Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Meeting Minutes June 16, 2020

**NOTE: THIS MEETING WAS HELD AS AN ONLINE VIDEO/AUDIO CONFERENCE AS PERMITTED UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDERS 20-69 and 20-114 (A physical presence was also supported)

TCC Members Present:

Andrew Holmes Ron Paradise Darren Lear Brian Walker Rebecca Witte

Kyle Fegley

Becky Mendez, Vice Chairperson

Shawn Finley

Jose Papa, Chairperson

Mark Karet Tim Burman Melissa Winsett

Edie Biro

Vickie Wyche (non-voting advisor)

TCC Members Absent:

Rodney Lucas Stewart Cruz Matt Boerger

Mike Holmes Larry Newsom Aref Joulani Brian Peek

Lauren Possinger Adam Mengel

Others Present:

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary

Colleen Nicoulin
Lois Bollenback
Pam Blankenship
Stephan Harris
Tony Nosse
Anna Taylor
Kellie Smith
Doug Robinson
William Roll

Marc Ispass Abby Morgan

Jim Wood

Jake Lunceford

Representing:

Daytona Beach

Deltona Edgewater Holly Hill Lake Helen

New Smyrna Beach

Orange City Ormond Beach Palm Coast Pierson Port Orange

V.C. Traffic Engineering

Votran

FDOT District 5

Representing:

Bunnell

Daytona Beach Shores

DeBary
DeLand
Flagler Beach
Ponce Inlet
South Daytona

V.C. Emergency Management

F.C. Traffic Engineering

Representing:

TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
FDOT
FDOT
FDOT

H.W. Lochner Kimley-Horn, Inc. Kimley-Horn, Inc. Kimley-Horn, Inc. Kittelson & Associates

Votran

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

Chairperson Papa called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) to order at 3:01 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present; due to the COVID-19 virus, the meeting was held virtually via GoToMeeting.

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press/citizen comments.

III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of May 19, 2020 TCC Meeting Minutes

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to approve the May 19, 2020 TCC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and carried unanimously.

B. Nomination and Election of TCC Officers for FY 2020/21

Ms. Nicoulin stated at the end of every fiscal year new TCC officers are nominated and elected. Per TPO bylaws, officers cannot serve more than two consecutive terms for the same office. The current TCC Chairperson, Mr. Jose Papa, and Vice Chairperson, Ms. Becky Mendez, are both serving their second terms. She asked for nominations or volunteers for these positions.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Lear to nominate and elect Ms. Becky Mendez as TCC Chairperson for FY 2020/21. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paradise and passed unanimously.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Walker to nominate and elect himself as TCC Vice Chairperson for FY 2020/21. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paradise and passed unanimously.

C. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Adopting the FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Nicoulin stated the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the five-year plan of funding and activities as well as a variety of different project types such as bicycle/pedestrian, traffic operations, rail, safety, aviation, etc., and resurfacing and maintenance projects. When the new TIP is developed the year ending is dropped and a new fifth year is added. The draft TIP and comparison report were presented last month; comments were received and have been incorporated into the draft document. A link to the draft TIP was provided in the agenda.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## adopting the FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Walker and passed unanimously.

D. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Adopting the 2020 List of Priority Projects

Ms. Nicoulin stated the List of Priority Projects (LOPP) includes updated project cost estimates received from local governments and state projects; new projects are incorporated that are submitted through the annual Call for Projects and they are reviewed and ranked by the subcommittees. Projects that are advanced into the Work Program are moved from Tier B to Tier A and this year two new lists were added. One is for SU funded planning studies; the list identifies planning studies that are funded with SU set aside funds. A Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) list was also developed; this list is populated by local governments who submitted projects for consideration for TRIP funding. In addition, three bridge projects were submitted that are on both the Bicycle/Pedestrian and Traffic Operations lists; they are identified as mixed-use projects because they contain components of both. The recommendation from the BPAC was to include a note in the comments that the portion of funding from each list is proportionate to the amount of funding for what the project consumes.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## adopting the 2020 List of Priority Projects (LOPP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Walker and passed unanimously.

E. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Amending the FY 2019/20 to 2023/24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Nicoulin stated this item amends the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by adding funding for a rail safety project at two crossings; West Beresford Avenue and Alexander Drive.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## amending the FY 2019/20 to 2023/24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and passed unanimously.

F. Review and Recommend Approval of an Amendment to the R2CTPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP)

Ms. Blankenship stated the draft amendment to the R2CTPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP) was presented last month; the CAC made a recommendation to add county and local guidance to the last sentence.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of an amendment to the R2CTPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and passed unanimously.

G. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Adopting the Connected and Automated Vehicle (CAV) Readiness Study and Technology Transition Plan

Ms. Nicoulin stated the TPO has developed a Connected and Automated Vehicle (CAV) Readiness Study and Technology Transition Plan. The Technology Transition plan outlines the transition specific to the TPO planning area for adopting CAV and other transformational technologies at the local level as well as for incorporating new transportation technologies into comprehensive plans, land development codes, legislation and funding. The draft plan was presented last month; no additional comments were received and there have been no changes.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## adopting the Connected and Automated Vehicle (CAV) Readiness Study and Technology Transition Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Karet and passed unanimously.

H. Review and Recommend Approval of the Draft Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Project List for Public Outreach

(Handout)

Ms. Nicoulin stated the draft Cost Feasible list of projects for the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is being presented for a recommendation of approval to go out for public outreach. The 2045 LRTP Subcommittee met last week to review the list and identify projects that will move into the Cost Feasible project list. She introduced Mr. William Roll, Kimley-Horn, to give the presentation.

Mr. Roll reviewed the list of projects and funding to be included in the draft Cost Feasible Plan. The project lists are broken down into three categories; Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), other arterial state roads and other arterial local roads. He reviewed the projects and the recommendations from the 2045 LRTP Subcommittee; the Tomoka River Bridge was the highest priority. The subcommittee met earlier and recommended a change to the state highway system project list to change the limits of the SR 44 project from Lake County to Grand Avenue; the original limits were from Lake County to SR 15A. The recommendation was made by the CAC, TCC and TPO Board to flex the maximum of 10% of other arterial state roads funding and allocate it for local road projects. The action being requested today is to recommend approval of these lists of projects to present to the public for input. He noted the dollar amounts are subject to change as better project cost information is received; the focus is the identification of projects in the Cost Feasible Plan and the relative order of those projects.

Ms. Nicoulin stated the TPO is asking for a recommendation of approval for the list of projects and their respective ranking to go out for public outreach in July. As part of the development of the project tables, costs have been developed; however, they are only asking for approval of the projects and the ranking. As we continue to move through the development process of the 2045 LRTP costs may be adjusted. The draft Cost Feasible Plan will be presented in August for review and for adoption in September. She reminded members that when making a motion for recommendation of approval to include the change in project limits to the SR 44 project from Lake County to Grand Avenue. Also, the Clyde Morris Boulevard project is currently identified in the 2040 LRTP as a capacity project; moving from four lanes to six. There has been a change in land use surrounding that corridor so the improvement is now identified as a corridor improvement with the understanding that the actual improvement is in development. The funding tied to that project is associated with a six lane roadway so if the project changes that project cost could decrease.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to recommend approval of the draft Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) project list for public outreach as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Karet and passed unanimously.

I. Cancellation of July TCC Meeting

MOTION:

A motion was made by Mr. Lear to cancel the July TCC meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Karet and passed unanimously.

IV. Presentation Items

A. <u>Presentation and Discussion of the Development Activities of the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation</u> <u>Plan (LRTP)</u>

(Handout)

Ms. Nicoulin stated that as part of the development of the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), three scenarios were reviewed; the resiliency and technology scenarios were previously presented. She introduced Mr. William Roll, Kimley-Horn, to give the presentation on the funding scenario.

Mr. Roll stated the Cost Feasible Plan factors in the funding scenario; they have identified two low funding scenarios as well as a high funding scenario. It is likely that in the future the revenues will not be as high as projected which may mean a change in the type of projects or investments that are made. There are many unfunded needs in the plan and it would be highly desirable to have additional funds available to fund those needs; he gave examples of potential additional funding opportunities. He reviewed the two low funding scenarios and the high scenario and explained how the priorities in the 2045 LRTP may or not be funded with each scenario.

Ms. Mendez referred to the 2040 status column and that some state cost feasible and some do not regardless of the scenario.

Mr. Roll that column represents the status of these individual projects in the current adopted 2040 LRTP.

Ms. Mendez asked if that means the project is funded if it states cost feasible.

Mr. Roll replied it means it was identified as cost feasible in the 2040 LRTP; there are protected projects but the others could drop off if the priorities shift or change. If the project is highlighted in green it is fully funded.

B. Presentation and Discussion of the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) Update

Ms. Nicoulin introduced Ms. Judy Pizzo, FDOT, to give the presentation.

Ms. Pizzo gave a PowerPoint presentation of the update to the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). The presentation given last year was on technology and resilience and this year's emphasis is on state, interregional, regional and local issues. The FTP is the single, overarching plan guiding Florida's transportation future and is for all of Florida created by, and providing direction to, FDOT and all organizations that are involved in planning and managing Florida's transportation system. The FTP provides policy guidance and a framework for allocating the state and federal transportation funds which flow through the five-year Work Program. She reviewed past FTPs and how they affect the transportation system. She reviewed the four cross-cutting topics included in the plan. She gave a survey QR code and weblink for members to participate in a live survey, went through the survey questions and received input. The schedule for 2020 is subject to change as planning for regional workshops has been put on pause. The draft FTP will be ready for a 30-day public comment period in November and publication in December.

C. Presentation and Discussion of the 2020 "Tell the TPO" Preliminary Results

Mr. Doug Robinson, H.W. Lochner, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the 2020 "Tell the TPO" survey preliminary results. He reviewed the marketing approach for the 2020 "Tell the TPO" survey, how they got the word out and the tools they used. COVID-19 caused plans to change for public engagement so an additional week was given to accept survey responses. Although the goal of 3,000 results was not reached, there was an increased response over the 2016 survey. He reviewed the answers to the survey questions including the demographic information. He announced the CAC was the winner of the Ambassador Challenge.

D. FDOT Report

The FDOT report was provided in the agenda.

E. Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports

The Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports were provided in the agenda.

V. Staff Comments

Ms. Nicoulin thanked TCC members for participating in the 2020 "Tell the TPO" survey. This is a busy time of year with deliverables for the TPO; if members have any questions regarding any of those documents please contact staff.

VI. TCC Member Comments

Ms. Winsett stated Mr. Clay Ervin, Director of Volusia County's Growth and Resource Management Department, asked her to remind members when submitting their city's comprehensive plan updates to have the transportation analysis included so the plan is not held up during the review process.

VII. Information Items

- → CAC & TCC Attendance Records
- → May 27, 2020 River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
- → May 2020 TPO Outreach and Events
- → 2045 LRTP Subcommittee Report

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the TCC meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Ms. Becky Mendez, Chairperson
Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)

CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the June 16, 2020 regular meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), approved and duly signed this 18th day of August 2020.

DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION



Connect 2045 Funding Scenarios

Background

At the heart of developing Connect 2045 is the prioritization and selection of projects for funding within the constraints of forecasted revenues. For each round of LRTP updates, FDOT develops the forecast of funds on the state highway system that are expected to be available over the 25-year planning period. The forecast uses factors known at the time it is developed. As with any long-range financial projection, actual revenue may vary due to unanticipated changes in economic conditions, revenue sources, and other factors. The evaluation of funding scenarios provides a window on potential changes to the Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) set of projects that could be applied in the wake of differing revenue levels.

Within the categories of the revenue forecast, the TPO has the greatest influence over where funds will be prioritized under the *Other Arterials* funding category. This category is the prime focus of the Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) and the funding scenarios.

The scenarios consist of both a LOW and HIGH funding amount relative to the baseline revenue forecast used for development of the Connect 2045 CFP. These funding amounts provide opportunity to illustrate how alternative futures would potentially change the projects and priorities included in the CFP.

Scenario Alternatives

Below is a summary of the baseline and two scenarios. The scenarios consist of three alternatives—two LOW alternatives and one HIGH alternative:

<u>BASELINE / 2045 Cost Feasible Plan</u> – This is the *Other Arterials* funding amount from the Connect 2045 Revenue Forecast being used to develop the CFP.

The BASELINE 2045 CFP consists of \$497,226,138 in *Other Arterials* funds -- \$447,503,524 for State Highway System (SHS) projects and a maximum of \$49,772,614 for local or "off-system" projects.

<u>LOW Scenario / 2040 Plan</u> — This is the *Other Arterials* funding amount from the 2040 LRTP Revenue Forecast. This funding amount acts as an appropriate surrogate for a more constrained financial situation. The potential factors that could drive a more constrained financial future include:

- growing shortfalls in federal transportation funding due to highway fuel tax remaining at the same level since 1993
- projected reductions in fuel tax revenue due to increasing vehicle fuel economy
- projected reductions in fuel tax revenue due to growth in sales of electric and other alternative fuel vehicles

The LOW Scenario assumes \$233,696,285 in *Other Arterials* funds -- \$210,326,656 for SHS projects and a maximum of \$23,369,628 for local or "off-system" projects.



LOW Scenario A assigns funding to the projects based on the rank as recommended by the LRTP Subcommittee. This scenario funds each of the SHS projects in the LOPP, \$40 million in SHS local initiatives (ITS and safety improvements), and the two highest-ranked projects. Of the two Old Kings Road projects included in the LOPP, the southern segment (Palm Harbor Village Way to Farnum Lane) can be fully funded. The remainder of the 10% Other Arterials funds earmarked for local projects is assigned to the other segment of Old Kings Road (Farnum Lane to Forest Grove Drive). This amount satisfies approximately 27% of the total needed funds. There is \$7,676,656 identified to fund operational improvements.

LOW Scenario B funds each of the SHS projects in the LOPP, \$40 million in SHS local initiatives (ITS and safety improvements), and approximately \$10 million (33%) of the highest-ranked SHS project (Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Blvd). This scenario enables a larger portion of funds to be used for smaller-scale operational projects to maintain system performance. Of the two Old Kings Road projects included in the LOPP, the southern segment (Palm Harbor Village Way to Farnum Lane) can be fully funded. The remainder of the 10% Other Arterials funds earmarked for local projects is assigned to the other segment of Old Kings Road (Farnum Lane to Forest Grove Drive). This amount satisfies approximately 27% of the total needed funds. There is \$39,026,656 identified to fund operational improvements.

<u>HIGH Scenario / 2045 + New Funding Source</u> – This is the *Other Arterials* funding amount from the Connect 2045 Revenue Forecast plus a hypothetical new source of funding. For purposes of developing the specific funding amount, the figure is based on the estimate of 25% of a 1 cent sales tax going to transportation. This is not a policy recommendation. This example is used for illustrative purposes. The potential factors that could drive a more abundant financial future include:

- increase in federal highway fuel tax
- a new local sales tax
- increase in state funding
- implementation of a new revenue source that based on miles driven rather than gallons of fuel sold

The HIGH Scenario assumes \$770,700,514 in funding. This is \$273,474,376 in addition to the BASELINE *Other Arterials* funding. The additional funding may or may not be restricted to 10% "off-system". For the purposes of this scenario alternative, we did not assume that restriction.

In the HIGH Scenario, all *Other Arterials* projects receive full funding. There is \$37,569,129 identified to fund additional operational improvements.

AND REAL PROPERTY.	The second second											
River	o sea 1PO	2045 Other Arterial Nee	ds — Alternative Funding	RIVEL to Sea (PO 2045) Other Arterial Needs — Alternative Funding Scenarios - Local Roadways	ıys		Baseline	Low Scenario A	Low Scenario B	High Scenario		
Q	Jurisdiction On Street	On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement	Cost	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	2040 Status	Criteria Score**
E	Local	Old Kings Road	Palm Harbor Village Way	Farnum Ln	2U-4D	\$ 18,650,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIRIE	N/A
F	Local	Old Kings Road	Farnum Ln	Forest Grove Dr	2U-4D	\$ 17.450.000	100%	77%	2016	100%	COST EFASIBLE	AI/A
×	Local	Old Kings Road - Extension Roadway (Phase II)	Matanzas Woods Pkwy	Old Kings Rd	00-2n	\$ 7,381,000	100%	%0	%0	7,001	COST FEASIBLE	10.0
-1	Local	Commerce Pkwy Connector Road	SR 5 (US 1)	SR 100	00-2U	\$ 9,680,000	64%	%0	%0	7,001	COST FEASIBLE	10.0
>	Local	Williamson Blvd	Summer Trees Rd	SR 400 (Beville Rd)	2LN - 4LN	\$ 6.700.000	%0	%0	760	1009	2 2 2 2 2 2	37.5
×	Local	Veterans Memorial Pkwy	Harley Strickland	Graves Ave	2LN - 4LN	\$ 9,800,000	%0	%0	%0	100%	-	30.0
-	Local	Matanzas Woods Pkwy	SR 5 (US1)	1-95	2U-4D	\$ 14,796,900	%0	%0	%0	100%	COST EEASIBLE	0.00
-	Local	LPGA Blvd	Nova Rd	US-1	2U-3D	\$ 12,950,000	%0	%0	%0	100%	COST EEASIBLE	10.5
>	Local	Hand Ave	Clyde Morris Blvd	SR 5A (Nova Rd)	2LN - 4LN	\$ 7,000,000	%0	%00	%0	100%	COST FEASIBLE	17.5
>	Local	Josephine St	Old Mission	Tatum	2LN - 4LN	\$ 4.950,000	%0	%0	%0	1004		000
Σ	Local	North Entrance DeLand Airport (Industrial Park)	Industrial Dr	SR 11	00-50	\$ 2,263,000	%0	%0	%0	100%	COST FEASIBLE	4.5

ID Jurisdiction On Street From Street To Street A SHS US-1 At Park Ave Intersection C SHS SR 443 (Clyde Morris Blvd) SR 400 (Beville Rd) US-92 D SHS SR 44 Grand Ave SR 15A B SHS US-92 I+4 EB RAMP CR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Q SHS I Omoka River Bridge (LPGA West of Champions Dr E of Tomoka Farms Rd) A SHS Local Initiatives N/A N/A B SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) Prevatt Ave. B SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) Pervatt Ave. B SHS SR 44 Howland Dr SR 44 B SHS SR 44 Howland Dr SR 15A B SHS SR 44 Lake County SR 15A B SHS SR 15 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Howland Dr Howland Dr B SHS SH 15 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr <th>River</th> <th>to Sea TPO</th> <th>River to Sea TPO 2045 Other Arterial Needs — Alternative Funding Scenarios - State Highway System</th> <th>ds — Alternative Funding</th> <th>g Scenarios - State Highwa</th> <th>y System</th> <th></th> <th>Baseline</th> <th>Low Scenario A</th> <th>Low Scenario B</th> <th>High Scenario</th> <th></th> <th></th>	River	to Sea TPO	River to Sea TPO 2045 Other Arterial Needs — Alternative Funding Scenarios - State Highway System	ds — Alternative Funding	g Scenarios - State Highwa	y System		Baseline	Low Scenario A	Low Scenario B	High Scenario		
SHS US-1 At Park Ave Intersection SHS SR 448 (Clyde Morris Blvd) SR 4400 (Bewille Rd) US-92 SHS US-92 1-4 EB RAMP CR 415 (Tom CR 415 (Tom CR 415) (Q	Jurisdiction	On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement	Cost	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	Percent Funded	2040 Status	Criteria Score**
SHS SR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd) SR 400 (Beville Rd) US-92 SHS SR 44 Grand Ave SR 15A SHS US-92 L4 EB RAMP CR 415 (Tomoka Blvd]**** SHS I Omoka River Bridge (LPGA) West of Champions Dr E of Tomoka Blvd]**** SHS L0 cal Initiatives N/A N/A SHS US 1/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Tayl SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) L-95 SHS SR 44 SR 415 Glencoe Rd. SHS SR 44 SR 415 Glencoe Rd. SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Lake County SR 40 SHS SR 15 (Us 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. Howland Dr SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. Flagler Count	٨	SHS	US-1	At Park Ave	Intersection	Intersection	\$ 6,300,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS SR 44 Grand Ave SR 15A SHS US-92 1-4 EB RAMP CR 415 (Tomoka Bivd)**** SHS I Omoka Bivd]**** West of Champions Dr E of Tomoka Bivd]**** SHS Local Initiatives N/A N/A SHS US 1/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Taylor) SHS SR 44 I-4 Movland Dr I-95 SHS SR 44 SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Howland Dr SR 44 SHS SR 44 SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) I-46 County SR 44 SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (Tomoka Farms Rd) N. Woodland Bivd. Flagier Count SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Bivd. Flagier Count	U	SHS	SR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd)	SR 400 (Beville Rd)	US-92	4D-6D	\$ 63,900,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS US-92 1-4 EB RAMP CR 415 (Tomoka Bivda et l') SHS Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Bivda)*** West of Champions Dr E of Tomoka Bivda)*** E of Tomoka Bivda)*** SHS Lo 2al Initiatives N/A N/A SHS US 1/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Tayl Strateger) SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) 1-95 SHS SR 44 SR 415 Glenco Rd. SR 44 SHS SR 44 SR 415 SR 44 SHS SR 15 (Us 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 15 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Bivd. Flagier Count SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Bivd. Flagier Count	O	SHS	SR 44	Grand Ave	SR 15A	2U-4D	\$ 19,100,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Blod)*** West of Champions Dr E of Tomoka Blod)*** E of Tomoka Blod)*** SHS Local Initiatives N/A N/A SHS US 17/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Taylor SHS) SHS US 1 Howland Dr I-95 SHS SR 445 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Howland Dr SR 44 SHS SR 44 Lake County SR 15A SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 115 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blod Flagler County SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blod Flagler County	8	SHS	US-92	I-4 EB RAMP	CR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.)	4D-6D	\$ 32,000,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS Local Initiatives N/A N/A SHS US 17/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Taylowat Farms Rd) SHS SR 44 I-4 Prevatt Ave. SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) I-95 SHS SR 44 SR 44 SR 44 SHS SR 44 SR 415 Glencoe Rd. SR 45 SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 44 Deleon Springs SR 40 SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) - excludes bridge Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (US 17)**** Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (US 17)**** Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (US 17)**** Seminole C/L Howland Dr SHS SR 115 (US 17)**** NA N/A	۵	SHS	Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Blvd)***	West of Champions Dr		Bridge	\$ 10,000,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	1	34.5
SHS US 17/92 SR 472 SR 15A (Taylor) SHS SR 44 I-4 Prevatt Ave. SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) I-95 SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) Howland Dr. SR 44 SHS SR 44 SR 415 Glencoe Rd. SHS SR 44 Lake County SR 15A SHS SR 15 (US 17)**** Deleon Springs SR 15A SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) Seminole C/L Howland Dr. SHS excludes bridge N. Woodland Blvd. Howland Dr. SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. Flagler County	9	SHS	Local Initiatives	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 40,000,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS SR 44 I+4 SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) Howland Dr. SHS SR 44 SR 415 SHS SR 44 Lake County SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) - Seminole C/L Seminole C/L SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd.	H	SHS	US 17/92	SR 472	SR 15A (Taylor Rd)	6D-6D (ITS)	\$ 31,350,000	100%	100%	%0	100%	COST FEASIBLE	65.0
SHS US 1 Nova Rd. (N) SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) Howland Dr. SHS SR 44 SR 415 SHS SR 44 Lake County SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SHS SR 445 (Tomoka Farms Rd.) - Seminole C/L Seminole C/L SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blwd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements* N/A	Z	SHS	SR 44	1-4	Prevatt Ave.	4D-6D	\$ 6,623,038	100%	%0	%0	100%	Shirt Sold and	52.5
SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Howland Dr SHS SR 44 SR 415 SHS SR 44 Lake County SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements ⁸ N/A	0	SHS	US 1	Nova Rd. (N)	1-95	4D-6D	\$ 34,463,484	100%	%0	%0	100%	1	52.5
SHS SR 44 SR 415 SHS SR 44 Lake County SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) - excludes bridge Seminole C/L SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements ⁸ N/A	R	SHS	SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd)	Howland Dr	SR 44	2U-4D	\$ 112,925,935	75%	%0	%0	100%	The state of the s	32.5
SHS SR 44 Lake County SHS SR 15 (US 17)*** Deleon Springs SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) - Seminole C/L Seminole C/L SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements ⁸ N/A	S	SHS	SR 44	SR 415	Glencoe Rd.	4D-6D	\$ 54,291,449	100%	%0	%0	1,00%		27.0
SHS SR 15 (US 12)*** Deleon Springs SHA15 (Tomoka Farms Rd) Seminole C/L excludes bridge SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements [§] N/A	n	SHS	SR 44	Lake County	SR 15A	2U-4D	\$ 38,656,527	100%	%0	%0	100%	The state of the s	25.0
SHS SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) - Seminole C/L excludes bridge N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements ⁶ N/A	(SISE)		SR 15 (US 17)***	Deleon Springs	SR 40	2U-4D	\$ 10,000,000	100%	%0	%0	100%	COST FEASIBLE	N/A
SHS SR 11 N. Woodland Blvd. SHS SHS Operational Improvements [§] N/A	А	SHS	SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd) - excludes bridge	Seminole C/L	Howland Dr	4D-6D	\$ 54,551,711	%0	%0	%0	100%	1	42.5
SHS Operational Improvements [§] N/A	L	SHS	SR 11	N. Woodland Blvd.	Flagler County	2U-4D	\$ 141,899,190	%0	%0	%0	100%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	30.0
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		SHS	SHS Operational Improvements [§]	N/A	N/A	N/A		\$16,124,575	\$7,676,656	\$39,026,656	\$37,569,129		N/A

	Total Revenues	Total Revenues	Total Revenues	Total Revenues
SHS	\$447,503,524	\$210,326,656	\$210,326,656	\$693,630,463
Local	\$49,722,614	\$23,369,628	\$23,369,628	\$77,070,051
TOTAL	\$497,226,138	\$233,696,285	\$233,696,285	\$770,700,514

Revenue Forecast and project costs are estimated at a planning level using historic data and FDOT guidance.

** Criterio Score is just one factor to consider in determining project prioritization.

** LPGA BIVD Tomoka River Bridge project is included in the SIS needs list as well.

§ In lieu of additional capacity projects, funding is identified to support smaller-scale operational to maintain system performance.

Projects are listed in priority order as recommended by the LRTP Subcommittee on June 1, 2020.

LOPP = List of Priority Projects; SHS = State Highway System; OA = Other Arterials on State Highway System;

U = Undivided; D = Divided; F = Freeway; LN = Lanes

Projects included in the 2040 LRTP Cost Feasible Plan; Per TPO Policy (Resolution 2019-02) projects 1-5 on the Other Arterials List are protected and remain untill they are completed and drop out of the work program.

2045 Fully Funded Projects 2045 Partially Funded Projects 2045 Unfunded Projects

				N N	11 to Sea	Cost Feasible Plan	Cost Feasible Plan	termodai sy an	stem (SiS)					
CFP ID	On Street	From Street	To Street	Imprv	PLA	PLANNING	DE	DESIGN	RIGHT	RIGHT OF WAY	CONS	CONSTRUCTION	ddOT	Eupding Chapus
		The second second	一 は 日本		Time	PDV Cost	Time	PDV Cost	Time	PDV Cost	Timo	DDV Coc+	Rank	and and a state.
v	Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Blvd)	West of Champions Dr	E of Tomoka Farms Bridge to match Rd interchange configuration	Bridge to match interchange configuration		13						\$ 10,000,000		PARTIALLY FUNDED ⁶
Ь	I-95/SR 44	at SR 44	Interchange / Intersection	Interchange									l art	UNFUNDED
œ	I-95/Matanzas Woods At Matanzas Pkwy Woods Pkwy	At Matanzas Woods Pkwy	Interchange / Intersection	Interchange										UNFUNDED
z	1-95	SR 400	Old Dixie Hwy	6F-8F							137			UNEUNDED
0	I-4 / SR 400	SR 472	SR 44	6F-8F										UNEUNDED
۵	I-4 / SR 400	SR 44	US-92 Connection	6F-8F		100								COUNTING

SHS = State Highway System; GFP = Cost Feasible Plan; Imprv = Improvement; PDV = Present Day Value; LOPP = List of Priority Projects; SIS = Strategic Intermodal System; OA = Other Arterials U = Undivided; D = Divided; P = Freeway; TBD = To be determined

s it is anticipated that this US-17 (SR 15) widening will be a SIS-funded project. \$ 10,000,000 is identified in the OA table for funding to show local commitment and priority, this anticipated that the Tomoka River Bridge will be a SIS-funded project. \$ 3,000,000 is identified in the OA table for funding 30% to show local commitment and priority.

				Riv	River to Sea 1	rpo 2	045 - S Cost	ea TPO 2045 - Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Cost Feasible Plan	ntern Ian	nodal Sy:	stem (SiS)							
CFP ID	On Street	From Street	To Street	Imprv	PLA	PLANNING		3	DESIGN		RIGH	RIGHT OF WAY	αγ	CONS	CONSTRUCTION	NO	LOPP	Funding Status
1.0					Time		PDV Cost	Time		PDV Cost	Time		PDV Cost	Time		PDV Cost	Kank	
A	I-4 / SR 400	Seminole C/L	0.5 MI E of SR 472	Managed Lanes Complete	Complete	٠,		Complete	₩.		2031-2035	45	36,923,000	2036-2045	\$ 90	907,649,000	1	COST FEASIBLE
В	SR 472	Graves Ave	Kentucky/MLK Blvd	4D-6D		10 II	area sia										1	COST FEASIBLE
U	Saxon Blvd	4	Normandy Blvd	2U-4D					Pa	rt of I-4 Beyon	Part of I-4 Beyond the Ultimate						1	COST FEASIBLE
۵	Rhode Island Extension	Veterans Memorial Pkwy	Normandy Blvd	2U-4D					1016				T X				1	COST FEASIBLE
ш	SR 15 (US 17)	Deleon Springs	SR 40	2U-4D	Complete	*		Complete	٠,		Programmed	٠,	11,142,775	2026-2030	٠,	83,918,108	2	COST FEASIBLE 5
				5		1				000 011 0	2025	45	2,260,000	טאטר שבטר	U	41 175 000	r	COST EFASIRIE
ц.	SR 40	Breakaway Trails	Williamson Blvd	40-60	Complete	n	•	Programmed	n n	2,750,000	2026-2030	45	5,955,000	7039-2040	2	000,517,74	3	
	45 miles										Programmed	s,	2,411,357					
5	SR 40	W of SR 11	W of Cone Rd	2U-4D	Complete	\$		2031-2035	٧,	7,365,000	2025	\$	429,000	2036-2045	v,	72,370,000	4	COST FEASIBLE
										Y	2026-2030	\$	181,000		1			
	日本 大学 世界				101	1			A CA	The second second	Programmed	\$	4,206,411			a de la companya de l		
Ξ	SR 40	SR 15 (US-17)	SR 11	2U-4D	Complete	s		2031-2035	s	6,338,000	2025	\$	880,000	2036-2045	45	62,279,000	5	COST FEASIBLE
						0.00					2026-2030	\$	319,000					
-	1-95/LPGA Blvd	Williamson Blvd	Tymber Creek Rd Ext	Interchange Improvement	Complete	s		2031-2035	v	3,000,000	N/A	v,		2036-2045	٠,	29,480,000	9	COST FEASIBLE
	I-95/Pioneer Trail New Interchange	At Pioneer Trail	Interchange / Intersection	Interchange Improvement	Programmed	vs.	4,000,000				Programmed	v	3,730,000	2036-2040	\$5	18,500,000	7	COST FEASIBLE
×	1-95/US 1 Interchange at US-1	at US-1	Interchange / Intersection	Interchange Improvement	Programmed	v	2,050,000	2031-2035	٧,	4,200,000	TBD		ТВД	2036-2040	٠,	28,000,000	60	COST FEASIBLE
٦	SR 100	Old Kings Rd	Belle Terre Pkwy	4D-6D							2031-2035	₩.	3,170,000	2036-2045	45	56,775,000	6	COST FEASIBLE
Σ	I-95 Interchange (Farmton Interchange)	At Maytown Rd	Interchange / Intersection	Interchange Improvement			al fair succe			Developer Funded	Funded							COST FEASIBLE - DEVELOPER FUNDED

					River to Se	o Sea TPO Connect 2045 Other Arterial - Local Roadways Cost Feasible Plan	TPO Connect 2045 Other Art Roadways Cost Feasible Plan	ther Arterial ble Plan	- Local					
CFP ID	On Street	From Street	To Street	Imprv	PLA	PLANNING	DE	DESIGN	RIGHT	RIGHT OF WAY	CONS	CONSTRUCTION	ГОРР	Compliant Control
					Time	PDV Cost	Time	PDV Cost	Time	PDV Cost	Time	PDV Cost	Rank	runding status
ш	Old Kings Road	Palm Harbor Village Way	Farnum Ln	2U-4D	COMPLETE	\$	COMPLETE	\$	79.3	45		2031-2035 \$ 18,650,000	ю	COST FEASIBLE
L.	Old Kings Road	Farmum Ln	Forest Grove Dr	2U-4D	COMPLETE	S	COMPLETE \$	\$	COMPLETE	5	2036-2045	2036-2045 \$ 17,450,000	ĸ	COST FEASIBLE
¥	Old Kings Road Extension Roadway (Phase II)	Matanzas Woods Pkwy	Old Kings Rd	00-2N	COMPLETE	v.	COMPLETE	S	COMPLETE	\$	2036-2045	\$ 7,381,000	9	COST FEASIBLE
1	Connector Road	SR 5 (US 1)	SR 100	00-20	COMPLETE	\$	COMPLETE		COMPLETE	· ·	2036-2045	2036-2045 \$ 6,241,614	7	PARTIALLY FUNDED ¹

 1 \$6,241,614 identified for construction, leaving an additional \$3,438,386 to be funded for full funding.

CFP = Cost Feasible Plan; Imprv = Improvement; PDV = Present Day Value; LOPP = List of Priority Projects; U = Undivided; D = Divided

		Funding Status		COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	PARTIALLY FUNDED	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE	COST FEASIBLE
		ddOT	Kank	1	2	4	5		6							SIS 2					
		ICTION	PDV Cost	3,500,000	32,000,000	17,360,000	37,500,000	\$ 3,000,000 2	27,000,000	3,580,021	18,628,910	27,860,560	33,180,486	29,346,729	20,895,420	\$ 10,000,000 4	2,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000	9,743,092
		CONSTRUCTION		30 \$	\$ 08	30 \$	\$ \$		35 \$	35 \$	45 \$	45 \$	45 \$	45 \$	45 \$	45	₩.	\$ 08	35 \$	45 \$	45 \$
THE RESERVE		5	Time	2025-2030	2025-2030	2025-2030	2031-2035	2025	2031-2035	2031-2035	2036-2045	2036-2045	2036-2045	2036-2045	2036-2045	2036-2045	2025	2025-2030	2031-2035	2036-2045	2036-2045
(SHS)		WAY	PDV Cost	2,800,000	31,900,000	1,740,000	8,870,200		3,000,000	2,864,017	14,903,128	22,288,448	26,544,389	23,477,383	16,716,336						al to maintain
stem		RIGHT OF WAY		٠,	40-	· v	40-		\$	40	45	45	45	w	w						eration
hway Sy		RIG	Time	2025	2025-2030	2025	2020-2025		2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2036-2045	2036-2045	2036-2045						naller-scale op
State Hig	lan		PDV Cost	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Funding		358,002	1,862,891	2,786,056	3,318,049	2,934,673	2,089,542	Funding					to support sn nance.
als -	ible F	DESIGN						ted SIS I	v,	₩	w	v	w	45	w.	ted SIS I		,	Z/X		entified
er Arteri	ost Feasi		Time	2025	COMPLETE	COMPLETE	COMPLETE	Anticipated SIS Funding	COMPLETE	2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2036-2045	2036-2045	Anticipated SIS Funding					s, funding is identified to su system performance
045 Oth	Tentative Cost Feasible Plan	(5)	PDV Cost	372,000				en groed		179,001	931,446	1,393,028	1,659,024	1,467,336	1,044,771						pacity project
ect 2	Te	PLANNING		v	₩.	s	v,		\$	₩.	ts.	47	44	\$	₩						ional ca
TPO Conn		PL	Time	2020-2025	COMPLETE	COMPLETE	COMPLETE		COMPLETE	2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2031-2035	2036-2045	2036-2045						In lieu of additional capacity projects, funding is identified to support smaller-scale operational to maintain system performance.
River to Sea TPO Connect 2045 Other Arterials - State Highway System (SHS)		Imprv		Intersection	Corridor Improvement*	2U-4D	40-60	Bridge (to match interchange configuration)	6D-6D (ITS)	4D-6D	4D-6D	2U-4D	2U-4D	4D-6D	2U-4D	2U-4D					
R		To Street			US-92	SR 15A	CR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd.)	E of Tomoka Farms Rd	SR 15A (Taylor Rd)	Prevatt Ave.	-95	Lake Ashby Rd	SR 44	Glencoe Rd.	SR 15A	SR 40			Various		Various
		From Street		At Park Ave	SR 400 (Beville Rd)	Grand Ave	L-4 EB Ramp	W of Champions E	SR 472 S	4-1	Nova Rd. (N)	Acorn Lake Rd	Lake Ashby Rd	SR 415	Lake County	Deleon Springs S					
		On Street		US-1	SR 483 (Clyde Morris Blvd)	SR 44 6	US-92	Tomoka River Bridge V (LPGA Blvd)	US 17/92 S	SR 44	US-1	SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd)	SR 415 (Tomoka Farms Rd)	SR 44 S	SR 44	SR 15 (US 17)	Local Initiatives 2025	Local Initiatives 2025- 2030	Local Initiatives 2031– 2035	Local Initiatives 2036- 2045	SHS Operational Improvements
日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日		CFP ID		A	O O	۵	<u>a</u>	Q C	I	Z	0	R13	R23 5	S	n	(SISE)	61	62	63	64	Z Z

^{*} Clyde Morris Blvd improvements are currently in development. The costs associated with this project is consistent with a previous plan in which the roadway would be widened to six lanes.

It is anticipated that the Tomoka River Bridge (LPGA Blvd) will be a SIS-funded project. \$ 3,000,000 is identified for funding 30% to show local commitment and priority. This project and additional associated cost is included in the SIS table.

³ SR 415 widening from Acorn Lake Rd to SR 44 is divided into two segments to facilitate optimal phase funding, reducing total cost.

⁴ SR 15 (US 17) is included in the SIS Cost Feasible Table. \$10,000,000 is identified for funding to show local commitment and priority for this project.