them available for review?
2. In discussing cost estimates and programming funding, the policy does not address project cost increases/inflation over time. This is an ongoing issue and we should have shared understanding of how this can be effectively managed. The R2CTPO inflates costs for projects on the LOPP, and I believe FDOT is intended to use escalation rates established in the Work Program Manual. We recommend adding information to clarify this matter (either within this policy or elsewhere).
3. In reading through the proposed policy, it's not clear what is established already in the Local Agency Program Manual and what is being added or established at the District level. Please consider a way to differentiate.
4. A variety of issues come up that impact project delivery such as archeological assessments, ROW issues, changes in design requirements, drainage, inter-agency delays (i.e. railroad crossing work). These unknowns don't seem to be recognized in this policy and they often impact successful completion or timely of a project. We try to identify all potential issues in advance of programming a project, but there are times that issues are not identified in advance.
5. I continue to believe that a reinstatement of "intake" meetings for some projects would lead to more successful outcomes. I would encourage the department to reconsider this as part of the development of a LAP policy.

Specific Comments:

Page 2: two statements in this section refer to counties only and do not seem to recognize full certification and LAP certification for qualified cities (for example Daytona Beach).

- a. Chapter 2, 2.2 Certification Options - refers only to “Counties” and
- d. Chapter 2, 2.3 Certification Requirements states “LAP certification shall be obtained by all Counties within the District...”

Page 3: Please clarify who is intended to serve on the “Task Team.” Also, please clarify if these are intended to be a single meeting with all agencies represented or individual meetings.

Page 3 (bottom) and 4 (top): This appears to be establishing requirements of the LRTP rather than a policy that helps administer the LAP. Consider re-writing this (and making it consistent with CFR 450.324)

- The LAP policy reads: “New alignment, interchanges and capacity projects shall be identified in the MPO/TPO Cost Feasible Plan of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Operation, enhancement and safety projects must be consistent with MPO/TPO LRTP policies and priorities.” However, CFR 450.324 says the plan shall, at a minimum include: “transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system...” A reference to “capacity” no longer exists.

Page 4 (top): What is the reference for requiring a project to be in the cost feasible portion of the LRTP to begin a PD&E? This has been considered a project planning phase that explores a no build option as well as future build options. It is also recognized that PD&E funds can be included as a programmatic (or boxed) expense rather than identified for specific projects (see FHWA Expectations letter for LRTP’s). Is this requirement intended for LAP managed projects only or for ALL PD&E’s?

Page 4 (near top): policy reads “Prior to programming...” this section does not reference the development of LOPP’s which is the legally established framework for M/TPO’s to communicate priorities to FDOT.

Page 4 (bottom) and Page 5 (top) – Items #1 & 2 both state agencies shall perform these activities “at their own expense.” I’m not sure I understand the intent of this? Agencies use LAP to access federal funds in support of a project. They are expected to outline a financial plan that supports completion of the work. Are you intending to clarify that the financial obligations for the work are the responsibility of the agency and that no financial commitment is made by FDOT unless through a partnership established in writing? Please consider making this section more clear.

Page 5: b. Chapter 21, 21.8 Planning and Programming – bullet reads “Minimum threshold for Construction (Phase 58) programming is \$250,000.” This is not supported by the River to Sea TPO. We have presented minimum thresholds for consideration by the TPO Board previously and they have made clear their opposition to placing restrictions on the allowable use of federal funds. We can present this for consideration again unless you have a reference that gives authority for FDOT to restrict the use of TMA funds in this way.

Page 5: CEI table – The table lists estimates for projects below the minimum threshold proposed by FDOT (see the previous comment).

Page 6: bullet reads: “if project design has not reached the appropriate Design (Phase 38) status as noted above, Construction (Phase 58) will be deferred to the last year of the Five-Year Plan (Year 5).” You may want to be more flexible and say: “the Construction phase will be re-evaluated and deferred as necessary pending the availability of funding.”

Page 6: It seems like you should acknowledge ROW as well in this section.

I hope these comments are helpful. Regards,

Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
2570 W. International Speedway Boulevard, Suite 100
Daytona Beach, FL 32114
Office: (386) 226-0422, ext. 20419
Cell: (386) 383-0845
Fax: (386) 226-0428
www.r2ctpo.org

