



# MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO)

**BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE** will be meeting on:

**DATE:** Wednesday, April 18, 2018

**TIME:** 2:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** River to Sea TPO

2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100 (Conference Room)  
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145

***Please reserve time on Thursday, April 25, for a continuation of this meeting in case we do not complete our work on April 18.***

\*\*\*\*\*

## AGENDA

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT/PARTICIPATION** (*length of time at the discretion of the chairman*)

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Selection of BPAC Project Review Subcommittee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson**  
(*contact: Stephan Harris*)

**B. Evaluation and Ranking of Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Applications**  
(*contact: Stephan Harris*) (*project applications to be provided under separate cover*)

**IV. R2CTPO STAFF AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

BPAC Project Review Subcommittee Members:

Jason Aufdenberg  
Gayle Belin  
Nancy Burgess-Hall (alternate)  
Larry Coletti  
Alice Haldeman  
Nic Mostert  
Roy Walters

cc: TCC, CAC, BPAC Members  
Vickie Wyche, FDOT  
Michael Ziarnek, FDOT  
Press

Note: Individuals covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in need of accommodations for this public meeting should contact the River to Sea TPO office, 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145, (386) 226-0422, extension 20416 at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date

Beverly Beach	DeBary	Flagler Beach	New Smyrna Beach	Palm Coast	South Daytona
Bunnell	DeLand	Flagler County	Oak Hill	Pierson	Volusia County
Daytona Beach	Deltona	Holly Hill	Orange City	Ponce Inlet	
Daytona Beach Shores	Edgewater	Lake Helen	Ormond Beach	Port Orange	

**SUMMARY SHEET  
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
APRIL 18, 2018**

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. SELECTION OF BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The TPO's bylaws require selection of a chairperson and vice chairperson for each subcommittee. Moreover, it is advisable to do so in order to ensure that meetings will be conducted in an orderly and effective manner.

***ACTION REQUESTED:***

***SELECT A SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON***

**SUMMARY SHEET  
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
APRIL 18, 2018**

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

**B. EVALUATION AND RANKING OF BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECT APPLICATIONS**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Interested parties were invited to submit Bicycle/Pedestrian project applications on or before April 2, 2018. Applications received by the deadline are listed below, including six (6) for feasibility studies and seven (7) for project implementation.

The BPAC Project Review Subcommittee is expected to create a draft list of priority projects in ranked order for review by the BPAC on Wednesday, May 9, 2018.

Completed project applications are available for download from the R2CTPO file transfer site at the following links:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects – Feasibility Study Applications

<https://www3.mydocsonline.com/Share.aspx?-004GagG2rzbFlqUMnauld9atw>

Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects – Project Implementation Applications

<https://www3.mydocsonline.com/Share.aspx?-338bYYAjM%2BY%2FU%2BC4IHJAiC68g>

<b>BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS - FEASIBILITY STUDIES</b>	
Golfview Blvd Shared Use Path Feasibility Study	City of South Daytona
Hickory Bluff Preserve Trail Feasibility Study	Volusia County
Madeline Avenue Trail & Sidewalk, Phase 2 Feasibility Study	City of Port Orange
Saxon-Normandy Intersection Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study	City of Deltona
South Daytona Elem School Sidewalk Expansion Feasibility Study	City of South Daytona
SR 44 Trail Feasibility Study	City of New Smyrna Beach
<b>BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS - IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
County Road 3 Shared Use Path	Town of Pierson
Derbyshire Park Area Sidewalk Improvements, Phase 2	City of Daytona Beach
Port Orange Sidewalk Gaps	City of Port Orange
SR A1A at Public Safety Complex Traffic Signal	City of Daytona Beach Shores
Sweetheart Trail Lighting-Beville Road to Orange Avenue	City of Daytona Beach
Sweetheart Trail Lighting-Orange Avenue to Main Street	City of Daytona Beach
Turnbull Bay Road Trail	City of New Smyrna Beach

Scoring sheets will be provided at the meeting. The following additional documents have been provided with this agenda packet for reference purposes:

- 2018 Priority Process Schedule
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Project List (adopted June 28, 2017)
- Sample scoring sheets – you are encouraged to use these to assign preliminary scores to projects as you review the applications in advance of the Subcommittee Meeting.

***ACTION REQUESTED:***

***RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A RANKED LIST OF BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS***



# River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization

## 2017 LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEM (SIS) PROJECTS .....	2
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT, NON-SIS ROADWAY PROJECTS .....	3
TRAFFIC OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS.....	5
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN AND B/P LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS .....	13
TRANSIT PROJECTS.....	19
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STUDIES.....	20

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Priority Rank <sup>1</sup>	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>2</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Comments
1	4084642	I-4 widening to 10 Lanes (1-4 Beyond the Ultimate)	Volusia/Seminole county line to 1/2 mile east of SR 472	widening	PE - \$1,228,818- FY 16/17; ENV - \$150,270 - FY 17/18	ROW - \$46,355,000; CST - \$372,070,000 (all costs are 2014)	\$424,800,000	To be funded as a public-private partnership using tolled lanes
		SR 472 - widen from 4 lanes to 6	Graves Av to Kentucky/MLK Blvd	widening		CST - \$40,480,000,	\$40,480,000	To be undertaken as part of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Project
		Saxon Blvd Ramp/Roadway	I-4 to Normandy Blvd			CST - \$35,380,000	\$35,380,000	To be undertaken as part of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Project
		Rhode Island Extension	Veterans Memorial Pkwy to Normandy Blvd			CST - \$34,870,000	\$34,870,000	To be undertaken as part of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Project
2	4102511	SR 15 (US 17) - widen to 4 lanes	Ponce de Leon Blvd to SR 40	widening	PE - \$455,410 - FY 16/17; ROW - \$13,691,472 - FY 16/17 through FY 20/21; RRU - \$3,000,000 - FY 20/21; CST - \$50,186,043 - FY 20/21		\$76,700,000	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
3	4289471	SR 40 - widen to 6 lanes	Williamson to Breakaway Tr	widening		PE - \$2,130,000, ENV - \$130,000, ROW - \$7,430,000, CST - \$22,990,000, (all costs are 2014)	\$33,260,000 (2014)	Also on Regionally-Significant, Non-SIS List; PD&E was completed in 2014
4	2408371	SR 40 - widen to 4 lanes	Cone Rd to SR 11	widening		ROW - \$2,300,000, CST - \$41,500,000 (all costs are 2015)	\$50,360,000	PE/ENV was completed in 2016
5	2408361	SR 40 - widen to 4 lanes	SR 11 to SR 15 (US 17)	widening	ENV - \$4,500,000 - FY 16/17; ROW - \$5,246,000 - FY 21/22	CST - \$35,000,000; (all costs are 2017)	\$48,500,000 (2017)	PE was completed in 2014
6		SR 100 - widen to 6 lanes	Old Kings Rd to Belle Terre Pkwy	widening		ROW - \$3,170,000; CST - \$31,700,000	\$34,870,000 (2015)	Also on Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Projects List

<sup>1</sup> Projects which are ranked one through five on the List of Prioritized SIS Roadway Projects will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program.

<sup>2</sup> Funds and phases programmed in prior years are not reported here, but can be found in the R2CTPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Projects**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Priority Rank <sup>3</sup>	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>4</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Comments
1		US 1 intersections (from the US 1 AIS)		intersection improvements	--	--		
	4371211	SR 5 (US 1) at Park Av	SR 5 (US 1) at Park Av	--	PE- \$372,000 - FY 19/20	CST	TBD	Southbound right turn lane added as part of FM# 4268891, US 1 Median Modifications); PE for signal system upgrade to improve intersection operations is programmed in FY 19/20
	2409925	SR 5 (US 1) at Canal St Intersection Improvements	SR 5 (US 1) at Canal St	--	PE - \$107,342 – FY 16/17; ROW - \$5,718 – FY 16/17; RRU - \$605,264 – FY CST - \$4,887,349- FY 18/19	--	\$7,345,128	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
	2409927	SR 5 (US 1) at Reed Canal Rd Intersection Improvements	SR 5 (US 1) at Reed Canal Rd	--	PE - \$7,793 – FY 16/17; ROW - \$15,152 – FY 16/17; CST - \$1,279,781- FY 16/17 through FY 17/18	--	\$2,485,713	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
	2409928	SR 5 (US 1) at Big Tree Rd Intersection Improvements	SR 5 (US 1) at Big Tree Rd Intersection	--	PE - \$10,389 – FY 16/17; ROW - \$17,171 – FY 16/17; CST - \$635,530 - FY 17/18	--	\$1,237,336	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
2	4081781	SR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd) widen to 6 lanes	SR 400 (Beville Rd) to SR 600 (US 92 - International Speedway Blvd)	widening	PE - \$13,934 – FY 16/17; ROW - \$24,673,760 - FY 17/18 through FY 21/22	CST - \$29,100,000 (2017)	\$70,100,000	CST cost matches CFLRoads info last updated 2017
3	4159641	Old Kings Rd widen from 2 lanes to 4	Palm Coast Pkwy to Forest Grove Dr	widening		CST - \$13,250,000 (2014); CEI - \$1,600,000 (2014)	\$17,260,000	Cost estimates per Table 1, Palm Coast FY 14/15 - FY 18/19 FDOT 5-Yr Work Program Project Priorities
4	--	SR 44 – Miscellaneous upgrades to improve access to DeLand SunRail	between SR 15A and SunRail Station	misc. upgrades to improve access to the SunRail station	--	ROW - \$1,740,000, CST - \$17,36,000	\$19,100,000	SR 44 corridor study completed

<sup>3</sup> Projects which are ranked one through five on the List of Prioritized Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program.

<sup>4</sup> Funds and phases programmed in prior years are not reported here, but can be found in the R2CTPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects – Continued...**

Priority Rank <sup>3</sup>	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>4</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Comments
5	4226271	US 92 – widen from 4 to 6 lanes	I-4 EB Ramps to SR 600 (US 92) to CR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd)	widening	PE - \$185,655 – FY 16/17; ROW - \$9,863,891- FY 18/19 through FY 21/22; ENV - \$1,500,000 – FY 16/17	CST - \$23,000,000 (2017)	\$37,500,000	CST cost estimate from CFLRoads (2017)
6	4355611	Old Kings Road Extension - Phase II	Matanzas Woods Pkwy to Old Kings Rd	new road construction	CST - \$3,782,318 - FY 18/19	--	\$5,600,000	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
7	4271181 and 4271182	Commerce Pkwy Connector Road – new 2 lane roadway	SR 100 to US 1	new road construction		CST - \$8,800,000 (2017) CEI - \$880,000	\$10,979,000	\$459,638 remaining in LAP to apply toward CST; plans are complete;
8	4336751	Matanzas Woods Pkwy – (west) – widen to 4 lanes	US 1 to I-95 southbound ramps	widening	PE - \$1,903,000 - FY 18/19	ROW - \$183,000; ENV - \$28,000; CST - \$12,653,000; CEI - \$1,265,000	\$16,032,000	Cost estimates per Table 1, Palm Coast FY 14/15 - FY 18/19 FDOT 5-Yr Work Program Project Priorities
9		SR 600/SR15 (US 17/92) – Emerging SIS	SR 472 to SR 15A (Taylor Rd)	not yet determined	--	ROW - \$3,000,000 CST - \$27,000,000	\$30,000,000	
10		LPGA Blvd - widen to 3 lanes	SR 5A (Nova Rd) to SR 5/US 1	widening	--	ROW - \$3,500,000 CST - \$9,000,000	\$12,500,000	
11	IFZ3-1	Howland Blvd - widen to 4 lanes	Providence Blvd to Elkcam Blvd	widening	ROW - \$2,500,000 – FY 17/18; CST - \$10,850,000 – FY 18/19 - FY 19/20		\$14,320,000	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> w/ local funding (Bond & LOGT)
12		North Entrance DeLand Airport (Industrial Park)	Industrial Park to SR 11	new road	--	CST - \$970,000	\$970,000	
13	4289471	SR 40 - widen to 6 lanes	Williamson Blvd to Breakaway Trails	widening	PD&E - \$5,881 – FY 16/17	PE - \$2,130,000, ENV - \$130,000, ROW - \$7,430,000, CST - \$22,990,000,		Also on SIS Projects List
14		SR 100 – widen to 6 lanes	Old Kings Rd to Belle Terre Pkwy	widening	--	ROW - \$3,170,000 CST - \$31,700,000	\$34,870,000	Also on SIS Projects List
15		SR 442 Extension	SR 442 to SR 415	PD&E for new road	--	PD&E - \$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	

Projects which are ranked one through five on the List of Prioritized Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program.



**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded										
Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Project Sponsor	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>5</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Comments
1	4355951	Doyle Road Paved Shoulders	Lush Ln to Courtland Blvd	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$98,662 - FY 16/17; CST - \$1,142,182 - FY 17/18	--	\$1,240,844	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
2	4355961	Mast Arm Installation on SR A1A at Cardinal Dr	SR A1A and Cardinal Dr	Traffic signal support system upgrade	Ormond Beach	PE - \$227,000 - FY 17/18 CST - \$545,316 - FY 19/20		\$772,316	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
4	4389811	Turnbull Bay Road Paved Shoulders	from Pioneer Trail to Sunset Drive	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$289,000 – FY 16/17; CST - \$2,403,195 - FY 18/19	--	\$2,692,195	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
5	4389801	Old New York Avenue Paved Shoulders and Lane Widening	from SR 44 to Shell Rd	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$390,000 - FY 16/17; CST - \$2,962,539 - FY 20/21	--	\$3,352,539	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
6	4355911	Dunlawton Av Walk Light Construction - Ph 1	SR 5 (US-1) to Spruce Creek Rd	Pedestrian lighting	Port Orange	PE - \$99,000 – FY 16/17; CST - \$577,100 - FY 16/17	--	\$786,000	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
7	4380171	Mast Arm Installation on SR A1A at Harvard Dr	at SR A1A and Harvard Dr	Traffic signal support system upgrade	Ormond Beach	PE - \$227,000 - FY 17/18 CST - \$573,986 - FY 19/20	--	\$800,986	--	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
8	4389821	US 1 Traffic Signal Upgrades	at 3rd St, 6th St, 8th St, Walker St, and Flomich St	Traffic signal support system upgrade	Holly Hill	PE - \$1,51,000 – FY 16/17 and FY 17/18	CST - \$2,000,000	\$3,505,000	0%	
9	4402701	SR40 Signal Design Build Operate & Maintain	Tymber Creek Rd to SR A1A	Arterial Traffic Management	FDOT	PD&E - \$120,000 – FY 18/19 OPS - \$1,560,000 – FY 19/20 through FY 21/22	--	\$1,680,000	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED;</b> replaces SR 40 Corridor Traffic Control Adaptive System

<sup>5</sup> Funds and phases programmed in prior years are not reported here, but can be found in the R2CTPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects

Tier "B" -- Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Rank <sup>6</sup>	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
1	Seminole Woods Pkwy/SR 100 Intersection Safety Improvement Project	Seminole Woods Pkwy at SR 100	Intersection improvement (add turn lane & upgrade signal heads)	Palm Coast	PE - \$3,809; CST - \$145,808; CEI - \$14,580 (2017)	\$160,388	10%	2015	62.71	
2	LPGA Blvd Corridor Traffic Control Adaptive System	from the I-95 SB ramps to Clyde Morris Blvd	Adaptive Signal Control	Volusia County	PD&E - \$18,000 PE - \$35,000 CST - \$500,000 CEI - \$75,000	\$628,000	10%	2016	84.83	
3	SR 44 (New Smyrna Beach) Corridor Traffic Control Adaptive System	Airport Rd to 3rd Av	Adaptive Signal Control	Volusia County	PD&E - \$35,000 PE - \$98,000 CST - \$1,400,000 CEI - \$210,000	\$1,610,000 (excludes SEMP and Design)	0%	2016	82.17	
4	SR 15 (US 17/92) at Fort Florida Rd SunRail Bus/Pedestrian Pre-Emption	US 17/92 at Fort Florida Rd	Traffic Signal	Volusia County	PE - \$30,000 (FDOT in-house) CST - \$200,000 CEI - \$30,000	\$230,000 (excludes Design)	0%	2016	81.57	
5	Saxon Blvd Corridor Traffic Control Adaptive System	Market Place Dr to Normandy Blvd	Adaptive Signal Control	Volusia County	PD&E - \$18,000 PE - \$56,000 CST - \$800,000 CEI - \$120,000	\$994,000	10%	2016	77.17	
6	SR 421 (Port Orange) Corridor Traffic Control Adaptive System	Summer Trees Rd to SR A1A (S. Atlantic Av)	Adaptive Signal Control	Volusia County	PD&E - \$35,000 PE - \$98,000 CST - \$1,400,000 CEI - \$210,000	\$1,610,000 (excludes SEMP and Design)	0%	2016	76.57	

<sup>6</sup> Projects which are ranked one through eight on Tier "B" of the List of Prioritized XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Projects will be ranked in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program.

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects**

Tier "B" -- Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Rank <sup>6</sup>	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
7	Tivoli Dr Intersection Improvements	Tivoli Dr at Saxon Blvd and Providence Blvd	Intersection Improvements	Deltona	PD&E - \$5,000 PE - \$100,000 CST - \$1,614,700 CEI - \$55,000 Other - \$635,300	\$2,410,000	33%	2016	75.43	
8	East Volusia Traffic Management Center Relocation	on SR 44 west of SR 415	New Traffic Management Center	Volusia County	PE - \$105,000 CST - \$700,000 CEI - \$70,000 Other - \$17,500,000 (VC match)	\$875,000 (w/o local match, excludes site acquisition/development costs)	10%	2016	71.00	
9	SR 5 (US 1) at Turgot Av Eastbound Right-Turn Lane	US 1 at Turgot Av	Intersection Improvements	Edgewater	PE - \$30,000 CST - \$73,302 CEI - \$7,330	\$110,632	10%	2016	69.83	
10	East International Speedway Blvd. (US 92) "Beachside" Corridor Improvement Project	from Halifax River to SR A1A	Corridor improvements	Daytona Beach	PE - \$750,000 ROW - \$26,100,000 CST - \$7,000,000 CEI - \$750,000	\$34,600,000	-%	2017	69.63	
11	Elkcam Boulevard paved Shoulders Project	from Fort Smith Boulevards to Sylvia Drive	Paved shoulders	Deltona	PE - \$316,224 CST - \$1,581,122 CEI - 287,168	\$2,134,515	10%	2017	63.63	
12	SR 421 Right Turn Lane on Westbound Dunlawton Av at City Center Pkwy/Victoria Gardens Blvd	SR 421 at City Center Pkwy	Intersection Improvements	Port Orange	PE - \$30,000 CST - \$202,500 CEI - \$20,150	\$252,650	0%	2016	59.50	

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects

Tier "B" -- Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Rank <sup>6</sup>	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
13	Belle Terre Pkwy Corridor Improvements (Pine Grove Dr to Pritchard Dr)	from Pine Grove Dr to Pritchard Dr	Intersection Improvements	Palm Coast	PE - \$?? CST - \$500,000 CEI - \$50,000	\$550,000	10%	2017	57.63	City to use local funds for PE and CEI;
14	Belle Terre Corridor Improvement-Ponce DeLeon-Point Pleasant	from Ponce DeLeon to Point Pleasant	Intersection Improvements	Palm Coast	PE - \$?? CST - \$281,000 CEI - \$28,100	\$309,100	10%	2017	55.63	City to use local funds for PE and CEI;
15	Belle Terre Pkwy/Royal Palms Pkwy Intersection Improvements	At Royal Palms Pkwy	Intersection Improvements	Palm Coast	PE - \$?? CST - \$1,698,000 CEI - \$169,800	\$1,867,800	10%	2017	54.38	City to use local funds for PE and CEI;
16	Doyle Road Paved Shoulders from Twisted Oak Trail to Lush Lane	from Twisted Oak Tr to Lush Ln	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$80,000 ROW - \$222,785 CST - \$507,292 CEI - \$60,000	\$870,077	10%	2017	50.25	County to use local funds for PE and CEI;
17	Fluhart Drive Roundabouts	Fluhart Dr at South Halifax and Riverside Dr	Roundabouts	Ormond Beach	PE - \$45,600 CST - \$277,600 CEI - \$22,800	\$296,000	10%	2017	49.88	
18	Paved Shoulders and Sidewalks on Jacobs Rd from Plymouth Av to US-92	from Plymouth Av to US-92	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$100,000 CST - \$1,873,265 CEI - \$100,000	\$1,973,265	10%	2017	45.75	County to use local funds for PE and CEI;

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects

Tier "B" -- Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Rank <sup>6</sup>	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
19	Paved Shoulders and Sidewalk on Stone Street from Orange Av to CR-92 / W Int'l Speedway Blvd	from Orange Av to CR-92 / W Int'l Speedway Blvd	Paved shoulders	Volusia County	PE - \$100,000 ROW - \$159,242 CST - \$1,443,213 CEI - \$100,000	\$1,802,455	10%	2017	44.75	County to use local funds for PE and CEI;
20	Railroad Quiet Zone Crossing Protection Improvements	FEC RR @ Ridge Blvd, Big Tree Rd, Beville Rd, and Country Club Rd	Rail crossing improvements	South Daytona	CST - \$97,350	\$97,350	10%	2016	(not scored)	City was awarded a state Quiet Zone Grant of \$52,175 (50% match required)

*River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects*

Tier "C" – Projects Awaiting Feasibility Study								
Priority Rank	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
1	Traffic Camera Network	city-wide	ITS	South Daytona	10%	2011	.7	Install traffic monitoring system; on hold pending outcome of ITS Master Plan;
2	US 92 (Int'l Speedway Blvd), Tomoka Farms Rd, & Bellevue Av Intersection Study	US 92 at Tomoka Farms Rd & Bellevue Av	Intersection improvements	Volusia County	0%	2017	14.56	
3	Dirksen/Fort Florida & US 17-92 Intersection Improvements	US 17-92 at Ft Florida Rd & Dirksen Rd	Intersection improvements	DeBary	0%	2017	14.22	
4	SR 44 & Kepler Rd - Alternative Intersection Design or Areawide Plan for Congestion Mitigation	SR 44 at Kepler Rd	Alternative Intersection Design or Areawide Plan for Congestion Mitigation	Volusia County	0%	2017	14.22	
5	SR 15A (Spring Garden Blvd) at SR 44 (W New York Av) Turn Lane Feasibility Study	SR 15A at SR 44	Intersection Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	14.10	Feasibility study may be needed; coordinate scope w/ VC and FDOT; as of 9/15/2016, reported by Amir Asgarinik as "In Scope Development"
6	US 92 & Kepler Road Intersection - Westbound Left Turn Lane Extension	US 92 at Kepler Rd	Intersection Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	13.90	At mtg. w/ VC & FDOT on 7/20/16, Amir Asgarinik agreed to develop a project scope with the expectation that FDOT would do this project; it was agreed that the TPO does not need to do a feasibility study;
7	Taylor Rd/ Williamson Blvd Intersection & Taylor Rd/Dunlawton Av corridor at I-95	Taylor Rd at Williamson Blvd	Intersection improvements	Port Orange	10%	2017	13.67	
8	US 17-92 & Highbanks Road Intersection - Southbound Right Turn Lane Extension	US 17-92 at Highbanks Rd	Intersection Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	12.70	At mtg. w/ VC & FDOT on 7/20/16, Jon Cheney recommended

<sup>7</sup> TIP Subcommittee ranked, but did not score, applications submitted in 2011 for feasibility study.

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects**

<b>Tier "C" – Projects Awaiting Feasibility Study</b>								
<b>Priority Rank</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Limits</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Local Match %</b>	<b>Year Submitted</b>	<b>Project Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
9	US 17-92 & New York Av Intersection - Southbound Right Turn Lane Extension	US 17-92 at New York Av	Intersection Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	12.40	no action be taken regarding these projects until after the Cross County Transit Connector Study has been completed to see if BRT is recommended; then, we need to consider the need for queue-jumping right turn lanes;
10	Old Mission Road Guardrail Addition (Park Av to Josephine St)	Park Av to Josephine St	Safety Improvement	Volusia County	10%	2016	12.30	On hold per Volusia County email (2/24/2017)
11	SR 421/Dunlawton Av & Victoria Gardens Blvd Intersection - Westbound Left Turn Lane Extension	SR 421 at Victoria Gardens Blvd	Intersection Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	12.20	Volusia County to request FDOT review w/ expectation that FDOT will do as push button project;
12	Signal Enhancement at SR 5/US 1 and SR 100	SR 5 at SR 100	Add protected left turn arrow	Bunnell	10%	2015	12.00	
13	Pioneer Trail Paved Shoulders (Tomoka Farms Rd to Airport Rd)	Tomoka Farms Rd to Airport Rd	Safety Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	11.80	
14	Pioneer Trail Paved Shoulders (Airport Rd to Williamson Blvd)	Airport Rd to Williamson Blvd	Safety Improvements	Volusia County	10%	2016	11.50	
15	SR 400 (Beville Rd) Mast Arm Traffic Signals (Golfview Blvd & Magnolia Av)	SR 400 at Golfview Blvd & Magnolia Av	Traffic Signal Upgrade	Daytona Beach	10%	2016	11.14	
16	Eastbound Madeline Avenue Left-Turn Lane at Clyde Morris Boulevard	Madeline Av at CR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd)	Intersection improvements	Port Orange	10%	2017	11.00	
17	Intersection of Herbert Street and Nova Rd	Herbert St at SR 5A (Nova Rd)	Intersection improvements	Port Orange	10%	2017	11.00	
18	US 1 Streetscape Improvements Phase II	McDonald Av to South City Limit	Streetscape and resurfacing	South Daytona	10%	2015	10.25	

*River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects*

Tier "C" – Projects Awaiting Feasibility Study								
Priority Rank	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
19	James Street/Anastasia Drive Traffic Circle at Big Tree Rd	Big Tree Rd at James St/Anastasia Dr	New roundabout	South Daytona	10%	2015	7.63	
20	Traffic Signal Improvements at Carmen Dr and Reed Canal Rd	Reed Canal Rd at Carmen Dr	Traffic signal upgrade	South Daytona	10%	2017	7.22	
21	Golfview Boulevard Traffic Circle at Big Tree Road	Big Tree Rd at Golfview Blvd	New roundabout	South Daytona	10%	2015	7.13	
22	Magnolia Avenue Traffic Calming Island	from Reed Canal Road to Big Tree Road	Traffic calming	South Daytona	10%	2017	6.89	
23	Reed Canal Road Roadway Enhancements	from SR 5A (Nova Rd) to SR 5/US 1 (Ridgewood Av)	Roadway/sidewalk barrier	South Daytona	10%	2017	6.56	Resurfacing component is not eligible for TPO funding
24	Anastasia Drive Traffic Calming Island	from Big Tree Road to Ridge Boulevard	Traffic calming	South Daytona	10%	2017	6.11	
25	Big Tree Road Roadway Enhancements	from SR 5A (Nova Rd) to SR 5/US 1 (Ridgewood Av)	Corridor enhancements	South Daytona	10%	2017	5.78	Resurfacing component is not eligible for TPO funding
26	Sauls Street Traffic Calming Island	from Reed Canal Rd to Madeline Av	Traffic calming	South Daytona	10%	2017	5.78	
27	Reed Canal Park Wood Bridge Replacement	Reed Canal at entrance to Reed Canal Park	Bridge replacement	South Daytona	10%	2015	5.25	



**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded										
Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Project Sponsor	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>8</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Comments
--	4354871	Flagler Av Sidewalk	12th St to Park Av	Sidewalk	Edgewater	PE - \$4,312 - FY 16/17; CST - \$416,830 - FY 17/18	--	\$457,945	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4355351	Forrest Hills Connector	Old Tomoka Rd to Scottdale Dr	Trail	Ormond Beach	PE - \$1,281 - FY 16/17; CST - \$589,288 FY 17/18	--	\$645,692	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4355391	N. Spruce Creek Rd Sidewalk	Nova Rd to Angelina Ct	Sidewalk	Port Orange	PE - \$74,355 - FY 16/17; CST - \$404,595 FY 18/19	--	\$478,158	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4398661	Halifax River/East Coast Greenway Trail	Wilder Bv to Shady Place	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE – 101,000 - FY 16/17 CST - 1\$400,000 - FY 17/18	--	\$525,517	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4364341	Seminole/Volusia Gap	Wayside Park to (Seminole County) Spring to Spring Trail (Volusia County)	Trail	Volusia County	CST - \$2,572,266 - FY 16/17 \$25,675 - FY 17/18	--	\$2,099,356	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4106761	Black Bear Scenic Trail (SR 40)	SR 35 (Marion County) to US 17 (Volusia County)	Trail	Volusia County	PD&E - \$4,620 - FY 16/17	PE, CST	TBD	0%	Also known as SR 40 Trail
--	4354991	W. French Av Sidewalk and Bike Lane	N. Carpenter Av to Valentine Park	Sidewalk and Bike Lane	Orange City		CST - \$579,083; CEI - \$49,871	\$727,142	10%	Connects to FM #4355381
--	4355381	W. French Av Shared Use Path	Spring to Spring Trail to Valentine Park	Trail	Orange City	PE - \$19,299 - FY 16/17	ROW; CST	TBD	10%	Alternative design on south side French Av
--	4302172	Alabama Av Trail	Minnesota Av to US 92	Trail	DeLand	CST - \$1,344,112 - FY 19/20	--	\$1,494,267	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4390371	Beville Rd Shared Use Path	Williamson Bv to Clyde Morris Bv	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE - \$131,800 - FY 16/17 CST - \$964,030 - FY 2020/21	--	\$1,095,830	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>

<sup>8</sup> Funds and phases programmed in prior years are not reported here, but can be found in the R2CTPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded										
Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Project Sponsor	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>8</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Comments
--	4154348	East Central Regional Rail Trail (ECRRT)	Guise Rd to Gobbler's Lodge Rd	Trail	Volusia County	CST - \$5,003,500 - FY 17/18	--	\$5,003,500	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4390391	Spring to Spring Trail	Detroit Terrace to US 17-92	Trail	Volusia County	PE - \$299,271 - FY 16/17	ROW, CST	TBD	10%	SUN Trail funded for ROW and CST phases.
--	4102511	US 17 Trail	W. Baxter St to SR 40	Trail	Volusia County	PE, ROW, CST	--	TBD	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> Included in roadway widening project
--	4398741	Spring to Spring Trail	Lake Beresford Park to Grand Av	Trail	Volusia County	PE - \$751,000 - FY 16/17	CST	TBD	0%	SUN Trail funded
--	4390571	Nova Rd Trail	Bellevue Av to South St	Trail	Daytona Beach	CST - \$298,116 - FY 16/17	--	\$298,116	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4398691	Halifax River Greenway Trail	Marina Point Dr to Orange Av	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE - \$101,000 - FY 16/17; CST - \$450,000 - FY 17/18	--	\$551,000	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> SUN Trail
--	4399711	Freemont Av Sidewalk	Niles St to US 1	Sidewalk	Daytona Beach	CST (RR Xing Only) - \$350,000 - FY 16/17	CST \$399,665			CST needed is for S/W only, pending completion of RR Xing work
--	4398771	US 17 Trail	Washington Av to Palmetto Av	Trail	Pierson	PE - \$301,000 - FY 17/18	--	\$1,424,240	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> SUN Trail
--	4408481	Deltona Lakes/Spirit Elem Sidewalks	[multiple limits]	Sidewalk	Deltona	PE - \$15,901 - FY 17/18	CST	TBD	10%	Deferred to FY 2018/19
--	4391951	Spring to Spring Connector Trail	Spring to Spring Trail to US 17-92	Trail	DeBary	PE - \$25,000 - FY 16/17; CST - \$225,000 - FY 18/19	--	\$250,000	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> Coast to Coast Trail
--	4398681	Halifax River Greenway Trail	Bellevue to Marina Point Dr	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE - \$66,000 - FY 16/17; CST - \$450,000 - FY 17/18	--	\$516,000	0%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b> SUN Trail
--	4408521	Tomoka Elementary Connector Sidewalk	Main Trail to Granada Bv	Sidewalk	Ormond Beach	PE - \$28,400 - FY 17/18	CST	TBD	10%	Sidewalk along Old Tomoka Road

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded										
Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Project Sponsor	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>8</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Comments
--	4408531	Williamson Bv/Hand Av Pedestrian Improvements	Hand Av to Regal Theater Driveway	Sidewalk	Ormond Beach	PE - \$28,400	CST	TBD	10%	Pedestrian Signal and Sidewalk.
--	4409061	Navy Canal Trail	Museum Bv to Clyde Morris Bv	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE - \$48,500; CST - \$250,570	--	\$299,070	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>
--	4409411	Tomoka State Park Trail	Sanchez Park to Tomoka State Park	Trail	Ormond Beach	PE - \$87,000	CST	TBD	10%	Trail connector between Sanchez Park and Tomoka Park
--	4408541	Lakeview Bv Trail	Matanzas Parkway to London Dr	Trail	Palm Coast	CST - \$563,771	--	\$563,771	10%	<b>FULLY-FUNDED</b>

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Tier "B" – Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Ranking	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
1	N. Orange/E. Graves Av Sidewalks	French Av to University Av/Thorpe Av to Leavitt Av	Sidewalk	Orange City	PE - \$56,587; CST - \$185,665 (2015)	\$241,952	10%	2015	87	Protected Status
2	Providence Bv Shared Use Path	Spring to Spring Trail to Alexander Dr and Tivoli Dr to Joyner Dr	Trail	Deltona	PE - \$284,256; CST - \$1,421,281 (2017)	\$1,918,729	33%	2017	90.25	Phase 1 trail segment
3	East ISB Beachside Corridor Improvement Plan	US 92 Bridge to SR A1A	Complete Streets	Daytona Beach	PE - \$750,000; ROW - \$20,000,000; CST - \$6,000,000; CEI - \$750,000 (2017)	\$27,500,000	-%	2017	85.75	Project sponsor has proposed advancing design with local funds
4	Coast to Coast Trail Wayfinding Signage Improvements	Lake Monroe Park to Rotary Park	Signage	Volusia County	PE/CST - \$150,000 (2017)	\$150,000	10%	2017	82	Signs along Coast to Coast Trail and Rail Trail corridors
5	Center Av, Phase 1 Sidewalk	LPGA Bv to Flomich St	Sidewalk	Holly Hill	PE - \$207,208; CST - \$664,026 (2017)	\$937,667	10%	2017	76	LAP Certification needed
6	Ormond Beach Downtown Crosswalk RRFB	Southside of SR 40 to Northside of SR 40	RRFB	Ormond Beach	PE - \$10,000; CST - \$36,750 (2017)	\$52,750	0%	2017	75.25	Funded by FDOT Safety Office
7	Flomich St Sidewalk	Nova Rd to Decatur St	Sidewalk	Holly Hill	PE - \$87,110 ROW - \$79,050 CST - \$340,729 (2016)	\$506,889	10%	2014	75	LAP Certification needed
8	SR A1A National Scenic & Historic Coastal Byway Beautification, Phase 1	N. 10th St to S. 10th St	Hardscaping	Flagler Beach	PE - ; CST -	TBD	10%	2011	75	To be completed in the reconstruction of SR A1A
9	15th St Sidewalk	Nova Rd to Center Av	Sidewalk	Holly Hill	PE - \$170,700; CST - \$542,304 (2017)	\$767,234	10%	2017	74.25	LAP Certification needed
10	SR A1A Pedestrian Safety Improvements	[multiple locations]	Crosswalks	Ormond Beach	PE - \$18,000; CST - \$120,000 (2017)	\$144,000	10%	2017	73.50	Funded by FDOT Safety Office
11	S. Holly/E. Lansdowne Av Sidewalks	Graves Av to Blue Springs Av/Volusia Av to Orange Av	Sidewalk	Orange City	PE - \$101,294 CST - \$289,412 (2016)	\$492,883	10%	2015	72	LAP Certification needed

River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Tier "B" – Projects Ready for Funding										
Priority Ranking	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
12	Halifax River/East Coast Greenway Trail	Orange Av to Intl. Speedway Bv	Trail	Daytona Beach	PE - \$55,000; CST - \$385,500 CEI - \$77,000 (2016)	\$517,000	10%	2016	70.67	Also known as Sweetheart Trail
13	Graham Swamp Trail Gap, Phase 2	Lehigh Trail to Graham Swamp Trail head	Trail	Palm Coast	PE - \$350,000; CST - \$2,500,000 (2017) CEI - \$250,000	\$3,100,000	10%	2017	66.75	Phase 2 trail segment
14	Reed Canal Rd Shared Use Path	Nova Rd to Ridgewood Av	Trail and Sidewalk	South Daytona	PE - \$725,608; CST - TBD (2016)	TBD	10%	2016	66.33	Construction cost to be determined
15	US 1 Sidewalk	Airport Rd to Wilmette Av	Sidewalk	Ormond Beach	PE - \$28,000 CST - \$253,000 (2015)	\$281,000	10%	2015	65	Includes upgraded pedestrian signals
16	Lehigh Trailhead	At Palm Coast Tennis Center	Trailhead	Palm Coast	PE - \$100,000; CST - TBD (2016)	TBD	10%	2014	64.38	Serves Lehigh Trail
17	Derbyshire Park Trail and Sidewalks	Internal to Derbyshire Park	Trail and Sidewalk	Daytona Beach	CST - \$458,736 (2014)	\$458,736	10%	2014	63.5	Internal Derbyshire Park Improvements
18	Bunnell Elementary School Sidewalks	[multiple limits]	Sidewalk	Bunnell	PE - \$83,467 CST - \$417,333 (2015)	\$500,800	10%	2015	57	LAP Certification needed
19	Derbyshire Park Sidewalk	Vine St to Nova Rd and Brentwood St to 5th St	Sidewalk	Daytona Beach	CST - \$413,648 (2014)	\$413,648	10%	2014	54	External Derbyshire Park Improvements
20	SR 44 Median Improvements, Phase 2	Glencoe Rd to Sugarmill Dr	Landscaping and Median Improvements	New Smyrna Beach	PE - \$80,000; CST - \$548,000; CEI - \$20,000 (2015)	\$648,000	10%	2015	52.75	Landscaping to be locally funded
21	Tarragona Way Sidewalk	Australia St to Museum St	Sidewalk	Daytona Beach	CST - \$300,894 (2014)	\$300,894	10%	2006	35	Designed by project sponsor

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects**

Tier "C" – Projects Awaiting Feasibility Study								
Priority Ranking	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Sponsor	Local Match %	Year Submitted	Project Score	Comments
1	Flomich St Sidewalk, Phase 2	Decatur St to Ridgewood Av	Sidewalk	Holly Hill	10%	2016	71.80	
2	Ponce Inlet Mobility Project	[multiple limits]	Sidewalk	Ponce Inlet	10%	2017	68	
3	Turnbull Bay Road Trail	Industrial Park Av to Fairgreen Av	Trail	New Smyrna Beach	10%	2017	59	
4	SR 442 Sidewalk	I-95 to Air Park Rd	Sidewalk	Edgewater	10%	2016	57.83	
5	Taylor Road Sidewalk	Leaning Tree Place to Blue Lake Av	Sidewalk	DeLand	10%	2017	57.75	
6	Madeline Av Sidewalk	Clyde Morris Bv to Nova Rd	Sidewalk	Port Orange	10%	2017	57.50	
7	Willow Run Bv Sidewalk	Harms Way to Clyde Morris Bv	Sidewalk	Port Orange	10%	2015	57	
8	Magnolia Av Shared Use Path	Reed Canal Rd to Beville Rd	Trail	South Daytona	10%	2015	56.3	
9	South St Trail	Turnbull Bay Rd to US 1	Trail	New Smyrna Beach	10%	2017	56.25	
10	Center Av Sidewalk, Phase 2	3 <sup>rd</sup> St to LPGA Bv	Sidewalk	Holly Hill	10%	2015	55.7	
11	Anastasia Dr Shared Use Path	Reed Canal Rd to Big Tree Rd	Trail	South Daytona	10%	2015	52.3	
12	Ocean Av Sidewalk	S. Peninsula Av to S. Atlantic Av	Sidewalk	New Smyrna Beach	10%	2017	52.25	
13	Volusia Gap	US 17-92 Bridge to Spring to Spring Trail	Trail	Volusia County	10%	2014	43	
14	Art Center Bv Sidewalk	Sundance Trail to US 1	Sidewalk	New Smyrna Beach	10%	2017	44	
15	Lambert Av Sidewalk	Palm Dr to Lambert Cove	Sidewalk	Flagler Beach	10%	2016	35.5	

TBD – to be determined

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Transit Projects**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Type	Programmed Phase(s) <sup>9</sup>	Needed Phase(s)	Estimated Total Project Cost	Comments
1		Commuter Rail - SunRail Phase 2 North expansion	DeBary Station to DeLand Station	Rail	--	PE/CST	\$77.1 million	Includes new DeLand Station

Note: Transit projects are typically identified by the designated recipient of transit funding. No transit projects have been identified at this time.

---

<sup>9</sup> Funds and phases programmed in prior years are not reported here, but can be found in the R2CTPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Transportation Planning Studies**  
**ADOPTED 6/28/17**

Priority Rank	FDOT FM#	Study Name	Study Limits	Sponsor	Programmed (Year)	Estimated Total Study Cost	Year Submitted	Score	Comments
1		Mason Avenue Corridor Study	from Riverside Dr to Williamson Blvd	Daytona Beach	-	\$75,000	2015	35.75	FDOT is committed to a "partnership", but can't initiate before FY 17/18.
2		SR 44 & Beresford Avenue Extension	from Kepler Rd to SR 44	DeLand	-	\$100,000	2015	34.88	
3		LPGA Blvd Corridor Management Plan	LPGA Blvd from US 92 to SR 5A (Nova Rd)	Volusia County	-		2017	33.56	
4		Beachside Neighborhood Pedestrian Safety, Mobility & Access	beachside in Daytona Beach	Daytona Beach	-	\$75,000	2015	32.50	
5		Ft Florida Road Planning Study	US 17	DeBary	-	\$75,000	2016	31.83	
6		DeBary Village Center Corridor Improvement Study	from Highbanks Rd at US 17-92 to Plantation Rd at US 17-92.	DeBary	-	TBD	2017	31.78	
7		West extension of DeLand Greenway	From Alabama Greenway Trail to Spring to Spring Trail	DeLand	-	\$25,000 to \$55,000	2017	29.89	Multiple alignments between Minnesota Av and Euclid Av will be considered
8		New Smyrna Beach Trolley Feasibility Study	City-wide	New Smyrna Beach	-	\$50,000	2016	27.67	
9		New Smyrna Beach US 1 Complete Streets	South city limit to north city limit	New Smyrna Beach	-	\$64,000	2016	27.50	
10		Flagler Beach Multi-Modal Hub Study	City-wide	Flagler Beach	-	\$150,000	2017	25.44	
11		Daytona Beach Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan	City-wide	Daytona Beach	-	\$115,000	2015	24.75	
<b>SIS Planning</b>									
1		I-95/ US 1 Interchange Modifications	at SR 5/US 1		-	TBD	2016	(not scored)	<b>SIS Needs List</b>
2		I-95/LPGA Blvd Interchange Modifications	at LPGA Blvd		-	TBD	2016	(not scored)	<b>SIS Needs List</b>
3		I-95/Pioneer Trail New Interchange	at Pioneer Trail		-	TBD	2016	(not scored)	<b>Volusia County-Funded Projects List</b>

TBD – to be determined



## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Saxon-Normandy Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: Deltona

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of

the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

Safety/Security	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?

- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_ Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: SR 44 Trail Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: New Smyrna Beach

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of

the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

Safety/Security	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?

- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary    Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_    Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Madeline Avenue Trail and Sidewalk Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: Port Orange

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as "needed" in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of

the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

Safety/Security	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?



- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary    Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_    Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Golfview Boulevard Shared Use Path Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: South Daytona

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of

the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

Safety/Security	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?

- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide *additional* information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary    Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_    Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: South Daytona Elem School Sidewalk Expansion Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: South Daytona

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of

the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

Safety/Security	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?

- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_ Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Hickory Bluff Preserve Trail Feasibility Study

Project Sponsor: Volusia County

### Criteria Definitions

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (25 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of



the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		12	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		13	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>25</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?

- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(7) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(8) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria Summary    Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_    Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: County Road 3 Shared Use Path

Project Sponsor: Pierson

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p

- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Derbyshire Park Area Sidewalk Improvements, Phase 2

Project Sponsor: Daytona Beach

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p



- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project "Readiness" (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Port Orange Sidewalk Gaps

Project Sponsor: Port Orange

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p

- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: SR A1A at Public Safety Complex Traffic Signal

Project Sponsor: Daytona Beach Shores

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p



- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Sweetheart Trail Lighting-Beville Road to Orange Avenue

Project Sponsor: Daytona Beach

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p

- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

**River to Sea TPO  
2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Project Scoring Sheet**

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Sweetheart Trail Lighting-Orange Avenue to Main Street

Project Sponsor: Daytona Beach

**Criteria Definitions**

**(1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)**

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

<b>Proximity to Community Assets</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)**

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

<b>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p



- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>			<b>20</b>

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

## River to Sea TPO 2018 Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Scoring Sheet

Scored by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: April 18, 2018

Project Title: Turnbull Bay Road Trail

Project Sponsor: New Smyrna Beach

### Criteria Definitions

#### (1) Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

Proximity to Community Assets	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Residential developments, apartments, community housing		4	
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities		4	
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities		4	
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center		4	
School bus stop (K-12)		2	
Schools (K-12)		2	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

#### (2) Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, shared use paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Project provides access to a transit facility		5	
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)		5	
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities		5	
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g. comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(3) Safety/Security (20 points maximum)**

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

<b>Safety/Security</b>	<b>Yes/N</b>	<b>Max. Points</b>	<b>Points Awarded</b>
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.		10	
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.		10	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

**(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?

p

- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(6) Project “Readiness” (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Points Awarded \_\_\_\_\_

**(7) Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

This measure considers whether the proposed facility has public support. Describe and provide documentation (e.g. letters of support, signed petitions, public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). This is an opportunity for the applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

Special Considerations	Yes/No	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?		5	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>5</b>	

**(8) Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)**

If local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points	Points Awarded
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%		2	
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%		4	
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%		6	
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%		8	
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%		10	
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%		12	
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%		14	
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%		16	
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%		18	
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds		20	
<b>Maximum Point Assessment</b>		<b>20</b>	

**(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)**

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

**Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria Summary**

**Total Points Awarded:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Initials:**\_\_\_\_\_

## 2018 Priority Project Process Schedule

January						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31	1	2
3						

Issue Call for  
Projects/"Notice of  
Funding Availability"  
(9-1/2 weeks long)

February						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
28	29	30	31	1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	1	2	3

TCC Meeting/Priority  
Project Process  
Workshop

March						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
25	26	27	27	1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

April						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	1	2	3	4	5

Application Deadline (12:00 noon)

TIP Subcommittee and BPAC Subcommittee meet separately to score/rank applications

TIP Subcommittee and BPAC Subcommittee meet separately to complete application scoring/ranking

Project sponsors submit updated cost estimates for projects currently on List of Prioritized Projects

May						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
29	30	1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31	1	2

BPAC reviews preliminary rankings

CAC/TCC review preliminary rankings; 30-day legal notice for adoption hearing

TPO Board reviews recommended preliminary rankings

30-day public notice/invitation to comment (post in area newspapers and on TPO website);

June						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
27	28	29	30	31	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

BPAC reviews/recommends rankings

CAC/TCC review/recommend rankings

TPO Board reviews/approves final rankings