MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO) BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) will be meeting on:

DATE:   Wednesday, May 9, 2018

TIME:   3:00 PM

PLACE:   River to Sea TPO
         2570 W. International Speedway Blvd.,
         Suite 100 (Conference Room)
         Daytona Beach, Florida  32114-8145

******************************************************************************
Mr. Bob Storke, Chairperson

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 Chairperson)

III. ACTION ITEMS

   A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
      (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, pages 3-13)

   B. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING
      THE FY 2017/18 – 2021/22 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
      (Contact: Colleen Nicoulin) (Enclosure, pages 14-17)

IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

   A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT FY 2018/19 – 2022/23
      TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (Contact: Colleen Nicoulin) (Enclosure, page 18)
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IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT LIST OF PRIORITIZED BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN AND B/P LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 19-27)

C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT LIST OF SHARED USE NONMOTORIZED (SUN) TRAIL PROJECTS (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 28-30)

D. STATUS REPORT ON RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACONS (RRFBs) (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 31-40)

V. STAFF COMMENTS (Enclosure, pages 41-44)

→ Update on the “Tell the TPO” Survey

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS (Enclosure, pages 41, 45-48)

→ April 2018 TPO Outreach & Activities (under separate cover)
→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ BPAC Project Review Subcommittee Reports
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 41)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT (Enclosure, page 41)

***The next meeting of the BPAC will be on Wednesday, June 13, 2018***

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., Suite 100, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145; (386) 226-0422, extension 20416, at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

NOTE: If any person decides to appeal a decision made by the board with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings including all testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. To that end, such person will want to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made.

NOTE: The River to Sea TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Those with questions or concerns about nondiscrimination, those requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, or those requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Pamela Blankenship at 386.226.0422 or pblankenship@r2ctpo.org.
III. ACTION ITEMS

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Minutes are prepared for each meeting and must be approved by the BPAC. The April 11, 2018 BPAC meeting minutes are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO APPROVE THE APRIL 11, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
April 11, 2018

**Members Present:**
- Doug Hall
- Paul Eik, Vice Chairperson
- Andrew Dodzik
- Gilles Blais
- Nic Mostert
- Bob Storke, Chairperson
- Gayle Belin
- Danielle Anderson
- Christy Gillis
- Jason Aufdenberg
- Nancy Burgess-Hall
- Alice Haldeman

**Representing:**
- Daytona Beach
- Flagler Beach
- Flagler County
- Holly Hill
- New Smyrna Beach
- Orange City
- Ormond Beach
- Palm Coast
- South Daytona
- Volusia County, At Large, Alternate
- Volusia County, District 2
- Volusia County, District 3

**Non-Voting Technical Appointees Present:**
- Wendy Hickey
- Gwen Perney
- Terri Bergeron
- Eric Kozielski
- John Cotton

**Representing:**
- Flagler County
- Port Orange
- Volusia County
- Volusia County School Board
- Votran

**Members/Technical Appointees Absent:**
- Jeff Hodge
- Ted Wendler
- Scott Leisen (excused)
- Michelle Grenham (excused)
- Mike Ziarnek (excused)
- Heidi Petito/Bob Owens
- Joe Villanella (excused)
- Patrick McCallister

**Representing:**
- DeBary
- DeLand
- Deltona
- Edgewater
- FDOT
- Flagler County Transit
- Ponce Inlet
- Volusia County, District 1

**Others Present:**
- Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
- Stephan Harris
- Pamela Blankenship
- Lois Bollenback
- Deborah McNeill
- Nicholas McNeill
- Paul Haydt
- Heather Grubert
- Lara Bouck
- Antoine Khoury
- Brian Walker
- Laura Turner
- John Scarlato
- Emery Jeffreys
- Maggie Ardito
- Patricia Northey

**Representing:**
- TPO Staff
- TPO Staff
- TPO Staff
- TPO Staff
- Citizen
- Citizen
- East Coast Greenway
- FDOT
- H. W. Lochner
- Holly Hill
- Holly Hill
- Laura Turner Planning Services
- Scalar Consulting
- St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance
I. Call to Order / Roll Call / Determination of Quorum / Pledge of Allegiance

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

Chairperson Storke introduced Flagler County Alternate, Mr. Andrew Dodzik and announced Ms. Nancy Burgess-Hall is now the primary representative for Volusia County District 2 and Mr. Chris Daun is her alternate.

II. Public Comment/Participation

Ms. Patricia Northey, St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance, stated the Alliance has growing concerns regarding the PD&E studies undertaken as part of the SUN Trail project for the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail. They have been directed to speak directly to the cities about where the design concerns are an issue but they felt it was important to share their concerns with the BPAC in the event the members are asked about the issue. The Alliance will also schedule appointments with the TPO Board representatives to update them on their concerns over three Volusia County trail gaps; as well as the TPO Chairperson and Volusia County Council members that serve on the TPO Board. The first gap is the SR 40 Halifax River Bridge crossing where the Alliance believes the study design does not meet the SUN Trail standards. She has shared information with Ormond Beach Commissioner Dwight Selby, who is also on the TPO Board, regarding the bridge. Commissioner Selby requested city staff to review the Alliance’s data and shared the Alliance’s concerns with the Ormond Beach City Commission at a recent meeting. The Alliance has identified two other areas of concern; the east side alignment from Daytona Beach to New Smyrna Beach where there is a potentially dangerous section and another dangerous bridge crossing at Rose Bay. Finally, the study on the Beresford gap on the west side of the county appears to be stalled. The Alliance has had discussions with FDOT that have not been fruitful; they are concerned that some of the designs are not safe alternatives for a statewide trail system that will be utilized by both residents and visitors. The Alliance is happy to share their concerns directly with the committee in a more formal presentation. Their goal is to ensure that the Loop will be safe and comfortable for users of all ages and fitness levels. It is challenging with all the different agencies involved and the 35 gaps in the alignment. The Alliance is happy to share their work on these three segments as well as general information on the Loop on their website, www.sjr2c.org or on Facebook at facebook/sjr2c.

Ms. Maggie Ardito, President of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance, stated she wanted to make the point that the people involved with the Alliance really care about the Loop; in fact, if these people had not worked and fought so hard, and invested so much, there would not be state and county funding for the Loop. They are the only organization dedicated entirely to just the Loop. There are a lot of studies going on around the Loop and the ones in Volusia County are really important. The Alliance feels they were not properly engaged in the Ormond Beach study and their comments were not responded to. They discovered after the fact that the study was closed. The project from Daytona Beach to New Smyrna Beach has an advisory group which is exactly the kind of relationship they would like to have with all the studies. The Alliance is concerned about the Beresford project because it does not seem to be going anywhere; they would like to see a formal arrangement like an advisory group and have the county in on the Beresford gap because it is such a dangerous location. The traffic circle at Grand Avenue and SR 44 is a deadly place and the Alliance is not convinced that the traffic circle has made it safer for cyclists. They are also concerned about the lack of safe access to the Loop north of Blue Springs State Park. The Alliance wants to be engaged and be part of the planning for the Loop and would like the TPO, FDOT and consultants to engage them and know of their concerns. They can help; they were instrumental in bringing in a DEO contract to the Regional Planning Council (RPC) and they are working with them as a partner. It was the largest grant Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) gave this year; $75,000 to develop a strategic plan, maps and a resource directory for the Loop. The Alliance would appreciate any assistance the TPO can provide.

Mr. Emory Jefferys, St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance, stated he has conducted the fact finding for the presentations Ms. Northey and Ms. Ardito referenced and he has discovered it is not safe for a cyclist along any of these gaps given the amount of traffic. He interviewed a cyclist on the Ormond Beach Bridge who uses the bridge to travel to and from work; he fears for his own safety. A lot of these gaps are not safe for cyclists; it presents a hazard to traffic and to the cyclists.
Mr. Paul Haydt, East Coast Greenway Alliance, stated he is excited about the SUN Trail program and the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail. The East Coast Greenway runs from the Florida Keys to Maine; the idea is to have an off-road ten-to-twelve-foot path that is safe for cyclists, walkers and runners of all abilities and ages. The SUN Trail program is an amazing commitment from the state of Florida to the trails. On the east side of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop, from Titusville to St. Augustine, is the identified East Coast Greenway route. The benefits of a trail include economic development, tourism and community health. The standard is a twelve-foot path for the East Coast Greenway; he is offering his services so that standard can be accomplished here. The East Coast Greenway Alliance has been involved in many successes all the way to Maine; they just received a $12 million TIGER grant in Philadelphia. In the Florida Keys, 100 miles has been declared a state park for the trail. Last month, there was an opening of a trail in Brevard County from Titusville that will eventually reach New Smyrna Beach; this opens up tourism between Titusville and Volusia County. The benefits are really great and we need to maintain the qualities and standards of the trail. He referenced the East Coast Greenway website, www.greenway.org, and urged members to check it out.

III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of March 14, 2018 BPAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Dodzik to approve the March 14, 2018 BPAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of the Resolution 2018-## Adopting the FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Harris stated the link to the draft FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was provided in the agenda. The TPO received comments from FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and as a result, three changes were made; these are also in the agenda. He reviewed the changes. This item is on the agendas for the other committees and the TPO Board for adoption this month; the resolution is also included in the agenda packet.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Blais to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## adopting the FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Eik and carried unanimously.

C. Review and Recommend Approval of the 2018 River to Sea TPO’s “Tell the TPO” Survey and Survey Kick-Off

(Handout)

Ms. Blankenship stated there was a presentation last month on the upcoming “Tell the TPO” survey which will go live on April 30, 2018. This month, the TPO has provided a set of draft questions based on feedback from the advisory committees and TPO Board. She introduced Ms. Lara Bouck, H.W. Lochner, to give the updated presentation.

Ms. Bouck gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the goals of the survey. The survey will launch on Monday, April 30, 2018; the online version will go live on that date and hard copies will be dispersed throughout the area. The draft questions are provided in the agenda. There was space for two new questions and based on instructions from the TPO Board those questions have been identified. New question 9 asks which types of transportation projects are the highest priorities to fund with the TPO’s limited resources and new question 10 asks which of the 10 highest crash locations are of the greatest concern. She reviewed the marketing plan designed to get the maximum exposure; the target goal is to receive 2,000 responses. The survey will be available in English and Spanish and be dispersed throughout East and West Volusia County and in Flagler County. The random prize drawing is a two-night stay for two people in a local area hotel. She reviewed the TPO Board and the committee challenge; the winner of each will receive a trophy. On Friday,
April 27, 2018, an email will be sent to the BPAC members with a specific link for the BPAC to forward to family and friends. There will also be an update in May on which committee is in the lead.

Mr. Mostert asked what initiatives have come from the results of the last survey.

Ms. Blankenship replied one purpose of the survey is to find out if the TPO is doing what the public wants regarding transportation. The survey is used to promote awareness of the TPO in the community.

Mr. Mostert referred to the public comments earlier concerning the trail system and asked if the survey was a tool that would be able to further the trail system and fill those gaps.

Ms. Bouck replied several of the survey questions ask how respondents want to prioritize funding; whether it is on trails, bicycle/pedestrian projects or roads. Those types of questions help the TPO see what the public's priorities are. The survey does not cover specific projects but will tell us if there is an increase in interest for trails.

Ms. Bollenback stated the survey has not been used specifically for projects or programs; it is used to verify if the TPO is currently on track. Although the TPO has asked funding questions in past surveys, it specifically kept questions about funding out of this year’s survey because of the sales tax initiative so it does not confuse anyone. The TPO has asked about trails and their funding in the past and received positive feedback. The surveys also asked questions regarding technology and the results confirm that people would support more technology to make our systems more efficient. This is not a statistically significant survey but responses from 1,200 people matter. Trail standards have already been set. The St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance’s comments earlier refers to whether we are going to encourage and enforce that the trail standard be met. There are minimum standards that the TPO has that were set by the state; there are exceptions when needed. What is being questioned is if the state standards can be met.

Mr. Aufdenberg referred to question 8 and thanked the TPO for including an option on technology for pedestrians. He asked if Embry Riddle Aeronautical University was one of the partners for the survey.

Ms. Bouck replied yes.

Mr. Dodzik announced Cycle Flagler is having a cycling event in Palm Coast on May 6, 2018; they are expecting around 400 bicyclists. He suggested the survey be made available there.

Mr. Eik referred to the five optional questions on the survey and asked if those responses were also tracked and reported on.

Ms. Bouck replied yes.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ms. Burgess-Hall to recommend approval of the 2018 River to Sea TPO’s “Tell the TPO” Survey questions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried unanimously.

IV. **Presentation and Discussion Items**

A. **Presentation and Discussion of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study: SR 44 (Lytle Avenue) to SR 400 (Beville Road)**

Mr. John Scarlato, Scalar Consulting Group, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail PD&E Study, from SR 44 at Lytle Avenue to Beville Road. He provided background information on the study, reviewed the study objectives, the purpose of the trail and the schedule. He explained that PD&E stands for Project Development and Environment study. A PD&E study is conducted to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and to determine social, natural, cultural and physical impacts. The project is funded with SUN Trail money; SUN Trail provides for the PD&E study, design
and construction but not operations and maintenance. FDOT is not obligated to provide operations and maintenance. This study is part of a regional trail and will close a gap in the Loop. He reviewed the project location and noted the trail is approximately 12 miles in length in Volusia County from SR 44/Lythe Avenue to Beville Road along US 1. He reviewed the challenges of the project and stated right-of-way is the biggest one. They cannot go through eminent domain and forcefully take any property. He reviewed the components of the study; engineering, environmental and public involvement. He explained the corridor alternatives and stated the New Smyrna Beach corridor alternative includes a possible one-way street conversion along Riverside Drive. There will also be a one-way conversion in Port Orange that they have coordinated with the city on; the city of Port Orange agrees with it. He reviewed the stakeholders involved and the coordination of the multiple government agencies. There were two kick-off meetings held to gather public input; he reviewed the comments and suggestions received. There will be a meeting with the homeowners to receive input regarding the one-way conversion of Riverside Drive and Faulkner Street. This was suggested as a traffic calming device. He explained the study schedule and stated currently, it is in the Environmental and Engineering Analysis phase, and is expected to be completed by June 2019. Design is funded for 2019; right-of-way and construction are currently not funded. He gave the website link and stated the FDOT Project Manager is Ms. Heather Grubert; he gave her contact information.

Mr. Hall referred to the earlier public comments from the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance and asked Mr. Scarlatos if he had been in contact with them to discuss their concerns about the Rose Bay area.

Mr. Scarlatos replied there is a Community Advisory Committee for that bridge that they are a part of; at this time there are a few options. They would leave the widths as they are and do striping, a physical barrier could be installed, or another potential option would be to widen the bridge. These options are still being evaluated.

Ms. Haldeman stated she attended the public meeting in New Smyrna Beach and there was not a consensus on the one-way street conversion of Riverside Drive. She asked when the next meeting with the residents will be held.

Mr. Scarlatos replied that was based on written comments received and evaluated; one from Riverside Drive and one from Faulkner Street.

Ms. Haldeman asked if the meeting would include just those residents or if other people in the general neighborhood would be invited.

Mr. Scarlatos replied a notice was sent specific to residents in that segment of Riverside Drive and Faulkner Street. Anyone is welcome to attend the meeting but the notices were only sent to the specific residents.

Ms. Haldeman asked where and when the meeting will be held.

Mr. Scarlatos replied next Wednesday, April 18, 2018 at 5:00 pm. at the Coronado Civic Center in New Smyrna Beach. To clarify, the discussion regarding the one-way street conversion is not part of this plan at this time. If the citizens and the City Council do not support it, it will not be pursued.

Ms. Haldeman stated her other concern is where the trail is being routed behind the airport on Turnbull Bay Road; she thinks that is part of the city’s future sidewalk plan. Since the city already has it in their plans, she asked if the city should wait and let it be paid for through this project.

Ms. Grubert replied they are meeting with all the cities; they have funding for design but not for construction. They have no idea how long it will take to get the construction funding.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked when the BPAC would see cross-sections of what the trail will look like relative to the road as he is concerned about bicycle safety.
Mr. Scarlatos replied that will be more defined at the Alternatives Workshop; some of it ties in with the right-of-way because they are trying to set the trail back as far from the road as they can.

Mr. Harris asked if the Alternatives Workshop has been scheduled yet.

Mr. Scarlatos replied no, it will probably be sometime in early September after more analysis is done. The TPO will be notified; they have updated their mailing list to include the BPAC, CAC, TCC and the TPO Board.

B. Presentation and Discussion Bundle Holly Hill Sidewalk Projects Along Center Avenue, Flomich Street and 15th Street

Mr. Harris gave the background of the five Holly Hill Sidewalk Projects that came out of a Bicycle and Pedestrian School Safety Review Study of Holly Hill Elementary School that the TPO completed in 2007. The Central Avenue and Flomich Street projects have two phases; 15th Street has one. The first project submitted, Flomich Street Phase 1, is in the Work Program on Tier A; it is funded for design in the next fiscal year but at the request of the city, it has been deferred to Fiscal Year 2020. Three projects are on Tier B awaiting funding and one feasibility study on Tier C at number 10. He introduced Mr. Antoine Khoury from Holly Hill to give the presentation.

Mr. Khoury gave a PowerPoint presentation and explained the city's plan for moving forward with these sidewalk projects. Due to challenges with some of these projects, the city feels the need to reprioritize them and that is why they asked for the delay. The Flomich Street project has right-of-way and utility challenges. Center Avenue is the best alternative to move forward with first because it has the widest right-of-way and currently has no conflict potential. He reviewed the projects in more detail. The city is asking to delay the funding currently available from Fiscal Year (FY) 2018/19 to FY 2019/20 and combine these projects so the design contract includes all of them. They will move forward with Center Avenue first, then 15th Street and Flomich Street last. The city is asking for $235,000 from FDOT with a 10% match of $23,500 to bring the total design cost to $258,500. They will also be asking for $750,000 in funding for construction for Center Avenue Phase 1 and Phase 2 for FY 2020/21; the same for 15th Street for FY 2021/22. Because of the challenges, Flomich Street will be last in FY 2023/24 in the amount of $1 million.

Mr. Harris stated there are two letters in the agenda packet; one from Holly Hill and one from the Volusia County Public Works Department. There are two scenarios being discussed; the city could partner with the county and the county would do design and construction or city staff could become Local Agency Program (LAP) certified and perform some of the functions in-house.

Mr. Aufdenberg stated these sidewalks are important because they are next to a school that has the most walking students in the county. He asked if all these projects have gone through the project priority process or if more projects will be coming in to be reviewed.

Mr. Harris replied yes; all five sidewalk projects are working their way through the process. Two are in project implementation and are waiting on funding. The Flomich Street, Phase 1 project is in the Work Program funded for design next year. The last sidewalk is waiting for a feasibility study on Tier C at number 10. Under the city's proposal, that feasibility study would be skipped to be bundled and designed with the other sidewalks.

Mr. Khoury referred to the map that shows the school and stated that all of these sidewalks serve the school. The city is also looking to do pedestrian enhancements such as flashing signs that are easy to implement and do not require much design and capital.

Mr. Harris stated this bundling request is also a request for additional funding because only one segment is funded for design; if the projects are bundled together they would be designed together. The TPO would have to increase the amount of funding to cover the large consolidated project. The city's estimate is $258,000 for design and they would be bundled in FY 2019/20.
Mr. Eik stated he has concerns; a number of people have looked at the city’s proposals over the years in order to give them the best opportunity for these projects to occur. He is hearing that the city would like the TPO to disregard all the prior work done. He understands this but the city needs to go through the proper process and officially submit a bundled project. Another concern is in this proposal the TPO is making a commitment to money that has not been allocated.

Ms. Belin commented she has the same concerns. She asked what happens to the money that was allocated for this year; if it goes back into the box or if it will go to the bundled project.

Mr. Harris replied most likely the money for the design of Flomich Street, Phase 1 would go back into the set aside box and if money is found to program the design of the bundled project it would go to that project; the TPO has not identified funding for that yet.

Ms. Belin asked what the likelihood of finding that funding is and what would have to be sacrificed.

Mr. Harris replied he does not know; there are too many unknown variables.

Mr. Mostert stated it seems that it will be funded anyway but the question is would it be funded incrementally or all at once. It would be cheaper to fund if the projects are bundled; it would be one bid on a larger project. Each of these roads surround the school and should be a high priority. There does not appear to be an issue if they are deferring funding. They are not asking for funding for the project on Tier C.

Mr. Harris replied if the project on Tier C went through the process in the normal way, the study would be completed, the city would apply for funding, it would move up to Tier B and when funding was found, it would move up to Tier A. The project on Tier C would leapfrog some of that process and move from Tier C to being funded in the Work Program as part of the bundled project. This proposal is an exception to how projects normally move through the TPO process but it does represent a viable way to move these projects forward. With these being separate projects on the LOPP they are not moving forward.

Ms. Belin asked if it would save money by bundling the projects.

Mr. Harris replied it is unclear because not all the costs of these projects are known. The four studies that have been completed total about $3.2 million to get the sidewalks built. What Volusia County expressed in their letter is that they think they can achieve a cost savings by pursuing one single project rather than doing them individually.

Mr. Khoury stated the idea is to move forward with the least expensive project which is Center Avenue; it has no right-of-way challenges. They will start design and while finishing that, start the 15th Street design. Flomich Street is a big challenge and might not make it because of those challenges. The city is looking for cost effective projects; it might make sense to do pedestrian enhancements on Flomich Street instead. It has to be cost effective for the TPO and the city.

Mr. Mostert commented the county’s letter dictates they bundle this project. If there are cost overruns, the city will be responsible.

Mr. Harris replied when the city agrees to the TPO’s program, they are bound by TPO policy; it is TPO policy that the city is responsible for cost overruns.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Bollenback stated this started because Holly Hill is not LAP certified; they were going to go through the process of getting LAP certified to administer the projects they have on the priority list. They also discussed working with the county on these projects because the county is perpetually LAP certified. The county agreed but only if the projects are bundled; they want to do all five projects at once. There will be a cost savings by
doing that; the TPO generally encourages bundling but typically projects come in that way as one application. In this case, the projects were already on the priority list when the decision to bundle design was made. It is the right approach for the city and the county to move these projects forward. However, the challenge is the projects were already on the priority list in different places. The TPO can update the priority list and work on bundling these projects through the call for projects but the question is how to fit this in with the TPO’s process and avoid setting a precedent. She showed the priority list and reviewed where these projects currently are and what projects it could effect.

Discussion continued.

Chairperson Storke closed the discussion and asked committee members to think about this and pass on any ideas to the TPO.

C. **Presentation and Discussion of the 2018 R2CTPO Annual Planning Retreat**

(Handout)

Ms. Blankenship gave a PowerPoint presentation of the 2018 R2CTPO Annual Planning Retreat and stated it was held Friday, March 23, 2018 at the Brannon Center in New Smyrna Beach in partnership with Volusia County Association for Responsible Development (VCARD). There were 126 attendees including TPO Board advisory committee members, the press, citizens, consultants, city and government staff, as well as VCARD members. The purpose of the retreat was to provide a forum to discuss and explore current and future transportation technology. It also incorporated some of the TPO’s core planning elements which included the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and how the TPO will include influencing advancing technologies, among others. She reviewed the opening exercise, the five presentations and presenters and showed a video on how the “Travel Safely” app works.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked if cars with this app could talk to a bicyclist on the phone.

Ms. Blankenship replied yes. She continued with the presentation and reviewed the interactive exercise done at the retreat. There were four display autonomous vehicles. She reviewed the different vehicles on display and stated test rides were given in the autonomous Tesla; the “Travel Safely” app was used in that vehicle. The TPO conducted a post-retreat survey that and the results were positive; respondents rated the retreat nine out of ten in satisfaction. The survey suggested topics for next year’s retreat and the top selection was “Transportation in Supporting Economic Development” followed by “What Will Transportation Look Like in the Next 25 Years”. All the presentations given at the retreat are available on the TPO’s website.

Mr. Blais asked about preempted traffic signal systems; fire departments claim with that system they can get emergency vehicles to a scene fifteen minutes faster than just with sirens. He stated he would like to know more about that.

Ms. Burgess-Hall stated she believes that is something that is being discussed for this area on International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) and Nova Road.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked if there more people that attended this year’s retreat than last years on sea level rise.

Ms. Blankenship replied yes; there were 88 attendees at that retreat while this year’s retreat had 126.

V. **Staff Comments**

→ **Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs)**
Mr. Harris stated a memorandum from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regarding the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) is included in the agenda; a new interim approval has been issued based on a new flash pattern.

→ Update on Annual Call for Projects

Mr. Harris stated the TPO received seven projects for implementation and six applications for feasibility studies. The agenda was sent out for the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee meeting and links to all of these applications are provided in it.

Ms. Stewart announced the Executive Committee decided to no longer mail hard copy agendas and have a limited number available at meetings due to a recent cost analysis. There will be an agenda on display when the hard copies are gone at meetings. Hard copies will still be mailed upon request.

VI. Information Items
→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ Bicycle Suitability Map Subcommittee Report
→ TPO Board Meeting Summary
→ TPO Outreach & Activities (March 2018)
→ Regional Resiliency Action Plan Listening Session
→ Project Review Subcommittee Meeting Notice

VII. BPAC Member Comments

Ms. Haldeman announced that a New Smyrna Beach city meeting was held last night regarding the Flagler Avenue Sidewalk project; it has been on the priority list for at least five years. The city notified residents in the general neighborhood with doorknob notices; approximately 15-20 residents attended. Everyone was very positive about the idea. The project will start Monday.

Ms. Burgess-Hall referred to the “Tell the TPO” survey and suggested members distribute them at their other organizations; church, homeowner associations, etc. She suggested having a link to email the survey and also providing hard copies.

Mr. Eik stated he read the memorandum on RRFBs and commented that it still needs to be discussed. He requested it be added to the May BPAC agenda for discussion.

Mr. Aufdenberg reiterated the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Alliance concerns regarding gaps in the trail. They want people from ages eight to eighty to use the trails and gaps like the Ormond Beach Bridge that should not be allowed to be part of the trail. Per the trail rules, there is a link where the trail can be on a road but that bridge is longer than the allowed link. FDOT has repaved Nova Road from International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) to Beville Road; it now has a bike lane northbound but on the southbound side they have installed “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” signs along a 50 mile per hour (mph) road with no shoulders. It is legal to ride a bicycle in the roadway but it is uncomfortable with vehicles approaching at 50 mph. He questioned why the BPAC did not see the design for this. He announced that in May, he will be riding in the D.C. Bike Ride; once a year Washington D.C. closes 20 miles of road for bicyclists on a Saturday. He said it is the day before Mother’s Day this year. The Bicycle Suitability Map Subcommittee also met and they are very excited about the map.

III. Adjournment

The BPAC meeting adjourned at 5:21 p.m.
CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the April 11, 2018 regular meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), approved and duly signed this 9th day of May 2018.

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
III. ACTION ITEMS

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING THE FY 2017/18 – 2021/22 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The proposed amendment to the FY 2017/2018 to 2021/2022 TIP revises funding for one (1) existing project as follows:

- West French Avenue Sidewalk Project (FM # 435499-1) from N. Carpenter Avenue to Valentine Park -- Revises funding to add $50,917 to the Construction (CST) phase in the current year; and re-allocates local and SU amounts corresponding to the 10% match requirement.

The proposed amendment is more fully described in the enclosed Resolution 2018-## and Attachment “A”.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING THE FY 2017/18 – 2021/22 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
WHEREAS, the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for Volusia County and portions of Flagler County inclusive of the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

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

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO shall annually endorse and amend as appropriate, the plans and programs required by 23 C.F.R. 450.300 through 450.324, among which is the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO’s adopted TIP is required to be consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation’s adopted Five-Year Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Department of Transportation has provided additional information to the River to Sea TPO regarding the FDOT adopted Five-Year Work Program.

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

1. River to Sea TPO’s FY 2017/18 to FY 2021/22 TIP is hereby amended as shown in Attachment "A" attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and the

2. Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit the FY 2017/18 to FY 2021/22 TIP as amended to the:
   a. Florida Department of Transportation;
   b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA);
   c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and the
   d. Department of Economic Opportunity.

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regularly convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 23rd day of May 2018.
CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on May 23, 2018.

ATTEST:

________________________________________
DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
W French Avenue Sidewalk

**Work Summary:** SIDEWALK  
**From:** N Carpenter Av  
**To:** Valentine Park

**Lead Agency:** City of Orange City  
**Length:** 1.04 miles

**Project Description:** Construction of a five-foot sidewalk along the north side of West French Avenue between the existing eight-foot sidewalk at Valentine Park to the existing five-foot sidewalk at N. Carpenter Avenue for a total length of 5,503 linear feet. (Reference 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, pgs 10, 11, 81, and table 31 on pg. 72.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>49,871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>80,083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>499,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>687,457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>687,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Cost < 2017/18:** 1,897  
**Future Cost > 2021/22:** 0  
**Total Project Cost:** 638,437
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT FY 2018/19 – 2022/23 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The TPO is required by 23 U.S.C. 134(j) to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a prioritized listing of transportation projects covering a period of five years that is developed and formally adopted by the TPO, consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and required for projects to be eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53. The TIP is developed in cooperation with FDOT and public transit operators.

The TIP lists capital and non-capital surface transportation projects proposed for funding under Title 23 U.S.C. and Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 (including transportation enhancements; safety projects; trails projects; pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities). Also required to be included are all regionally significant projects requiring an action by FHWA or FTA regardless of funding source and projects that implement paratransit plans required for compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. For information and conformity purposes, the TIP includes all regionally significant projects to be funded with federal funds other than those administered by the FHWA or FTA, as well as all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-federal funds. Florida law also requires the TIP to include a list of locally and privately-funded projects for informational purposes. Due to its relatively large size we are providing the draft TIP and a report comparing the draft TIP to the current adopted TIP for viewing and downloading from the TPO’s website at:

M:\TIP\FY 2018-19 to FY 2022-23 TIP\TIP FY 2018-19 to FY 2022-23.pdf

Ms. Colleen Nicoulin, TPO Senior Planner, will lead a committee discussion regarding the draft FY 2017/18 to FY 2021/22 TIP. Issues identified during this discussion will be addressed in a subsequent draft which will be presented to the BPAC for final review and approval in June.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT LIST OF PRIORITIZED BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN AND B/P LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The River to Sea TPO accepted application packets for Transportation Projects from January 25th to April 2nd, 2018. The Project Review Subcommittee met on April 18th and April 25th to evaluate and rank the applications. The draft List of Prioritized Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects is provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>FDOT FM#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Programmed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Needed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4354871</td>
<td>Flagler Av Sidewalk</td>
<td>12th St to Park Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>PE $4,312 FY 16/17; CST $416,830 FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$457,945</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4355351</td>
<td>Forrest Hills Connector</td>
<td>Old Tomoka Rd to Scottsdale Dr</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $1,281 FY 16/17; CST $589,288 FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$645,692</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4355391</td>
<td>N. Spruce Creek Rd Sidewalk</td>
<td>Nova Rd to Angelina Ct</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Port Orange</td>
<td>PE $74,355 FY 16/17; CST $404,595 FY 18/19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$478,158</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4398661</td>
<td>Halifax River/East Coast Greenway Trail</td>
<td>Wilder Bv to Shady Place</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $101,000 FY 16/17 CST $400,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$255,517</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4364341</td>
<td>Seminole/Volusia Gap</td>
<td>Wayside Park to (Seminole County) Spring to Spring Trail (Volusia County)</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $2,572,266 FY 16/17 CEI $25,675 FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$2,099,356</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4106761</td>
<td>Black Bear Scenic Trail (SR 40)</td>
<td>SR 35 (Marion County) to US 17 (Volusia County)</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PD&amp;E $1,138,110 FY 19/20</td>
<td>PE, CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Also known as SR 40 Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4354991</td>
<td>W. French Av Sidewalk and Bike Lane</td>
<td>N. Carpenter Av to Valentine Park</td>
<td>Sidewalk and Bike Lane</td>
<td>Orange City</td>
<td>CST - $636,540; CEI - $57,457</td>
<td>$727,142</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Connects to FM #4355381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4355381</td>
<td>W. French Av Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Trail to Valentine Park</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Orange City</td>
<td>PE $84,683 FY 17/18</td>
<td>ROW, CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Alternative design on south side French Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4302172</td>
<td>Alabama Av Trail</td>
<td>Minnesota Av to US 92</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>DeLand</td>
<td>CST $1,344,112 FY 19/20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,494,267</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4379421</td>
<td>East ISB Beachside Corridor Improvement</td>
<td>US 92 Bridge to SR A1A</td>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $505,000 FY 2017/18</td>
<td>ROW, CST</td>
<td>$27,500,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4390371</td>
<td>Beville Rd Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Williamson Bv to Clyde Morris Bv</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $131,800 FY 16/17; CST $850,000 FY 2020/21; CEI $114,030 FY 20/21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,095,830</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>FDOT FM#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Programmed Phase(s) 8</th>
<th>Needed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4154348</td>
<td>East Central-Regional Rail Trail (ECRRRT)</td>
<td>Guise Rd to Gobbler’s Lodge Rd</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $5,003,500–FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$5,003,500</td>
<td>10% Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4390391</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Trail</td>
<td>Detroit Terrace to US 17-92</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE $299,271–FY 16/17</td>
<td>TFD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10% Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4102511</td>
<td>US 17 Trail</td>
<td>W. Baxter St to SR 40</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE, ROW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>0% FULLY-FUND Project Completed Included in roadway widening project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4364731</td>
<td>Lehigh Trailhead</td>
<td>Palm Coast Tennis Ctr.</td>
<td>Trailhead Palm Coast</td>
<td>PE - $101,000–FY 18/19</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4386351</td>
<td>Graham Swamp Trail, Phase 2</td>
<td>Lehigh Trail to Graham Swamp Trailhead</td>
<td>Palm Coast</td>
<td>PE $1,505,000–FY 18/19; CST $6,393,744 FY</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$7,898,744</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4391951</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Connector Trail</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Trail to US 17-92</td>
<td>DeBary</td>
<td>PE $25,000–FY 16/17; CST $225,000 FY 18/19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0% FULLY-FUND Coast to Coast Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4398741</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Trail</td>
<td>Lake Beresford Park to Grand Av</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE $2,100,000–FY 19/20; CST</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
<td>0% Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4398771</td>
<td>US 17 Trail</td>
<td>Washington Av to Palmetto Av</td>
<td>Pierson</td>
<td>PE $301,000–FY 17/18; CST $987,518–FY 17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,424,240</td>
<td>0% Refer to List of SUN Trail Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded
- Estimated Total Project Cost includes local match.
- CST: County share of total project cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>FDOT FM#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Programmed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Needed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4408481</td>
<td>Deltona Lakes/Spirit-Elem Sidewalks</td>
<td>[multiple limits]</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Deltona</td>
<td>PE $15,901 FY-17/18</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>PE Phase locally funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4408501</td>
<td>Flomich St Sidewalk</td>
<td>Nova Rd to Decatur St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Holly Hill</td>
<td>PE $92,462 FY-18/19</td>
<td>ROW, CST</td>
<td>$506,889</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>LAP Certification needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4408521</td>
<td>Tomoka Elementary Connector Sidewalk</td>
<td>Main Trail to Granada Bv</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $18,200 FY-17/18</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Sidewalk along Old Tomoka Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4408531</td>
<td>Williamson Bv/Hand Av Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Hand Av to Regal Theater Driveway</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $28,400 FY-17/18</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Pedestrian Signal and Sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4409061</td>
<td>Navy Canal Trail</td>
<td>Museum Bv to Clyde Morris Bv</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE - $48,500; CST $225,973; CEL $24,597 FY-18/19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$299,070</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4409411</td>
<td>Tomoka State Park Trail</td>
<td>Sanchez Park to Tomoka State Park</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $87,000 FY-18/19</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Trail connector between Sanchez Park and Tomoka Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>4408541</td>
<td>Lakeview Bv Trail</td>
<td>Matanzas Parkway to London Dr</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Palm Coast</td>
<td>CST $637,271 FY-17/18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$637,271</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>FULLY-FUNDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4425511</td>
<td>Coast to Coast Trail Wayfinding Signage Improvements</td>
<td>Lake Monroe Park to Rotary Park</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE $165,000 FY-18/19</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Ranking</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Limits</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Needed Phase(s)</td>
<td>Estimated Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Local Match %</td>
<td>Year Submitted</td>
<td>Project Score</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N. Orange/E. Graves Av Sidewalks</td>
<td>French Av to University Av/Thorpe Av to Leavitt Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Orange City</td>
<td>PE $56,587.; CST $317,200. (2017)</td>
<td>$373,787</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Removed by R2CTPO policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Providence Bv Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Trail to Alexander Dr and Tivoli Dr to Joyner Dr</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Deltona</td>
<td>CST $2,728,366 (2018)</td>
<td>$2,728,366</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>90.25</td>
<td>Phase 1 trail segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SR A1A at Public Safety Complex Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Intersection of SR A1A and Liberty St</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Shores</td>
<td>CST $223,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$223,000</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Conversion from pedestrian signal to traffic signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>East ISB Beachside Corridor Improvement Plan</td>
<td>US 92-Bridge to SR A1A, Complete Streets to Rotary Park</td>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE,CST $750,000.; ROW $20,000,000.; CST $6,000,000.; CEI $750,000. (2017)</td>
<td>$27,500,000</td>
<td>-%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>Moved to Tier “A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coast to Coast Trail Wayfinding Signage Improvements</td>
<td>Lake Monroe Park to Rotary Park</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE,CST $150,000 (2017)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Signs along Coast to Coast Trail and Rail Trail corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Derbyshire Park Area Sidewalks</td>
<td>Multiple Limits</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $689,784 (2018); CEI $137,956 (2018)</td>
<td>$891,788</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bundle of five (5) sidewalk segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Center Av, Phase 1 Sidewalk</td>
<td>LPGA Bv to Flomich St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Holly Hill</td>
<td>PE $207,208; CST $1,191,128 (2018)</td>
<td>$937,667</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>LAP Certification needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sweetheart Trail Lighting</td>
<td>Orange Av to Main St</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $1,584,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$2,059,200</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Port Orange Sidewalk Gaps</td>
<td>Multiple Limits</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Port Orange</td>
<td>PE $89,000 (2018); CST $360,600 (2018); CEI $60,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$539,600</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75.60</td>
<td>Bundle of four (4) sidewalk segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ormond Beach Downtown Crosswalk RFFB</td>
<td>Southside of SR 40 to Northside of SR 40</td>
<td>RRFB</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $10,000.; CST $36,750 (2017)</td>
<td>$52,750</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>Moved to Tier “A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flomich St Sidewalk</td>
<td>Nova Rd to Decatur St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Holly Hill</td>
<td>PE $87,110.; ROW $79,050.; CST $340,729</td>
<td>$506,889</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>LAP Certification needed; Moved to Tier “A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Completion Year</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>SR A1A National Scenic &amp; Historic Coastal Byway Beautification, Phase 1</td>
<td>N. 10th St to S. 10th St, Flagler Beach, Hardscaping</td>
<td>PE, CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>To be completed in the reconstruction of SR A1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>15th St Sidewalk</td>
<td>Nova Rd to Center Av, Sidewalk, Holly Hill, PE $170,700; CST $778,116 (2018)</td>
<td>$767,234</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td>LAP Certification needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>SR A1A Pedestrian Safety Improvements</td>
<td>[multiple locations], Crosswalks, Ormond Beach, PE $18,000; CST $120,000 (2017)</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>Funded by FDOT Safety Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>S. Holly/E. Lansdowne Av Sidewalks</td>
<td>Graves Av to Blue Springs Av/Volusia Av to Orange Av, Sidewalk, Orange City, PE $101,294 CST $507,298 (2017)</td>
<td>$608,592</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>LAP Certification needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sweetheart Trail Lighting</td>
<td>Beville Rd to Orange Av, Lighting, Daytona Beach, CST $1,354,976 (2018)</td>
<td>$1,761,469</td>
<td>11.23%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Ranking</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Limits</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Needed Phase(s)</td>
<td>Estimated Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Local Match %</td>
<td>Year Submitted</td>
<td>Project Score</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Halifax River/East Coast Greenway Trail</td>
<td>Orange Av to Intl. Speedway Bv</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $55,000; CST $385,500; CEI $77,000 (2016)</td>
<td>$517,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>Aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Graham Swamp Trail Gap, Phase 2</td>
<td>Lehigh Trail to Graham Swamp Trailhead</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Palm Coast</td>
<td>PE – $350,000; CST – $2,500,000 (2017); CEI – $250,000</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>Phase 2 trail segment Moved to Tier “A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>Reed Canal Rd Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Nova Rd to Ridgewood Av</td>
<td>Trail and Sidewalk</td>
<td>South Daytona</td>
<td>PE $725,608; CST TBD (2016)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66.33</td>
<td>Construction cost to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>US 1 Sidewalk</td>
<td>Airport Rd to Wilmette Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>PE $28,000; CST $253,000 (2015)</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Includes upgraded pedestrian signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lehigh Trailhead</td>
<td>At Palm Coast Tennis Center</td>
<td>Trailhead</td>
<td>Palm Coast</td>
<td>PE – $100,000; CST – TBD (2016)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>64.38</td>
<td>Serves Lehigh Trail Moved to Tier “A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 15</td>
<td>Derbyshire Park Trail and Sidewalks</td>
<td>Internal to Derbyshire Park</td>
<td>Trail and Sidewalk</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $458,736 (2014)</td>
<td>$458,736</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>Internal Derbyshire Park Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Turnbull Bay Rd Trail</td>
<td>Fairgreen Av to Industrial Park Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna</td>
<td>PE $105,758 (2018); CST $141,551 (2018)</td>
<td>$821,792</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 18</td>
<td>Derbyshire Park Sidewalk</td>
<td>Vine St to Nova Rd and Brentwood St to 5th St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $413,648 (2014)</td>
<td>$413,648</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>External Derbyshire Park Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 19</td>
<td>SR 44 Median Improvements, Phase 2</td>
<td>Glencoe Rd to Sugarmill Dr</td>
<td>Landscaping and Median Improvements</td>
<td>New Smyrna</td>
<td>PE $80,000; CST – $548,000; CEI – $20,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$648,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>Landscaping to be locally funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>County Rd 3 Shared Use</td>
<td>Washington Av to Palmetto Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Pierso n</td>
<td>PE $260,500 (2018); CST $905,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$2,169,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tarragona Way Sidewalk</td>
<td>Australia St to Museum St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $300,894 (2014)</td>
<td>$300,894</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Designed by project sponsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## River to Sea TPO List of Prioritized Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

### Tier "C" – Projects Awaiting Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>Year Submitted</th>
<th>Project Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flomich St Sidewalk, Phase 2</td>
<td>Decatur St to Ridgewood Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Holly Hill</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ponce Inlet Mobility Project</td>
<td>[multiple limits]</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Ponce Inlet</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turnbull Bay Road Trail</td>
<td>Industrial Park Av to Fairgreen Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 442 Sidewalk</td>
<td>I-95 to Air Park Rd</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Golfview Blvd Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Big Tree Rd to Beville Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>South Daytona</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Madeline Av Trail &amp; Sidewalk, Phase 2</td>
<td>Williamson Blvd to Clyde Morris Blvd</td>
<td>Trail and Sidewalk</td>
<td>Port Orange</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Taylor Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>Leaning Tree Place to Blue Lake Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>DeLand</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Madeline Av Sidewalk</td>
<td>Clyde Morris Bv to Nova Rd</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Port Orange</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Willow Run Bv Sidewalk</td>
<td>Harms Way to Clyde Morris Bv</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Port Orange</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 44 Trail</td>
<td>Regency Trail to I-95 northbound ramp</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Magnolia Av Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Reed Canal Rd to Beville Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>South Daytona</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>South St Trail</td>
<td>Turnbull Bay Rd to US 1</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Center Av Sidewalk, Phase 2</td>
<td>3rd St to LPGA Bv</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Holly Hill</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Anastasia Dr Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Reed Canal Rd to Big Tree Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>South Daytona</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ocean Av Sidewalk</td>
<td>S. Peninsula Av to S. Atlantic Av</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>South Daytona Elem School Sidewalk Expansion</td>
<td>Multiple Limits</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>South Daytona</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hickory Bluff Preserve Trail</td>
<td>Hickory Bluff Preserve to Maytown Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Volusia Gap</td>
<td>US 17-92 Bridge to Spring to Spring Trail</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Art Center Bv Sidewalk</td>
<td>Sundance Trail to US 1</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lambert Av Sidewalk</td>
<td>Palm Dr to Lambert Cove</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Flagler Beach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TBD – to be determined
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT LIST OF SHARED USE NONMOTORIZED (SUN) TRAIL PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In 2015, the Shared-Use Non-motorized (SUN) Trail Network was created by the Florida Legislature as a component of the Florida Greenways and Trails System. The network consists of multiuse trails separated from motor vehicle traffic and constructed with asphalt or concrete. The List of SUN Trail Projects is separate from the List of Prioritized Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects. All projects on the List of SUN Trail Projects are in the five year FDOT work program with one or more phases funded.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
# River to Sea TPO List of Shared Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail Projects

**DRAFT 5/2/18**

## Tier "A" – Projects with One or More Phases Funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDOT ID#</th>
<th>Regional Trail System</th>
<th>FDOT FM#</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Programmed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Needed Phase(s)</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398731</td>
<td>Flagler</td>
<td>SR A1A</td>
<td>S. 26th St to N. 9th St</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Flagler Beach</td>
<td>PDE $600,000 FY 17/18 PE $2,500,000 FY 20/21</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$3,115,000</td>
<td>SR A1A or alternate route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398711</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 1: N. Beach St</td>
<td>Sickler Dr from 350' south of 2nd St to 2nd St</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $1,060 FY 17/18 CST $100,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$101,060</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398701</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 2: Ballough Bridge</td>
<td>Ballough Road Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $1,060 FY 17/18 CST $100,000 FY 18/19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398691</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 3: S. Beach St</td>
<td>Marina Point Dr to Orange Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $450,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398681</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 4: S. Beach St</td>
<td>Bellevue Av to Marina Point Dr</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>PE $8,181 FY 17/18 CST $300,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$501,000</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398671</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 5: Donnelly Place</td>
<td>Shady Place to Bellevue Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $196,277 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398661</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Daytona Beach Gap 6: S. Beach St</td>
<td>Wilder Blvd to Shady Place</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>CST $500,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$366,000</td>
<td>aka Sweetheart Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398651</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>New Smyrna to Port Orange Gap: US 1</td>
<td>Canal St. to Beville Rd SR 44/Lytle Av to Beville Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach/Port Orange/South Daytona</td>
<td>PDE $800,000 FY 17/18 PE $3,500,000 FY 18/19</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398641</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>New Smyrna Gap: Myrtle Av</td>
<td>10th St to SR 44/Lytle Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach</td>
<td>PE $800,000 FY 17/18; ROW $375,000 FY 19/20</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398761</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>SR 15 (US 17)</td>
<td>SR 40 to Putnam County Line</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PDE $732,963 FY 17/18 PE $2,835,000 FY 20/21</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398771</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Pierson Gap: SR 15 (US 17)</td>
<td>Washington Av to Palmetto Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Pierson</td>
<td>CST $876,924 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT ID#</td>
<td>Regional Trail System</td>
<td>FDOT FM#</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Project Limits</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Programmed Phase(s)</td>
<td>Needed Phase(s)</td>
<td>Estimated Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398751</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: DeLeon Springs</td>
<td>Grand Av/Baxter St to SR 15 (US 17)</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>ROW $400,000 FY 18/19 CST $4,500,000 FY 19/20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398741</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: DeLand</td>
<td>Lake Beresford Park to Grand Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PDE $20,443 FY 17/18 PE $2,143,988 FY 19/20 CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4390393</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: DeBary (Phase 3B)</td>
<td>US 17/92 from Benson Junction Rd to W. Highbanks Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $2,225,000 FY 18/19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4390392</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: DeBary (Phase 3A)</td>
<td>DeBary Plantation Blvd to Detroit Terrace</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $2,225,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
<td>Replaces original project limits: W. Highbanks Rd (Rob Sullivan Park) to Detroit Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>4154348</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>East Central Regional Rail Trail (Phase 4A)</td>
<td>Guise Rd to Gobbler’s Lodge Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $5,000,000 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Design-build in FY 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398621</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Oak Hill to Edgewater: US 1</td>
<td>Kennedy Pkwy to Dale Av</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE $2,349,000 FY 20/21 CST $5,889,945 FY 22/23</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$8,238,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398631</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Edgewater Gap</td>
<td>Dale Av to 10th St</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>CST $1,100,000 FY 2016/17</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>4364341</td>
<td>Seminole/ Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: US 17/92 Bridge</td>
<td>Wayside Park to Lake Monroe Park</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>CST $177,173 FY 17/18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>Project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>4364342</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Spring to Spring Gap: Lake Monroe Park to Old DeLand Rd</td>
<td>Lake Monroe Park to Old DeLand Rd</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Volusia County</td>
<td>PE $128,199 FY 2017/18 CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SJR2C</td>
<td>4398721</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>Ormond Beach Gap: SR 40</td>
<td>Cassen Park to A1A</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Ormond Beach</td>
<td>FS $21,339 FY 17/18 PE, CST</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2C: Coast to Coast  CST: Construction  PDE: Project Development & Environment Study  PE: Design  ROW: Right-of-Way  SJR2C: St. Johns River to Sea Loop  TBD: To be determined
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. STATUS REPORT ON RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACONS (RRFBs)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) are user-actuated amber LEDs that supplement warning signs at unsignalized intersections or mid-block crosswalks. TPO staff will provide a status report on the USDOT Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) interim approval of RRFBs.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
Memorandum

Subject: INFORMATION: MUTCD – Interim Approval for Optional Use of Pedestrian-Actuated Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons at Uncontrolled Marked Crosswalks (IA-21)

From: Martin C. Knopp  
Associate Administrator for Operations

To: Federal Lands Highway Division Directors  
Division Administrators

Date: MAR 20 2018

In Reply Refer To: HOTO-1

Purpose: The purpose of this memorandum is to issue an Interim Approval for the optional use of Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons (RRFB) as pedestrian-actuated conspicuity enhancements for pedestrian and school crossing warning signs under certain limited conditions. Interim Approval allows interim use, pending official rulemaking, of a new traffic control device, a revision to the application or manner of use of an existing traffic control device, or a provision not specifically described in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (MUTCD). State and local agencies must request and receive permission to use this new Interim Approval, designated IA-21, from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in accordance with the provisions of Section 1A.10 of the MUTCD before they can use the RRFB, even if prior approval had been given for Interim Approval 11 (IA-11), now terminated. The issuance of this new Interim Approval does not reinstate IA-11 either in whole or in part.

Background: The Florida Department of Transportation has requested that the FHWA issue an Interim Approval to allow the use of RRFBs as pedestrian-actuated conspicuity enhancements to supplement standard pedestrian and school crossing warning signs at uncontrolled marked crosswalks. The RRFB does not meet the current standards for flashing warning beacons as contained in the 2009 edition of the MUTCD, Chapter 4L, which requires a warning beacon to be circular in shape and either 8 or 12 inches in diameter, to flash at a rate of approximately once per second, and to be located no less than 12 inches outside the nearest edge of the warning sign it supplements. The RRFB uses rectangular-shaped high-intensity light-emitting-diode (LED)-based indications, flashes rapidly in a combination wig-wag and simultaneous flash pattern, and may be mounted immediately adjacent to the crossing sign.
**Research on the RRFB.** The City of St. Petersburg, Florida, experimented with the RRFB at 18 pedestrian crosswalks across uncontrolled approaches and submitted its final report in 2008. In addition to “before” data, the city collected “after” data at intervals for one year at all 18 sites and for two years at the first two implemented sites. For the first two sites, the city collected data for overhead and ground-mounted pedestrian crossing signs supplemented with standard circular yellow flashing warning beacons, for comparison purposes, before the RRFBs were installed. The data showed higher motorist yielding rates at crosswalks where the RRFBs had been installed in comparison to lower rates for standard warning beacons. The higher yielding rates were sustained even after two years of operation, and no identifiable negative effects were found. The St. Petersburg data also showed that drivers exhibit yielding behavior much farther in advance of crosswalks with RRFBs than with standard circular yellow flashing warning beacons.

In addition to the St. Petersburg locations, experimentation with RRFBs was also conducted at other uncontrolled marked crosswalks in Florida and other States. Data from locations other than St. Petersburg was limited, but did show results similar to those found in St. Petersburg.

The Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) conducted a Federally funded research project\(^1\) that developed and tested a new flash pattern for the RRFB that was shown to be at least as effective as the flash pattern that was initially tested in St. Petersburg, Florida, and that showed that mounting the RRFB unit above the sign was at least as effective as mounting the RRFB unit below the sign. In this project, the results were generally favorable, however there was a wide range of yielding rates, with some as low as 19 percent. This broad range indicates that there might be certain factors or characteristics of locations at which the RRFB might not be effective.

A separate project\(^2\) conducted by TTI examined data from multiple projects to determine various factors that influenced driver yielding rates at RRFB locations. In this project, the researchers found that intersection configuration, presence of a median refuge, crossing distance, approach to the crossing, and one-way vs. two-way traffic significantly affected the rate of driver yielding. Additional factors including posted speed limit, mounting of the beacons (overhead or roadside), and the type of crossing and sign—Pedestrian (W11-2) or School (S1-1) sign compared with the Trail Crossing (W11-15) sign—were also significant.

---


**FHWA Evaluation of Results:** The Office of Transportation Operations reviewed the available data in 2008 and considered the RRFB to be highly successful for the applications tested (uncontrolled marked crosswalks). The RRFB offers significant potential safety and cost benefits because it achieves high rates of compliance at a low relative cost in comparison to other more restrictive devices that provide comparable results, such as full midblock signalization or pedestrian hybrid beacons.

The FHWA granted interim approval status to the RRFB on July 16, 2008, and designated that action as Interim Approval 11 (IA-11).

The FHWA was later informed that the concept of the RRFB had been patented by a private company. Because patented traffic control devices are not allowed to be included in the MUTCD, are not allowed to be given interim approval status, and are not allowed to be a part of an official experiment, the FHWA terminated Interim Approval 11 on December 21, 2017.

The FHWA has confirmed that the patents on the RRFB device that was the subject of Interim Approval 11 have been expressly abandoned and the concept of the RRFB is now in the public domain. Because of this action, the RRFB is once again eligible for interim approval status and the FHWA is issuing this new Interim Approval for the RRFB.

Interim Approval 11 (IA-11) remains terminated. Agencies that previously had been approved to use RRFBs under IA-11 are not covered by this new Interim Approval to install new RRFBs. If agencies that had approval under IA-11 wish to continue to install new RRFBs, then they must submit a new request to the FHWA and agree to comply with the terms and conditions of IA-21.

This Interim Approval does not create a new mandate compelling installation of RRFBs, but will allow agencies to install this traffic control device, pending official MUTCD rulemaking, to provide a degree of enhanced pedestrian safety at uncontrolled marked crosswalks.

**Conditions of Interim Approval:** The FHWA will grant Interim Approval for the optional use of the RRFB as a pedestrian-actuated conspicuity enhancement to supplement standard pedestrian crossing or school crossing signs at uncontrolled marked crosswalks to any jurisdiction that submits a written request to the Office of Transportation Operations. A State may request Interim Approval for all jurisdictions in that State. Jurisdictions using RRFBs under this Interim Approval must agree to the following:

- Comply with the Technical Conditions detailed in this memorandum;
- Maintain an inventory list of all locations at which the RRFB is installed; and
- Comply with all the conditions as listed in Paragraph 18 of Section 1A.10 of the MUTCD.
In addition, any agency that receives this approval must acknowledge agreement with the following:

- That an agency will furnish its list of locations where implemented if requested by FHWA;
- That FHWA has the right to rescind this Interim Approval at any time; and
- That issuance of this Interim Approval does not guarantee that the provisions, either in whole or part, will be adopted into the MUTCD.

1. General Conditions:

   a. Each RRFB unit shall consist of two rapidly flashed rectangular-shaped yellow indications with an LED-array-based light source, and shall be designed, located, and operated in accordance with the detailed requirements specified below.

   b. The use of RRFBs is optional. However, if an agency opts to use an RRFB under this Interim Approval, the following design and operational requirements shall apply, and shall take precedence over any conflicting provisions of the MUTCD for the approach on which RRFBs are used:

2. Allowable Uses:

   a. An RRFB shall only be installed to function as a pedestrian-actuated conspicuity enhancement.

   b. An RRFB shall only be used to supplement a post-mounted W11-2 (Pedestrian), S1-1 (School), or W11-15 (Trail) crossing warning sign with a diagonal downward arrow (W16-7P) plaque, or an overhead-mounted W11-2, S1-1, or W11-15 crossing warning sign, located at or immediately adjacent to an uncontrolled marked crosswalk.

   c. Except for crosswalks across the approach to or egress from a roundabout, an RRFB shall not be used for crosswalks across approaches controlled by YIELD signs, STOP signs, traffic control signals, or pedestrian hybrid beacons.

   d. In the event sight distance approaching the crosswalk at which RRFBs are used is less than deemed necessary by the engineer, an additional RRFB may be installed on that approach in advance of the crosswalk, as a pedestrian-actuated conspicuity enhancement to supplement a W11-2 (Pedestrian), S1-1 (School), or W11-15 (Trail) crossing warning sign with an AHEAD (W16-9P) or distance (W16-2P or W16-2aP) plaque. If an additional RRFB is installed on the approach in advance of the crosswalk, it shall be supplemental to and not a replacement for the RRFBs at the crosswalk itself.

3. Sign/Beacon Assembly Locations:

   a. For any approach on which RRFBs are used to supplement post-mounted signs,
at least two W11-2, S1-1, or W11-15 crossing warning signs (each with an RRFB unit and a W16-7P plaque) shall be installed at the crosswalk, one on the right-hand side of the roadway and one on the left-hand side of the roadway. On a divided highway, the left-hand side assembly should be installed on the median, if practical, rather than on the far left-hand side of the highway.

b. An RRFB unit shall not be installed independent of the crossing warning signs for the approach that the RRFB faces. If the RRFB unit is supplementing a post-mounted sign, the RRFB unit shall be installed on the same support as the associated W11-2, S1-1, or W11-15 crossing warning sign and plaque. If the RRFB unit is supplementing an overhead-mounted sign, the RRFB unit shall be mounted directly below the bottom of the sign.

4. Beacon Dimensions and Placement in the Sign Assembly:

   a. Each RRFB shall consist of two rectangular-shaped yellow indications, each with an LED-array-based light source. The size of each RRFB indication shall be at least 5 inches wide by at least 2 inches high.

   b. The two RRFB indications for each RRFB unit shall be aligned horizontally, with the longer dimension horizontal and with a minimum space between the two indications of at least 7 inches, measured from the nearest edge of one indication to the nearest edge of the other indication.

   c. The outside edges of the RRFB indications, including any housings, shall not project beyond the outside edges of the W11-2, S1-1, or W11-15 sign that it supplements.

   d. As a specific exception to Paragraph 5 of Section 4L.01 of the 2009 MUTCD, the RRFB unit associated with a post-mounted sign and plaque may be located between and immediately adjacent to the bottom of the crossing warning sign and the top of the supplemental downward diagonal arrow plaque (or, in the case of a supplemental advance sign, the AHEAD or distance plaque) or within 12 inches above the crossing warning sign, rather than the recommended minimum of 12 inches above or below the sign assembly. (See the example photo that is shown below.)

5. Beacon Flashing Requirements:

   a. When actuated, the two yellow indications in each RRFB unit shall flash in a rapidly flashing sequence.

   b. As a specific exception to the requirements for the flash rate of beacons provided in Paragraph 3 of Section 4L.01, RRFBs shall use a much faster flash rate and shall provide 75 flashing sequences per minute. Except as provided in Condition 5f below, during each 800-millisecond flashing sequence, the left and right RRFB indications shall operate using the following sequence:
The RRFB indication on the left-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

The RRFB indication on the right-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

The RRFB indication on the left-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

The RRFB indication on the right-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

Both RRFB indications shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

The RRFB indication on the right-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.
Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 250 milliseconds.

c. The flash rate of each individual RRFB indication, as applied over the full flashing sequence, shall not be between 5 and 30 flashes per second to avoid frequencies that might cause seizures.

d. The light intensity of the yellow indications during daytime conditions shall meet the minimum specifications for Class 1 yellow peak luminous intensity in the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) Standard J595 (Directional Flashing Optical Warning Devices for Authorized Emergency, Maintenance, and Service Vehicles) dated January 2005.

e. To minimize excessive glare during nighttime conditions, an automatic signal dimming device should be used to reduce the brilliance of the RRFB indications during nighttime conditions.

f. Existing RRFB units that use the flashing sequence that was specified in the Interim Approval 11 memorandum and a subsequent interpretation (the RRFB indication on the left-hand side emits two slow pulses of light after which the RRFB indication on the right-hand side emits four rapid pulses of light followed by one long pulse of light) should be reprogrammed to the flash pattern specified above in Condition 5b as part of a systematic upgrading process, such as when the units are serviced or when the existing signs are replaced.
6. **Beacon Operation:**

   a. The RRFB shall be normally dark, shall initiate operation only upon pedestrian actuation, and shall cease operation at a predetermined time after the pedestrian actuation or, with passive detection, after the pedestrian clears the crosswalk.

   b. All RRFB units associated with a given crosswalk (including those with an advance crossing sign, if used) shall, when actuated, simultaneously commence operation of their rapid-flashing indications and shall cease operation simultaneously.

   c. If pedestrian pushbutton detectors (rather than passive detection) are used to actuate the RRFB indications, a PUSH BUTTON TO TURN ON WARNING LIGHTS (R10-25) sign shall be installed explaining the purpose and use of the pedestrian pushbutton detector.

   d. The duration of a predetermined period of operation of the RRFBs following each actuation should be based on the procedures provided in Section 4E.06 of the 2009 MUTCD for the timing of pedestrian clearance times for pedestrian signals.

   e. The predetermined flash period shall be immediately initiated each and every time that a pedestrian is detected either through passive detection or as a result of a pedestrian pressing a pushbutton detector, including when pedestrians are detected while the RRFBs are already flashing and when pedestrians are detected immediately after the RRFBs have ceased flashing.

   f. A small pilot light may be installed integral to the RRFB or pedestrian pushbutton detector to give confirmation that the RRFB is in operation.

7. **Accessible Pedestrian Features:**

   a. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, a locator tone shall be provided.

   b. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, the audible information device shall not use vibrotactile indications or percussive indications.

   c. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, the message should say, “Yellow lights are flashing.” The message should be spoken twice.

Any questions concerning this Interim Approval should be directed to Mr. Duane Thomas at duane.thomas@dot.gov.
Figure 1. Example of an RRFB dark (left) and illuminated during the flash period (center and right) mounted with W11-2 sign and W16-7P plaque at an uncontrolled marked crosswalk.

Figure 2. View of pilot light to pedestrian at shared-use path crossing with median refuge. Enlargement of pilot light at right.
Figure 3. Example of pedestrian pushbutton and R10-25 sign with pilot light for pedestrian actuation.
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VIII. ADJOURNMENT
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)

2018 “TELL THE TPO” SURVEY CAMPAIGN LAUNCHES

Daytona Beach FL: The River to Sea TPO (R2CTPO), www.R2CTPO.org, is actively seeking public participation as we plan transportation improvements for the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA), which includes all of Volusia County and portions of Flagler County, including Beverly Beach and Flagler Beach as well as portions of the cities of Palm Coast and Bunnell. The R2CTPO will officially launch the 2018 “Tell the TPO” Community Transportation Survey Campaign on April 30, 2018, and the survey will be open through June 30, 2018. This survey is conducted every two years and helps provide insights for the TPO as it makes decisions on transportation priorities.

To ensure the highest possible survey response rate, the survey is available online at www.TelltheTPO.com (PC and mobile-device friendly); hard copies are also available, both in Spanish and English. Each person who completes the survey by June 30, 2018 can choose to be entered into a drawing to win a 3 day/2 night hotel stay for 2!

Specifically, the River to Sea TPO would like to ask:

**INDIVIDUALS:** Visit www.TelltheTPO.com and click the link to fill out the survey to tell us what you think about transportation in Volusia and Flagler Counties.

**EMPLOYERS:** Email the www.TelltheTPO.com link to your employees, clients and contact lists.

**ORGANIZATIONS:** Include this information in your next newsletter and/or email the www.TelltheTPO.com link to your members and contact lists.

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:** Place the www.TelltheTPO.com link on your website, in newsletters and/or in emails to your employees and stakeholders.

There is an online Tool Kit available at www.TelltheTPO.com that includes suggested email and social media blast language and graphics, printable surveys, an outreach flyer and other items to help you help us get the word out! Thank you for your support of the River to Sea TPO’s 2018 “Tell the TPO” Survey Campaign!

For more information, please contact:
Pamela Blankenship, R2CTPO Community Outreach Coordinator
386-226-0422 ext. 20416
PBlankenship@r2ctpo.org

###
A COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION SURVEY

The River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) wants your input as we plan transportation improvements for Volusia County and parts of Flagler County. Please complete our survey online at www.TelltheTPO.com or mail back this copy. All responses received by 6/30/18 will be eligible to enter a drawing for a three day/two night hotel mini-vacation.

1a. Home Zip _____________________________ Work/School Zip (If applicable): _____________________________

1b. Have you taken a River to Sea TPO “Tell the TPO” survey in the past? (Check one):
   Yes  No

2. What forms of transportation do you use regularly (3 or more times per week)? (Select any that apply):
   Walk  Bicycle  Drive Alone  Carpool  Bus  SunRail  Uber/Taxi

3. If you do not walk or bicycle now, what prevents you from doing so? (Select any that apply):
   Lack of pedestrian or bike facilities (sidewalks, marked crosswalks, paths, bike lanes, etc.)
   Safety concerns (too much traffic, vehicles too fast, sidewalks too close to roadway, etc.)
   Distance too far or takes too long to walk or bicycle
   I am not comfortable with my bicycle riding/walking ability
   I won’t walk or ride a bicycle, even if pedestrian and bicycle facilities are improved
   I can’t walk or ride a bicycle, no matter how sidewalks or bicycle lanes are improved

4. If you do not regularly use public transit buses, what improvements might make it a more attractive option for you? (Select any that apply):
   More convenient bus stops or route locations
   Faster or more direct bus stop
   More frequent and/or expanded hours for bus service
   Cleaner buses
   Lower fares
   I do not know enough about public bus service to make that choice
   I will not ride the bus, even with public transportation improvements

5. If you do not regularly use SunRail, what improvements might make it a more attractive option for you? (Select any that apply):
   More frequent and/or expanded hours for SunRail service
   Expand SunRail service to DeLand station
   Expand SunRail service beyond DeLand station
   Lower fares
   More parking at stations
   More effective feeder bus service
   I will not ride SunRail, even with public transportation improvements

6. What is your overall level of satisfaction with the current transportation facilities in Volusia/Flagler Counties? (Select one answer for each category.)
   (Rank: 1=completely satisfied; 2=somewhat satisfied; 3=no opinion; 4=somewhat dissatisfied; 5=completely dissatisfied):
   a. Sidewalks and crosswalks (availability, maintenance conditions, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Trail system (availability, trail conditions, logical connections, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Bicycle lanes (accessibility, bicycle lane markings, pavement conditions etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   d. Public transit service (availability, routes connecting destinations, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   e. Public transit shelters/benches (availability, conditions) 1 2 3 4 5
   f. Local neighborhood streets (traffic, maintenance conditions, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   g. Major streets (traffic, maintenance conditions, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   h. Interstate highways (traffic, maintenance conditions, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

7. As we prioritize spending on transportation projects, do you think we should invest more, the same or less than we are spending now on the following? (Select one answer for each category.)
   (Rank: 1=much more; 2=more; 3=the same; 4=less 5=much less):
   a. Improving roadway operations (better traffic signal timings, adding or extending turn lanes, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   b. Implementing technology to improve safety and efficiency of traffic operations (e.g. coordinated traffic signals, real-time mobile traffic info, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   c. Building new roadways 1 2 3 4 5
   d. Adding lanes to existing roadways 1 2 3 4 5
   e. Traffic calming measures (e.g. roundabouts, speed bumps, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   f. Improving/adding bus service 1 2 3 4 5
   g. Improving/adding SunRail service 1 2 3 4 5
   h. Encouraging carpooling (e.g. communication and/or incentives) 1 2 3 4 5
   i. Adding/Improving multi-use trails 1 2 3 4 5
   j. Improving walking conditions (e.g. sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
   k. Improving bicycling conditions (bike lanes, wayfinding, paved shoulders, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

Continue Survey >>

To complete this survey online, visit www.TelltheTPO.com
8. New transportation technology is important for which of the following (Select one answer for each category.) (Rank: 1=most important; 2=somewhat important; 3=neutral; 4=less important; 5=least important):
   a. Improving the flow of vehicle traffic
   b. Helping transit vehicles arrive on time or have shorter travel times
   c. Reducing freight shipping travel times
   d. Providing real-time information to drivers/transit riders/pedestrians (via mobile devices, variable message signs on roadways, etc.)
   e. Decreasing roadway crashes
   f. Providing safer intersections for pedestrian (talking or countdown signals)

9. Transportation needs exceed the amount of funding available. Which types of transportation projects are your highest priorities to fund with our limited resources? (Select your top three choices):
   - Improve transit service (bus and SunRail)
   - Widen existing roadways
   - Construct new bike lanes and trails/greenways
   - Construct new sidewalks/improve connectivity
   - Install bicycle/pedestrian-oriented signals
   - Improve roadway safety
   - Replace/upgrade aging facilities
   - Improve street appearance (lighting and landscaping)
   - Build new streets and roadways
   - Implement new transportation technologies
   - Other:

10. Crash data show the following intersections as the 10 highest crash locations in the planning area. These areas also have increasing congestion. Which of these intersections cause the greatest concern for you as a driver, bicyclist or pedestrian? (Select your top three choices):
   - Dunlawton Ave. @ South Nova Rd.
   - Cypress Point Pkwy. @ Palm Coast Parkway/Boulder Rock Dr.
   - International Speedway Blvd. @ Ridgewood Ave.
   - International Speedway Blvd. @ Williamson Rd.
   - International Speedway Blvd. @ Clyde Morris Blvd.
   - Granada Blvd. @ Nova Rd.
   - Granada Blvd. @ North Yonge St. (US 1)
   - Granada Blvd. @ Williamson Blvd.
   - South Clyde Morris Blvd. @ Dunlawton Ave.
   - Palm Coast Pkwy. @ Old Kings Rd.

11. Optional Questions - Please describe yourself (This information helps us know if we’ve reached all types of travelers within our area):
   11a. Age
       - <16
       - 16 to 25
       - 26 to 40
       - 41 to 65
       - >65
   11b. Gender
       - Female
       - Male
       - Other
   11c. Work Status
       - Employer
       - Employee
       - Student
       - Retiree
       - Other
   11d. Race/Ethnicity
       - White
       - Hispanic/Latino
       - Black/African American
       - Asian
       - Other
   11e. Annual income
       - <$25,000
       - $25,001 to $45,000
       - $45,001 to $100,000
       - >$100,000

If you want to be eligible to win a three day/two night hotel mini-vacation, please provide your name, email address and phone number below. PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: The River to Sea TPO is governed by the State of Florida public records law. Information we receive may be disclosed to any person making a public records request in accordance with Chapter 119 Florida Statutes. This information is for prize notification purposes only.

Name
Email
Phone #

Please let us know if you would like additional information on: (Select all that apply*)
   - River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (meetings, issues and events)
   - reThink Your Commute (ridesharing, carpooling, park-and-ride services, etc.)
   - Votran (bus schedules, updates, route changes, etc.)
   - Flagler County Public Transportation (news, updates, etc.)
   - SunRail (news, updates, schedule, etc.)
   - No thank you

*If you check any box other than the last one, your email address will be shared with the agency you indicated.

As we plan transportation improvements in Volusia and Flagler Counties, do you have any additional concerns, suggestions, problems, and/or recommendations for us?

If you want to receive your survey results, please send an email to RIVER TO SEA TPO.

Mail To: RIVER TO SEA TPO
2570 W. International Speedway Boulevard, Suite 100
Daytona Beach, FL 32114-8145

**Hard copies of the survey can be mailed back to the TPO or turned in at any Volusia County or Flagler County branch library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Ryan/Doug Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daytona Beach (appt. 3/12) (alt. appt. 02/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wendler</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeLand (appt. 05/11) (appt. 6/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Leisen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deltona (appt. 12/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Grenham</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgewater (appt. 01/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Eik (17/18 Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler Beach (appt. 7/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Coletti/Andrew Dodzik</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt 2/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Blais</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Hill (appt 3/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic Mostert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach (appt. 03/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Storke (17/18 Chairman)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange City (appt. 12/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Belin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ormond Beach (appt. 01/15 - 07/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Anderson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Coast (Appt. 02/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Villanella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ponce Inlet (Appt. 4/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Gillis</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Daytona (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McCallister</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County District 1 (appt. 10/16) (Patterson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Walters/Jason Aufdenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County At-Large (appt. 03/05) (alt. appt 07/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Burgess-Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (app 2/14) D-2 (Wheeler) [alt. appt 09/15] [appt 3/18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Haldeman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (appt. 04/13) D-3 (Denys)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Hickey</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt. 12/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Petito/Bob Owens</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County Transit (appt 9/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Perney</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large City - Port Orange (appt. 10/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cotton/Edie Biro</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Votran (appt. 07/13) [alt. appt. 02/16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Winsett/Terri Bergeron</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (02/14) [alt. Appt. 09/16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Brinson/Eric Kozielisk</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County School Board (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ziarnek</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT (appt 8/17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUORUM**

Y Y Y Y

**Vacancies**

- Beverly Beach
- Bunnell
- Daytona Beach Shores
- DeBary
- Flagler County School Board
- Flagler County Traffic Engineering
- Lake Helen
- Oak Hill
- Pierson
- Port Orange
- Volusia County D-2
- Volusia County Chair
BPAC Project Review Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
April 18, 2018

- Selected Dr. Jason Aufdenberg as Chairperson and Ms. Alice Haldeman as Vice Chairperson

- Evaluated and ranked 6 bicycle/pedestrian project applications (3 for feasibility studies and 3 for project implementation)

- Approved a motion declining to rank the Saxon-Normandy Intersection Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study on the grounds that it reduces pedestrian mobility and access by removing street level pedestrian safety equipment (crosswalks, pedestrian signals, etc.)

**The next meeting will be on Wednesday, April 25, 2018**
BPAC Project Review Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
April 25, 2018

- Evaluated and ranked 7 bicycle/pedestrian project applications (3 for feasibility studies and 4 for project implementation)

- Approved a motion recommending the addition of Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) equipment to the SR A1A at Public Safety Complex (Liberty Street) Traffic Signal Project
River to Sea TPO Board
Meeting Summary
April 25, 2018

• Introduced new FDOT District 5 Secretary, Mr. Mike Shannon

• Approved consent agenda including approval of the March 28, 2018 TPO Board meeting minutes, and the approval of the Selection Committee’s recommendation for copier services

• Held Open Public Hearing on the FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP); no comments were received

• Approved Resolution 2018-08 adopting the FY 2018/19 and 2019/20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

• Approved Resolution 2018-09 amending the FY 2017/18 to 2021/22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

• Received a PowerPoint presentation and approved the 2018 River to Sea TPO’s “Tell the TPO” survey questions

• Received a staff presentation of the draft R2CTPO FY 2018/19 budget

• Received a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the request to bundle Holly Hill sidewalk projects along Center Avenue, Flomich Street and 15th Street

• Received a staff PowerPoint presentation of the 2018 R2CTPO Planning Retreat

• Received a PowerPoint presentation of the R2CTPO Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) Master Plan

• Received the FDOT report

• Received Executive Director’s Report including an update on the Annual Call for Projects and announced TIGER Grant

• Announced the proposed sales tax initiative will go before the Volusia County Council Tuesday, May 1, 2018 at 10:10 am and urged members to be there to support it

Items Requiring Follow-Up

• Executive Director to email her report with updates on FY 2017/18 SU funding; the Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials; the Flagler County Transit Operations Plan; the Regional Truck Park Study; the Volusia County Bus Stop Improvement Plan

The next River to Sea TPO Board meeting will be on Wednesday, May 23, 2018