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

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

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press/citizen comments.
III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of June 19, 2018 CAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Peterson to approve the June 19, 2018 CAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Amending the FY 2018/19 to 2022/23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Nicoulin stated FDOT’s Work Program becomes effective each year on July 1 as does the TPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This is the “roll forward” amendment that is done every year by request from FDOT. It ensures that projects that roll forward in their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are rolled forward in the TPO’s TIP. There are two projects that were not in the previous TIP that will be in the current TIP as part of this amendment. She referred to pages 25 and 26 of the agenda, which includes the list of all the projects that are part of this TIP amendment. Some of these projects are adding funds and some are new to the TIP. The most notable one is the East International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) Beachside Corridor Improvement project; this project recently was awarded a design contract from FDOT. It was in the previous FDOT TIP but not the TPO’s TIP. There was a link provided in the agenda for the TIP sheets.

Ms. Stevens-Foltz asked if this project was the rotary.

Ms. Nicoulin replied this includes the project that has the roundabout concept in it.

Mr. Peterson referred to the three projects noted with an asterisk that have added funds and commented they total roughly $5 million. He asked where those funds were coming from; if they are TPO funds or state funds.

Ms. Nicoulin replied all of those projects have state or local funding from the project sponsor. The East ISB Beachside Corridor Improvement project has state funds and funds from the city of Daytona Beach, not TPO or federal allocations.

Ms. Gillespie referred to the list of projects and commented that she only recognizes about three projects from the TIP Subcommittee she served on.

Ms. Nicoulin replied projects in the TIP come from a variety of sources; some come through the annual Call for Projects that the TIP Subcommittee reviews. There are state projects that do not come from the annual Call for Projects because there is not a local project sponsor; they are FDOT projects using state funds.

Ms. Gillespie asked what happened to the projects reviewed and scored by the TIP Subcommittee.

Ms. Nicoulin replied they have already been incorporated into the TIP.

Ms. Gillespie asked why the damage from Hurricane Irma was not included before now.

Ms. Nicoulin replied it has been; it was in the state TIP and they are rolling it forward with additional funds.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Storke to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## amending the FY 2018/19 to 2022/23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Villanella and carried unanimously.

C. Review and Recommend Approval of Palm Coast Request for Additional Funding for the Seminole Woods/SR 100 Intersection Improvements
Ms. Nicoulin stated the city of Palm Coast submitted an application for funding for an intersection improvement project at Seminole Woods Boulevard and SR 100 through the annual Call for Projects which was ranked by the TIP Subcommittee. It was programmed for funding earlier this year; prior to programming the funding, the city worked with FDOT to update the cost estimate. At that time, the estimate was $187,385 and that amount is what was programmed for construction for the current year in the TIP. When the city sent the project out for bid, the bids received exceeded that amount. The lowest bid amount received was $254,735 which leaves a difference of $67,350. The city is asking for additional funding to cover this shortfall. The city updated its cost estimate prior to programming this project which is what the TPO requires. The city is also contributing a significant amount of local funds in the amount of $63,836 to cover the design and CEI phases. That amount covers 20% of the total project cost; the requirement for a local match is 10%. There is a city representative from Palm Coast in attendance to answer any questions. The request is for additional funding in SU dollars of $67,350.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Peterson to recommend the addition of the Palm Coast request for additional funding for the Seminole Woods/SR 100 intersection improvements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gillespie and carried unanimously.

Ms. Nicoulin stated tomorrow the TPO Board meeting will be held and this item is on that agenda also. The arrangement of action items on the TPO Board agenda is different; the request from Palm Coast for additional funding is before the TIP amendment item. The TPO intends to ask the board tomorrow that if they approve this request for additional funding, it also be included in the TIP amendment. By doing so, the project will not be delayed another month. Unless this committee has any objections, the TPO will ask the TPO Board to roll it into the TIP amendment if the request for additional funds is approved tomorrow.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ms. Gillespie to recommend the addition of the Seminole Woods/SR 100 intersection improvement project into the TIP amendment if the request for additional funding is approved by the TPO Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson and carried unanimously.

D. **Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Adopting the 2018 “Tell the TPO” Survey Campaign Summary**

Ms. Blankenship stated the “Tell the TPO” survey began April 30, 2018 and ended June 30, 2018. The TPO will be asking for a recommendation of approval of the 2018 “Tell the TPO” Summary Brochure. She introduced Ms. Lara Bouck, consultant with H.W. Lochner to give the presentation.

Ms. Bouck gave a PowerPoint presentation and stated the target goal for the survey was 2,000 responses; the total number of responses received was 2,176. The number of responses received increased by 70% over 2016. She thanked the committee members for their efforts. She reviewed the target events the TPO attended and the media outreach. She reviewed some of the responses to the survey questions and the demographics of the respondents. She reviewed the results of what respondents are and are not satisfied with on transportation issues and what the top priorities should be for funding. She announced the winner of the Ambassador Challenge is the TCC; the TPO Board member winner will be announced tomorrow at the TPO Board meeting.

Mr. Peterson commented he was surprised to see that of the 2,176 responses, 92% of those were taking the survey for the first time. He asked for an explanation on why people that responded in the past did not this time and why the new survey response was such a high percentage.

Ms. Blankenship replied it could be interpreted one of two ways; they may have not taken it before in the past or the respondent could have interpreted it as they have not taken it this year.

Mr. Peterson asked if that would be corrected on the next survey.

Ms. Blankenship replied yes, that question will be made more specific on the next survey.
Mr. Peterson asked if the intent of the question on modes of travel is how people get to work or to shop. He finds it hard to believe 31% of people walk to work or to shop.

Ms. Blankenship replied the intention of that question was if people walk or bike three times a week or more whether it was for exercise, walking to work, etc. It was for three or more times a week and did not qualify if it was how people commute.

Mr. Peterson suggested if that question was used again it should be refined in a tighter fashion; if it is for working or shopping. He suggested having another question for exercise or using public transportation to get to where people go to exercise. This gives a misleading response.

Ms. Blankenship replied she will look at that for the next survey.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ms. Lendian to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## adopting the 2018 “Tell the TPO” Survey Campaign Summary. The motion was seconded by Ms. Elliott and carried unanimously.

### IV. Presentation Items

#### A. Presentation and Discussion of the R2CTPO FY 2017/18 Year in Review

Ms. Blankenship presented a PowerPoint slideshow accompanied by music on the R2CTPO FY 2017/18 year in review and stated the video includes highlights and not everything the TPO has done.

#### B. Presentation and Discussion of Regional Truck Parking Study

Ms. Nicoulin introduced Mr. Jeremy Upchurch, FDOT District 5 Freight Coordinator to give the presentation.

Mr. Upchurch gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Regional Truck Parking Study and gave the background of the study including Jason’s Law which is a federal mandate; it acknowledges there is a shortage of truck parking and requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to do a national survey of truck drivers and trucking firms as well as an industry inventory of truck parking. They did an inventory for all 50 states and acknowledged there needs to be funding for the truck parking shortage for safety issues. FDOT has acknowledged this is statewide issue in their Freight Mobility and Trade Plan as well as the Motor Carrier System Plan which were both updated in the last few years. Each district is undertaking studies to take a closer look at the what the need is at the local and regional level and address it. To date, FDOT District 5 has developed an inventory of truck parking in the nine county district, both public and private facilities, on I-95, I-75 and I-4. They did an evaluation of the truck parking supply and demand as well as a survey for the demand. The reports are in detail and available online. The next steps will be identifying the needs and working with local partners to identify possible opportunities. They identified the need on I-95 and I-75 and the available parking spaces match closely; however, there is a significant demand on I-4 that is not being met. He reviewed the best practices and opportunities. Right now, they are identifying those best practices and putting them in a format to present to local partners to look at opportunities to fix this issue.

Ms. Bledsoe referred to the numbers for supply and demand and asked if those were for I-4, I-95 and I-75 in District 5.

Mr. Upchurch replied yes; District 5 stops at the Polk County and Osceola County lines.

Ms. Gillespie asked if these parking spaces were places to just stop and rest or if there were any facilities there.
Mr. Upchurch replied the rest areas have rest rooms and the private owned travel centers offer showers. Ms. Gillespie asked if there was anything in the study on accidents if truckers do not have a place to stop.

Mr. Upchurch yes, that was done at the national level as a safety issue; he does not have those numbers with him.

Ms. Bledsoe asked for clarification that the demand on I-4 is from Osceola County through Volusia County.

Mr. Upchurch replied yes, it is broken down by county.

Ms. Foltz asked for what year the demand projection is for.

Mr. Upchurch replied it is based on 2016 traffic numbers and is projected out to years 2025 and 2040.

Ms. Bledsoe asked where she could access the reports.

Mr. Upchurch replied it is on the state Freight Moves Florida website; www.freightmovesflorida.com. He will follow up with Ms. Bollenback and provide links for the TPO to distribute.

Discussion continued.

C. Presentation and Discussion of Port Orange Request for Additional Funding for the North Spruce Creek Road Sidewalk/SUN Trail Gap

Ms. Nicoulin stated this request for additional funding from Port Orange is a bicycle/pedestrian project that went through the annual Call for Projects process and was scored by the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee. It is on the priority list and has been designed as two 8’ wide sidewalks on each side of Spruce Creek Road north of Nova Road. The project is programmed for construction in the current fiscal year. Earlier this year, FDOT did a PD&E study for the alignment of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail and as part of that study they identified this section of Spruce Creek Road as a possible alignment for that trail. The TPO, FDOT and the city of Port Orange discussed alternative solutions of paying for an 8’ sidewalk now and then have SUN Trail come through with the alignment for a 12’ wide multi-use trail. The city worked with FDOT and SUN Trail to identify what changes would need to be made to the current design. They are requesting additional funds to re-design a section on the west side of the road; a retaining wall will need to be incorporated which is most of the additional cost for the re-design. There are representatives from Port Orange, Mr. Stephan Harris, TPO Project Manager, and Mr. Bob Storke, BPAC Chairperson, in attendance to answer any questions. Since the BPAC takes action on bicycle/pedestrian projects the TPO brought this as a presentation to the CAC and TCC so they are aware of the issue with this project.

Ms. Gillespie referred to the BPAC’s vote of 6 “yes” and 5 “no” votes and asked why the vote was so close. She does not endorse a 12’ trail.

Ms. Nicoulin replied there was a lot of discussion surrounding the timing of what is happening. The trail alignment has not been finalized by SUN Trail; this is one possible alignment but there is another possible alignment. The alignment is supposed to be finalized the beginning of next year. Port Orange is ready to move forward and construction is funded in the current year. They cannot wait for the alignment to be finalized because it could jeopardize the funding currently programmed.

Ms. Gillespie asked if the TPO can postpone a decision.

Ms. Nicoulin replied no; Port Orange is ready to move forward. If the TPO postpones, Port Orange would move ahead with the 8’ sidewalk. It is programmed for funding for an 8’ wide sidewalk; they are asking for additional funding to re-design that one section of the west side to a 12’ wide trail.
Ms. Gillespie asked if the TPO would be paying for the stormwater re-design if the TPO gives them the money.

Ms. Nicoulin replied it is not a stormwater re-design.

Mr. Villanella asked if this project was on the north side of Spruce Creek Road.

Ms. Nicoulin replied that Spruce Creek Road runs north/south and this is on the west side, north of Nova Road.

Mr. Ball asked if the TPO needs action from the CAC today.

Chairperson Deyette replied no.

Mr. Ball asked if there was an idea of the cost to incorporate this later.

Ms. Colleen replied potentially, what could happen later is SUN Trail could come in with their alignment and see that an 8’ sidewalk has been constructed and decide to accept it as part of the SUN Trail network. The requirement for a SUN Trail is 12’ unless otherwise justified. There could potentially be a 12’ trail that drops to 8’ and then becomes 12’ wide again which is not is not keeping in the spirit of the SUN Trail program.

Mr. Storke stated a few years ago the BPAC made a recommendation to the TPO Board that all trails be 12’ wide unless constrained by physical conditions. A 12’ trail is what the TPO has set as a minimum trail.

Ms. Gillespie replied she had served on the BPAC then and she did not favor a 12’ trail because it cuts back on funding and what else could be done. There were a lot of 8’ trails that could be accepted under the justification of constraints. We do not throw out an 8’ wide trail because it cannot be 12’; they keep it at 8’. She has a real problem with this.

Mr. Harris stated the original 8’ wide sidewalk on both sides of Spruce Creek Road is fully funded. Earlier this year, when SUN Trail announced their intention to build a trail along the west side of Spruce Creek Road, discussions ensued with the TPO, Port Orange and FDOT with the goal that SUN Trail would supplement existing funding to widen the facility to a trail width of 10’ to 12’; there is no agreement in place to do that. At this time, since the project is programmed for construction in the current fiscal year, if the TPO waits, the city will not have the opportunity to re-design and construct in the current fiscal year.

D. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Resilient Flagler County Report

Ms. Margo Moehring, Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council, gave a PowerPoint presentation and update of the draft Resilient Flagler County Report which was just completed. In 2016, there was a transportation infrastructure, critical facilities and methodology developed to look at sea level rise in the planning area. In September, the TPO established the Volusia County Resilient Report. Flagler County used the existing methodology but refined it to make sure it works for that county. They created a stakeholder group that knew the county well enough to look at critical infrastructure and know they were looking at the right things and to act as quality assurance. They did a vulnerability analysis and there is a tool box at the end of the plan that has recommendations and strategies that can be used. She introduced Mr. Aaron Glick, also with the Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council, to continue the presentation.

Mr. Glick gave the background of the methodology used that was based on the Resilient Volusia County Plan and the sea level rise model data by the Army Corps of Engineers. The years used were 2040, 2070 and 2100 at low, intermediate and high scenarios for sea level rise. He reviewed the areas of assessment including significant evacuation routes and critical facilities. He reviewed important notes about the model used and stated they used a “100-year” flood event. He gave an overview of the different scenarios for
each of the forecasted years. He reviewed the vulnerabilities and the impacts to critical facilities in Flagler County.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Glick to explain the term "flood depth"; a 14 foot flood would flood the entire county.

Mr. Glick replied that this study is only for the coastal portion of Flagler County; from I-95 east to the ocean.

Mr. Peterson asked if he means that area would flood to 14 feet from the present sea level.

Mr. Glick replied correct, above mean sea level. It is based on the “100-year” flood event and the addition of the sea level rise prediction only for east of I-95.

Mr. Peterson asked why they only looked east of I-95.

Mr. Glick replied the model used was limited to that area; it was the same model used for Volusia County. He continued reviewing the areas that would be impacted by each of the scenarios.

Ms. Lendian asked if any of these areas were impacted by Hurricane Matthew or Hurricane Irma.

Mr. Glick replied yes; parts of SR A1A and Palm Coast Parkway among others. He gave an overview of the predicted total mileage of impact for each area under the scenarios. He reviewed the focus areas of implementation and stated a link was needed between emergency preparedness, land use planning and transportation planning.

Ms. Moehring stated the value of the study is it allows planners to know if they are working on a critical facility or one of the roads that may be impacted; they will know to take the next step and see how to do it to make the best use of tax payer dollars and take into account the potential of sea level rise. It also helps with larger policy questions of what happens next such as the parallel flood legislation that includes the possibility of doing an adaptation action area; one is a state requirement and one is a state designation that focuses on the vulnerable area. There are different approaches to take on short life and long life projects. Resiliency and collaboration is something her agency works on with the TPOs.

Ms. Foltz asked if the state is making the counties adopt these maps as part of their comprehensive plan.

Ms. Moehring replied no and referred to the 2015 Parallel Flood Legislation. She stated the next time a jurisdiction updates their comprehensive plan, they will need to address parallel flood.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Harris stated this item will be back next month for a recommendation of approval for the TPO Board to adopt this study. This study represents the third and final assessment of sea level rise resiliency that began in 2016.

Ms. Foltz asked if Volusia County adopted their Resiliency Plan.

Mr. Harris replied not to his knowledge. Once the plan is adopted by the TPO Board, it will move to the implementation phase. He expects to see sea level rise and resiliency addressed in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and in the priority process.

Mr. Peterson commented that he does not think this study goes far enough; it implies the problem is only east of I-95 and that is not true. Flagler County drains west to east and if the east side floods, the west side cannot drain and will also flood. There will be major consequences with sea level rise and this is only addressing the more obvious problems with sea level rise and not the ones that may result in the future.
Mr. Harris replied that this is just a start; as mentioned earlier, one of the limitations of the model used is it only covered the area east of I-95. That is a significant portion of the TPO’s planning area. The stormwater issues that came from this study will need to be addressed. The TPO will take the recommendations from the study and come up with strategies to move forward.

E. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Roadway Safety Evaluation and Improvement Study

Ms. Martha Moore, consultant with Benesch, Inc., gave a PowerPoint presentation on the draft Roadway Safety Evaluation and Improvement Study. She has been working with Mr. Harris and the TPO since the spring to build on the 2017 Crash Analysis Study done by the TPO to see what can be done using the three Es; engineering, education and enforcement. They are working within the TPO planning area and going back five years to look at all the crash data using the Signal Four Analytics program to identify segments and intersections that have the most frequent crashes and the most severe crashes to see if there are any engineering solutions to improve them. If not, then they will look to see if education or enforcement could help improve the crash rates. They have excluded Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects and intersections and segments that already have studies or projects planned or being done. She reviewed the statistics of the collisions, fatalities and injuries for severity and frequency. She reviewed the project scope and stated a field review was done during peak hours on the segments and intersections identified and noticed many drivers looking at their phones. They looked at the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) proven low-cost safety measures to identify what can be done at these intersections and segments. She has presented at the East and West Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST), she will be presenting at the Flagler CTST meeting, the TPO advisory committees and TPO Board. She reviewed the schedule of the study and stated the final report will be presented to the TPO for adoption in September. A link to the draft report was emailed to members on Friday for review and comment by then end of the month.

Mr. Villanella asked if any of the crash data was seasonally adjusted.

Ms. Moore replied they did not look at the months of the year.

Mr. Villanella referred to the intersection at Dunlawton Avenue and Nova Road and asked if there was a way to narrow the data down to see if they were out-of-state drivers or resident drivers because there is a lot of confusion on that road by out-of-town visitors that results in minor rear-end collisions. He travels that road several times a day and notices a lot of people on cell phones and a lack of attentiveness at each traffic light.

Ms. Moore replied statistics are provided in the report on distracted driving. You could manually pull data from the crash reports by license plates or sort it by the month; they did not do that in this study.

Ms. Habel commented that a presentation was given at a previous meeting on the largest crash areas and they were not the same as these that were just presented. She asked what the difference was.

Ms. Moore replied this study is a year off from the first study and covered non-FDOT facilities or intersections that currently are undergoing a study or project so these may not be the worst intersections for crashes. This study went deeper into the crash data.

Ms. Habel asked what the difference was in the action plan in this study compared to the prior study.

Ms. Moore replied that the Signal Four Analytics program is not always accurate when it identifies crashes; it is not always the same as the refined data. This report highlights key areas and how to fix some of the problems at these locations. If there is not an engineering solution, there may be an education or enforcement solution to recommend.

Discussion continued.
Ms. Habel asked if there was any priority in the allocation of funds.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the TPO identified certain candidate projects for cities to apply for in this study. There is information on countermeasures; the next step is for the project sponsors to apply for funding through the TPO's annual Call for Projects.

Mr. Peterson asked if they adjusted for the amount of traffic; obviously high traffic roads have more accidents so they will show on the crash by frequency data but based on the amount of traffic that goes through an intersection, it could be a relatively safe intersection.

Ms. Moore replied they compared the crash rates to similar facilities that pertains to the type of road and the volume of traffic.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Habel asked if she knew what the plans were for improving the intersection at US 92 and Tomoka Farms Road and for the extension of Bellevue Road.

Ms. Bolienback replied there are plans for the intersection at US 92 and Tomoka Farms Road; the issue at Bellevue Road as it connects has not been addressed. It has been raised as an issue but those are both county roads and ultimately it is a county issue to address. The TPO keeps a list of issues that have been raised and that is a project on that list to follow up on but it is not a road that falls under the TPO’s jurisdiction.

F. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft R2CTPO Bicycle Suitability Map

Mr. Harris gave a PowerPoint presentation of the draft Bicycle Suitability Map. He stated the purpose of the map is to provide a portable, graphic representation of bicycle routes suitable for cycling in the entire R2CTPO planning area. The map is intended as a navigational tool for the general public. The TPO wanted to make improvements to the last map which includes encompassing the entire R2CTPO planning area; the last map was done in 2014 before reapportionment and did not include the parts of Flagler County that the TPO now serves. The TPO also wanted to provide the user with roadway suitability data. The last map consisted of bicycle routes provided by the BPAC and other bicycle clubs. The only roadway data included indicated roads that had posted speeds of above 35 miles per hour (mph) or below 35 mph. The new map will have more roads with suitability data. He reviewed the criteria for roadway suitability and the methodology for determining the suitability levels. The ranges were determined by the Bicycle Suitability Map Subcommittee. He explained the suitability levels in terms of comfort for the rider. He reviewed the draft map including both the west side and east side. The most notable difference is the on-road bicycle routes on the last map have been replaced with routes determined by suitability levels. The information on the panels at the top has been updated using 2017 Florida Statutes. The disclaimer and statement of purpose have also been updated. Website information for areas in Palm Coast and Flagler County was also added. To make room for the areas in Flagler County, the inset for the Doris Deelee Preserve was removed. Ms. Lara Bouck, H.W. Lochner, is the consultant project manager for this and she and her staff have spent a lot of time tweaking how the suitability levels are symbolized on the new map.

Ms. Lendian asked if the draft map was available for review.

Mr. Harris replied the draft map is on the TPO website and will be back next month for a recommendation of approval. The TPO will then remove the old map from the website and have several thousand printed for distribution.

G. Presentation and Discussion of Transportation Performance Measures Implementation

Ms. Bollenback stated this time last year the TPO began discussing performance measures that are required to be incorporated into the work it does. So far, the only target that the TPO has adopted is the...
safety measure. A data sharing agreement has been put in place between the MPOs, FDOT and the transit agencies to agree to share needed data. She gave a PowerPoint presentation on Transportation Performance Measures Implementation and stated this will be back next month in more detail and possibly for action on transit measures and in October for the other requirements. The reason TPOs are being asked to do this is to link their decision making and funding investments to what is in the Work Program and is actually built; to measure it and use that data to create priorities and fund the improvements identified and then measure it again to see any results. At the national level, they say the data will not be used to direct funding but the reason they want the MTOs to do this is to direct funding. She believes that this data will eventually be used to make comparisons on a national level. A lot of the TPO’s performance measures are very good because FDOT invests heavily in transportation and has been tracking these measures for a long time. The state has the responsibility to report these measures and targets to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) but in order for the state to make progress, they must have support from the TPOs. The TPOs targets and measures roll into an aggregate state measure. She reviewed some of the other targets and measures including bridge conditions, pavement conditions and travel time reliability. FDOT sets aside money for the bridges with the greatest problems. It is not money that is requested from the TPO so she recommends supporting FDOT’s target for bridges. The same goes for pavement conditions; the TPO does not program or make decisions on resurfacing priorities. The TPO is being asked to track how reliable travel times are on the different roads; interstate and non-interstate. The state has not been able to break down the aggregate yet to the TPO’s level but she expects that information in the next few weeks. She referred to transit measures and stated there was a deadline last summer for that but the Federal Transit Agency (FTA) declared it was a soft target so the TPO does not have the targets yet. The TPO also does not yet have the Transit Asset Management Plans; this is important because they are required by October 1, 2018 and must be incorporated into the TPO’s Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). If they are not incorporated by October 1, 2018, FHWA and the FTA will not approve any updates to the TIP which could prevent the advancement of projects. She has been in contact with Votran and they are concluding their plan and expect it to be available soon. The state is doing a plan for small transit agencies including Flagler County Public Transportation. There will be more detail available next month.

Ms. Foltz asked if the plans had to be adopted next month.

Ms. Bollenback replied they will be presented next month and recommended for approval in October which will coincide with any TIP amendments after October 1, 2018. The TPO will need time to review the information from the plan and incorporate it into the TIP. The safety transit targets have not been set yet and she does not expect those for a couple of years. She briefly reviewed other measures that will be discussed in the future.

H. FDOT Report

Ms. Wyche stated the Pioneer Trail PD&E study is currently in Alternative Concept Analysis and should be completed by spring 2019; a public alternative meeting is scheduled for April 2019. The SR A1A construction, Flagler Dunes, all projects have been transmitted to Tallahassee for review and will be advertised for construction on August 24, 2018 and awarded on September 26, 2018. She referred to the East International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) Beachside Corridor Improvement project and stated negotiations were held and the amount will be available by the end of August; the initial design should be completed by July 2020.

I. Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports

Ms. Winsett stated the Volusia County Construction Report is on page 117 of the agenda and there are a few projects at the top of the page that are ready to start. The Flagler County Construction Report was provided in the agenda.
V. Staff Comments

Due to time constraints, Ms. Nicoulin will email updates on the below items. She announced that Mr. Vince Wang, TPO Transit Planner, has resigned from his position. Mr. Harris will be the transit contact until that position is filled.

→ Update on SIS Designation Criteria Policy
→ Update on Development of Regional List of Priority Projects
→ Update on CFTPM 2015 S/E Data Review

VIII. CAC Member Comments

Ms. Gillespie thanked the Volusia County Council for the blinking solar stop signs on SR A1A in New Smyrna Beach.

Ms. Lendian thanked the TPO for giving the August events before they happened; she was able to attend the Florida Resilient Coastline event this morning.

IX. Information Items

→ CAC & TCC Attendance Records
→ June 27, 2018 River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
→ June and July TPO Outreach and Events
→ SIS Cost Feasible Plan Letters to FDOT and FDOT's Response

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, the CAC meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.
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Background
As the State's population continues to grow and freight movement responds to commercial and consumer demands, truck parking needs must be addressed to ensure the trucking industry has the necessary infrastructure to serve global trade while complying with trucking regulations and the quality of life of nearby communities.

Truck parking shortages are a national safety concern and inadequate supply of truck parking locations and spaces can result in negative consequences.

Study Area

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 Square Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,124 Centerline Miles of State Highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Million Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Purpose
While recognizing that new technologies, such as vehicle automation, are being explored, this study will focus on traditional truck movements and will provide initial recommendations to address the shortage of available spaces and plan for the anticipated need over the next 20 years.

To plan for steady growth in the District and support the on-going expansion in truck parking infrastructure, this study will seek to understand existing facilities, the unmet parking need and demand for truck movements in today's economy, and the regulations and policies in order to provide adequate truck parking capacity.

Methodology
- Partner & Stakeholder Engagement
- Develop Inventory of Existing Truck Parking
- Evaluate Truck Parking Supply & Demand
- Document Sample Truck Parking Usage
- Forecast Future Truck Parking Demands
- Identify Needs, Opportunities & Next Steps

Contact
Jeremy Upchurch
District Freight Coordinator
(386) 943-5026

For More Information
Visit the District Five page under the Local and Regional Initiatives tab on the Freight Moves Florida website for available study materials and additional information.
BACKGROUND & NEED

Truck Parking Conditions

- Jason’s Law and Subsequent Industry Surveys
- Projected growth in truck volumes tied to economic growth of the State
- Observed Challenges and Community Impacts

Study Purpose

- Understand Issues
- Engage Stakeholders
- Plan for Future
- Identify Opportunities
WORK TO DATE

- Develop Inventory of Existing Truck Parking
- Document Sample Truck Parking Usage
- Evaluate Truck Parking Supply and Demand
- Forecast Future Truck Parking Demands
- Needs, Opportunities, and Next Steps
- Planning Partner and Stakeholder Efforts

Legend:
- ✓ Task Complete
- 🔁 Task In-Progress
IDENTIFYING NEEDS
Multiple Approaches – Common Findings

- Stakeholder Feedback
  (What we heard)

- Field Observations
  (What we observed)

- Demand Estimation
  (What we estimated)
INTERSTATE HIGHWAY COMPARISON
Parking Supply & Demand

Central Florida’s Interstate Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interstate</th>
<th>Average Demand</th>
<th>Available Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 75</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 95</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGAGEMENT NEXT STEPS

- MPO Coordination
  - River to Sea TPO
  - MetroPlan Orlando
- County Coordination
  - Orange County
  - Seminole County
  - Volusia County
- Central Florida MPO Alliance
  - October 12, 2018

TECHNICAL NEXT STEPS

- Identification of Best Practices and Opportunities for Implementation
- Complete Documentation and Final Report
CONTACT

Jeremy Upchurch
District Five Freight Coordinator
386.943.5026
Jeremy.Upchurch@dot.state.fl.us