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, October 9, 2019

TIME:       2:00 P.M.

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

******************************************************************************

Mr. Paul Eik, 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 SEPTEMBER 11, 2019 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
          (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, pages 4-13)

B.       REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## ADOPTING A
          COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN  (Contact: Stephan Harris)
          (Enclosure, page 14)

C.       REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## AMENDING
          THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)  (Contact: Stephan Harris)
          (Enclosure, pages 15-38)

D.       REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA
          REGIONAL RESILIENCE COLLABORATIVE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
          (MOU)  (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 39-49)
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE (Contact: Stephan Harris and Lorena Cucek, FDOT) (Enclosure, pages 50-61)

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT’S HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT (HVE) PROGRAM (Contact: Stephan Harris and Captain Scott Goss, Daytona Beach Police Department) (Enclosure, pages 62-68)

C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE GRAHAM SWAMP TRAIL, PHASE 1 (Contact: Stephan Harris and Faith Alkatib, Flagler County Engineering) (Enclosure, pages 69-78)

D. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT R2CTPO FY 2018/19 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES SUMMARY (Contact: Pamela Blankenship) (Enclosure, page 79)

E. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT COMMUNITY SAFETY ACTION PLAN (CSAP) (Contact: Pamela Blankenship) (Enclosure, page 80)

F. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE GUIDING RESOLUTIONS AND PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANNUAL CALL FOR PROJECTS (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 81-93)

V. STAFF COMMENTS

→ 2045 LRTP Subcommittee Membership
→ Mobility Week Events
→ Update on SU Funding/Work Program
→ Update on FDOT D-5 Proposed Local Agency Program (LAP) Policy

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS (Enclosure, pages 94-97)

→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ September 2019 TPO Outreach & Activities
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 94)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT (Enclosure, page 94)

***The next meeting of the BPAC will be on Wednesday, November 13, 2019***
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 SEPTEMBER 11, 2019 BPAC MEETING MINUTES

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Minutes are prepared for each meeting and must be approved by the BPAC. The September 11, 2019 BPAC meeting minutes are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2019 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
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 2:00 p.m. by Chairperson Paul Eik. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

A moment of silence was observed in remembrance of 9/11 victims.
II. New BPAC Member Introduction

Chairperson Eik announced that Mr. Andrew Dodzik, Flagler County Alternate, will also be the Palm Coast Alternate. He introduced Mr. Ned Wolfarth as the new Holly Hill representative.

III. Public Comment/Participation

There were no public comments.

IV. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of August 14, 2019 BPAC Meeting Minutes

*MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Storke to approve the August 14, 2019 BPAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and carried unanimously.*

Chairperson Eik announced Presentation Item A will be presented prior to Action Item B as it includes information that pertains to the action item.

A. Presentation and Discussion of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Ms. Nicoulin introduced Mr. Jim Wood, Kimley-Horn and Associates, to give the presentation on the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Mr. Wood gave a PowerPoint presentation and introduced his team. He reviewed the major milestones and the schedule of deliverables. The adoption package will be presented in June 2020 which will include the cost feasible plan and an open public hearing will be held; the plan will be adopted in September 2020. He reviewed the public involvement schedule and stated there will also be ongoing public involvement activities that TPO staff will be doing as well as a website and social media. One of the most important parts of the LRTP is to show how the projects in the cost feasible plan will be funded.

Mr. Aufdenberg stated the presentation referred to resiliency and the impact of climate change on the transportation system and asked if there were any effects the transportation system has on the climate.

Mr. Wood replied as part of this process, they will work with resource and land management agencies to understand the environmental issues and for them to provide input.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked when the survey will debut.

*The following comments relate to Action Item A, Review and Approval of the August 14, 2019 BPAC meeting minutes.*

Chairperson Eik asked if members had any changes or corrections to the August 8, 2019 meeting minutes.

Mr. Daun referred to the Staff Comments section of the minutes where he had requested the proposed FDOT D-5 Local Agency Program (LAP) policy be sent to the BPAC members; this was not done and he requested that the information be sent.

Mr. Harris replied he will send the information via email.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Public Involvement Plan

(Handout)
MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Daun to approve the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Wendler. The motion was withdrawn by Mr. Daun later in the meeting.

Mr. McCallister commented that millennials are driving less than previous generations and asked if that is affecting planning in general and things like the LRTP; if that was taken into account and if so, how?

Mr. Wood replied it is taken into consideration and there has been discussion about what this means as we prioritize and look forward 25 years. They look closely at the demographics and how people use transportation; there is a push for transportation choices and a broader spectrum of options. There are some groups that are moving away from single car use as much as possible and it is a factor that is considered.

Mr. McCallister asked how people are getting around if they are choosing not to drive.

Mr. Wood replied some use transit, shared mobility, biking or walking; some are moving closer to their workplace where they do not need to drive. However, the trends must be reviewed carefully; as millennials age and have families they are using cars more than was predicted. It goes back to having a multiuse system and diversifying transportation options.

Chairperson Eik reminded members that this action item is for the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the 2045 LRTP; it is provided as a handout and was emailed to the members yesterday for review.

Ms. Belin asked if they were taking autonomous vehicles into consideration and the need for a place for those vehicles, and people that use Uber or Lyft as well as having fewer vehicles on the road.

Mr. Wood replied the automated, connected or electric vehicles are one of the scenarios they will look at and what possible influences they may have on priority decisions. We know the technology is changing but we do not always have enough data to understand what it will mean. They are trying to understand how to anticipate what a model of shared mobility will mean; some companies are commenting that we will no longer own cars but will instead have a subscription.

Ms. Belin commented she has heard there is a lack of housing for people moving to Florida and asked if that would be considered.

Mr. Wood replied they will look at it to the extent it is reasonable. He summarized the PIP and stated it is the intent for the 2045 LRTP to have meaningful public input. He reviewed the key components which include a website, social media, a survey, focus groups and a series of public meetings.

Mr. Aufdenberg commented the Complete Streets Policy includes holding meetings at the Votran Transit Center where people that use transit will actually be and asked if something like that could be done for the LRTP.

Mr. Wood replied the sites for the meetings have not yet been selected; they will be geographically and demographically dispersed.

Mr. Mostert referred to the environmental justice workshops and asked if any emphasis would be on the biological impact; it seems that the loss of habitats due to development should be considered.

Mr. Wood replied connected wildlife corridors and ecological greenways are factors that the resource agencies will respond to and discuss. This plan is just one of several touchpoints for environmental consideration; there is a specific process as projects move into development. The intent here is to be mindful of setting priorities if there are significant concerns from an environmental perspective.
Mr. Hall asked that the public workshops be scheduled when people can get there; there is a lack of transportation in many areas at night. He asked if the LRTP addresses the prejudices or opinions of the officials that fund the programs.

Mr. Wood replied the plan is shaped by input from the community, elected officials and the public; it all feeds into the plan for the priorities of the area.

Mr. Daun stated he neglected to see this was a discussion on the presentation and withdrew his earlier motion after the presentation. He referred to the handout, page 9, second paragraph, that states the TPO project manager will schedule subcommittee meetings on the third Tuesday each month at noon; however, the meeting notice received yesterday has the meeting starting at 11:30 am. He asked if the meetings will be at 11:30 am or noon.

Ms. Nicoulin replied on the third Tuesday of the month there is a hard deadline to finish the meeting by 1:00 pm because the CAC meeting begins at 1:15 pm. After reviewing the items on the agenda, the decision was made to include extra time. After the first meeting, they will be able to gauge if starting at noon will allow enough time for discussion.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Storke to recommend approval of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Public Involvement Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hall and passed unanimously.

### IV. Presentation and Discussion Items

#### A. Presentation and Discussion of an Amendment to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Ms. Bollenback stated funding was recently programmed for right-of-way for two segments of the SR 40 widening project; one between US 17 and SR 11 and the other between SR 11 and Cone Road in Ormond Beach. There is intended to be a shared use path as part of this project that will eventually continue into the City of Ormond Beach. Because FDOT has the funding programmed in the Work Program it needs to be reflected in the existing 2040 LRTP. As part of this amendment, the TPO will be considering the incorporation of the I-95 and US 1 interchange improvement project; Ormond Beach has been actively looking at improvements to this interchange for safety and design. It is one of the oldest and most dangerous interchanges in the planning area. It is currently in the LRTP but on the unfunded needs list; it may be moved to the funded needs list. Also, additional performance measures the TPO was required to adopt will be incorporated into the plan. Earlier this year when the plan was amended to include the I-95 interchanges at SR 44 and Pioneer Trail, the adopted safety performance measures were added. Since then, bridge condition, pavement condition and travel time reliability performance measures have been adopted which will need to be included. This item will be back next month with additional details.

Mr. Aufdenberg commented that he thinks the shared use path along SR 40 is part of the Heart of Florida Loop.

Ms. Bollenback replied the Heart of Florida Trail will be part of the shared use path system and is part of the portion from US 17; it will connect to the shared use path on SR 40. The state trails list is updated every couple of years and Mr. Harris has been working to get this cross-county section included because it links to the St. Johns River to Sea Loop and the Heart of Florida Loop. It is not part of the SUN Trail but from a local perspective having this link is valuable. She announced that Mr. Jim Wood, before he was a consultant, was the head of planning for the state and was instrumental in implementing the SUN Trail program.

#### B. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Community Safety Action Plan (CSAP)

Ms. Blankenship gave a PowerPoint presentation of the draft Community Safety Action Plan (CSAP) and stated she will be asking for feedback at the end of the presentation. She reviewed the goals and objectives of the
CSAP and stated this is to develop a work plan for TPO staff. She reviewed the five “Es” of safety and stated the CSAP will focus on all but engineering. She reviewed the data for all crashes in Volusia and Flagler Counties from 2014 to 2018; the most common vehicle crash type is rear-end crashes. She reviewed the data for bicycle and pedestrian deaths and incapacitating injuries for the same time period.

Mr. Daun referred to the statistics for bicycle and pedestrian crashes and asked if any of them involved alcohol.

Ms. Blankenship replied she does not have that information but can get it for him; much of this data came from the Crash Analysis Report the TPO completed in 2017. She continued with the presentation and reviewed the three main roadways for bicycle and pedestrian fatalities; US 1, US 17 and US 92. The alcohol statistics were included in this slide of the presentation.

Mr. Aufdenberg asked if it was the pedestrian or driver that was under the influence of alcohol.

Ms. Blankenship replied that information she does not have.

Ms. Winsett asked if there were any crashes on US 17/92.

Ms. Blankenship replied she would have to check and continued reviewing the data.

Ms. Belin asked if the pedestrians were in dark clothing or impaired.

Ms. Blankenship replied alcohol and drugs were involved in many of the crashes.

Mr. McCallister commented that the 75% of crashes that were not at intersections were probably generated by people pulling out of parking lots. The phrase “I did not see them” is used as an exonerating statement for drivers and if police recorded those statements could show the real rate of distracted driving.

Ms. Burgess-Hall stated she sees pedestrians constantly crossing the roadway within feet of an intersection and pedestrians wearing dark clothing at night.

She continued reviewing the data. She gave an overview of the current strategies and initiatives that are ongoing for FDOT, the TPO, and a number of other agencies.

Mr. Hall referred to engineering and stated he feels it would be a good idea if the delay on traffic signals was changed to give pedestrians a chance to get across the street. He and Ms. Burgess-Hall stated they visited Pennsylvania and New Jersey this summer and the hotels had posters with information on safety such as “buckle up”. He thinks that should be done here due to all the tourists we have as well as to remind the residents. Along with that, perhaps having a chain letter sent via social media to five people and then asking them to forward it to five people; this would help get the word out and not cost anything.

Mr. Aufdenberg agreed with Mr. Hall on the idea of hotels and tourists; Daytona Beach has a population of approximately 100,000 and tourists are ten times that number.

Mr. Wendler asked if this presentation could be sent to the CAC members.

Ms. Blankenship replied yes and asked the members to send her any ideas they may have.

Mr. Daun commented that different agencies use different data sources; an important thing to do would be to have a universal standard that all agencies in the TPO planning area can have access to the same information in order to have a valid conversation. We could then apply for grants and the data will be consistent.

Ms. Blankenship replied most of the data came from Signal 4 Analytics.
Ms. Winsett commented that what is missing from the five “E”s of safety is obedience; respect for the law and for others. People are lazy and reckless and there are not enough police officers to monitor it. There is also a disconnection in the community. The Volusia County Traffic Engineering Department works with the Community Safety Traffic Teams and law enforcement to pinpoint where the problems are and come up with solutions; most of the time the solutions are already there. We cannot put all the blame on engineering and enforcement. She referred to the high number of pedestrian fatalities and stated we should look at the land use adjacent to those roadways and the socioeconomic areas to see if there are any correlations. She referred to the list of initiatives and strategies and suggested we look into how effective they are, how much they are used and their accessibility. There are things the TPO can make an impact on but we need to get the word out about what we cannot control.

Discussion continued.

C. Presentation and Discussion of the Draft Complete Streets Policy and Implementation Plan

Mr. Harris stated that according to the Smart Growth National Complete Streets Coalition, complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for users including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. A Complete Streets Policy directs transportation planners and engineers to integrate a complete streets approach into their transportation practices, policies and decision making processes to improve the entire street network. The Complete Streets Subcommittee met on August 29, 2019 to review the draft policy and they had a few suggestions which are summarized on their meeting summary on page 36 of the agenda; he reviewed those suggestions. TPO staff will continue to refine the draft policy and bring it back for adoption in October. He asked for feedback and suggestions.

Mr. Daun commented that it is awesome that the policy is using health statistics. He was involved in the walkability study that was completed for Midtown and one of the biggest issues was shade; he asked if having more shade on walkways and trails was a component of the policy. There have been discussions and presentations on roundabouts and it was found that there is not a universal standard for safety. He suggested adding a roundabout component into the Complete Streets Policy; if a roundabout is built on a state road safety is looked at but if a municipality wants to build a roundabout and does not receive federal funds there is no standard. He believes it is vital to include that since this policy will hopefully be adopted by the cities.

Mr. Aufdenberg replied that as a member of the subcommittee he believes this policy does well in that regard. He referred to the design section of the draft policy that states “roadway projects shall accommodate people of all ages and abilities including pedestrians and cyclists” so if a local jurisdiction has a roadway project and similar verbiage it will include roundabouts as they are roadway projects.

Ms. Burgess-Hall asked who on the committee sent a letter to the editor regarding roundabouts.

Mr. Coletti replied it was him.

Ms. Burgess-Hall asked if a response was received.

Mr. Coletti replied no.

Chairperson Eik stated that will be discussed.

Mr. Storke referred to the suggestion of removing the definition of exceptionally disproportionate and asked if something will replace it.

Mr. Harris replied no.

Mr. Aufdenberg explained the objection was to the exact percentage; the subcommittee did not want it to be a fixed number. The disproportionate language is still included.
Chairperson Eik asked Mr. Coletti to give a brief presentation regarding the letter Ms. Burgess-Hall mentioned and the roundabout on US 1.

Mr. Coletti stated a roundabout is currently under construction in Corona on US 1 and Old Dixie Highway in Flagler County just before the Volusia County line. The northbound, right-hand side of the roundabout is completed and they have installed tall shoulders. The road is next to the shoulder so they have eliminated the bike lane in the roundabout. There was a bike lane prior to that and when that section of the roundabout was under construction the orange construction barrels were in the bike lane. On August 29, 2019 he wrote a letter to the editor that FDOT is building a roundabout on US 1 and Old Dixie Highway to make it safer for vehicles but without consideration for the danger it presents for bicyclists and pedestrians. Prior to the roundabout, there was a relatively safe bike lane; now, bicyclists have to use the roadway lane which is dangerous for both bicyclists and vehicles. Currently, there are no sharrows or signs warning drivers that bicyclists will be using the roadway; the only sign is “bike lane ends” northbound. He rides through there at least once a week and now it is very dangerous. He was frustrated and sent this letter to the editor but has received no comments back from FDOT, the Flagler County Sheriff’s Office or the Flagler County Commission. The southbound section is still under construction and the bike lane is still there but it could disappear once construction is completed.

Chairperson Eik replied that Ms. Brenda Young, FDOT, is here today and asked if she had a response.

Ms. Young thanked Mr. Coletti for his letter and she has looked into the history of that roundabout and contacted the FDOT Project Manager and engineers. She was told the impetus for installing this roundabout had to do with vehicular crashes and fatalities. They were trying to expedite a roadway safety improvement project as quickly as possible to eliminate the driver fatalities at this intersection which necessitated it be built within the existing right-of-way at this time. In the existing condition there is a paved shoulder that bicyclists use that keeps them out of the vehicular travel lane. Now that the roundabout is being installed, FDOT chose this opportunity to add a buffered bike lane within the project limits; however, when the buffered bike lane approaches the roundabout there was not room in the right-of-way to continue it. The engineers did consider the bicyclist and driver interaction and designed the roundabout curvature that drivers would slow down. They have empirical data that shows the vehicular driver and bicyclist interaction at a slower speed works but she understands how a bicyclist would still feel uncomfortable. The southbound section is currently under construction and the final configuration will have a bike lane which will continue through the roundabout. She is happy to take these concerns to the engineer and see if there is something FDOT can do to make the cyclists more comfortable.

Ms. Burgess-Hall stated this issue makes her nervous about the roundabout going in at International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) and SR A1A. She is afraid this situation will happen there as well and the roundabout will be completed but will have safety hazards for bicyclist, pedestrians and those with visual impairments.

Chairperson Eik replied that is an excellent comment. There have been numerous discussions today regarding safety and we are fortunate to have an FDOT representative here to hear our concerns and bring those concerns back to FDOT.

Mr. Daun commented he used to ride in an urban area where bicycles are legally considered a vehicle and interact with traffic but we do not ride that way here. He attended the recent FDOT meeting regarding the Oakridge Boulevard project where they are going to install a bike lane but just before SR A1A bicyclists will have to enter the vehicle lane to make a left-hand turn. He thinks they should consider what an elementary school child would do in that situation when designing a project like this.

Mr. McCallister referred to engineers citing data and commented that there are lurking variables in that data. There are places he will not ride even as experienced as he is because it is too dangerous. Engineers need to be educated and keep in mind that data has a working variable which is when the design has dissuaded pedestrians and bicyclists from being there. He has a firm belief that there should be a state law or FDOT
policy that states when an engineer firm is working on a project with bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure they should have at least one bicyclist on their staff.

V. Staff Comments

→ Update on SU Funding/Work Program

Mr. Harris stated the new fiscal year began in July with approximately $400,000 in federal funds for bicycle/pedestrian projects. Two projects in the current fiscal year have been withdrawn; one is the Alabama Multi-Use Trail in DeLand. It was programmed for construction in the current year but the city of DeLand has chosen not to pay the 10% local match. The second project being withdrawn is the Tomoka Park trail project in Ormond Beach because of the negative feedback received from residents along the proposed trail. These funds are going to the construction of the LeHigh Trailhead in Palm Coast which is just over $1 million. They are finishing the design and going to construction later this year. The TPO is also programming in the current year the Fremont Avenue sidewalk in Daytona Beach, the Deltona School crosswalk embedded light project, and the Willow Run sidewalk project in Port Orange.

Mr. Aufdenberg stated the crosswalk embedded light project was just reviewed and this is an awesome implementation time scale. He credits Deltona for providing a 33% match.

VI. Information Items

→ Alabama Multiuse Trail Withdrawal Letter
→ August TPO Outreach and Activities
→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ Complete Streets Subcommittee Report
→ National Park Service News Release
→ Save the Date for Central Florida Mobility Week: October 25 – November 1, 2019
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VII. BPAC Member Comments

Mr. Daun referred to page 36 of the agenda and the Complete Streets Subcommittee Report where they made a motion to exclude health specific measures in section 7 of the draft policy. He is very interested in health impact assessments which allow communities to obtain funding from alternate sources such as the National Institute of Health to build trails for health benefits. He asked if by excluding the health specific measures it would deny communities that adopt the Complete Streets Policy from accessing other funding.

Mr. Harris replied he hopes not; that may be put back in. There will be a revised draft next month.

Mr. Mostert reminded members to wear their bike helmets while bicycling.

Mr. Coletti reminded Ms. Young of the broken sidewalk on US 1 North in Bunnell.

Ms. Young replied she will follow up with FDOT Traffic Operations.

Ms. Burgess-Hall announced October is White Cane and Pedestrian Safety Awareness month; they are also including cycling safety. They have had weekly meetings and discussed different activities; one idea is a chain letter for the Alert Today, Alive Tomorrow campaign. They are working on getting posters to disseminate throughout the community. The next meeting is tonight via telephone at 6:30 pm; she gave the phone number and access code. They are still in the planning process and if anyone has a suggestion that a small group could implement to let her know.

Mr. Hall stated one of the projects they are looking at is education. The last week of October is FDOT’s Mobility Week and they are also planning a project that week; the project they are considering is to ask people to take Votran
Route 11 to the Daytona Beach Police Station and walk or ride to the Tanger Outlet Mall to see what is involved in getting there. There is no bus service to the Tanger Outlet Mall.

Ms. Burgess-Hall added the lack of bus service is not necessarily Volusia County’s fault.

Mr. Hall replied that the county pays for Votran but the city let them do it; it is a joint fault that there is no bus service there. They are looking to do several different educational projects throughout the month of October.

Mr. Aufdenberg announced another mobility week activity; they are arranging to show the documentary cargo bike film “Motherlode” at the downtown Cinematique Theater on Saturday, November 2, 2019 at 10:00 am; the film will be free. He will be speaking as a proud owner and operator of a cargo bike. He asked members to support federal legislation under consideration, Senate Bill 2077 and House Bill 3663, the Complete Streets Act.

Mr. McCallister stated Representative Brian Mast of the 18th District, the Treasure Coast of St. Lucie, Martin and part of Palm Beach Counties, is a wounded veteran and may be a strong resource for this bill.

Mr. Aufdenberg stated he also attended the Oakridge Boulevard public meeting and was encouraged to send email comments; he was pleased that the engineer responded point by point to his comments. He explained that due to the number of driveways the bike lane would not be effective. There is no direct guidance on how many driveways per mile there can be for a protected bike lane.

Mr. McCallister stated he contacted the Volusia County Sheriff’s Office regarding a safety awareness campaign; intersection safety was repeatedly discussed last month during the Sheriff’s presentation so that is where he started. Hurricane Dorian derailed that conversation but he will revitalize it and asked if anyone had any suggestions.

Chairperson Eik commented that having been on this committee for several years and seeing all the hard work and hard questions get asked and answered he realized after returning here after the hurricane, how many benefits we have here in Volusia and Flagler Counties for bicyclists and pedestrians. He was in a small community around Richmond, Virginia and for five days did not see a single bicyclist and only a few pedestrians.

VIII. Adjournment

The BPAC meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization

___________________________________
Mr. Paul Eik, Chairperson
Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

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 September 11, 2019 regular meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), approved and duly signed this 9th day of October 2019.

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

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## ADOPTING A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

According to Smart Growth America’s National Complete Streets Coalition, complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. A Complete Streets Policy directs transportation planners and engineers to integrate a Complete Streets approach into their transportation practices, policies and decision-making processes to improve the entire street network.

Last month, the TPO Board, BPAC, CAC and TCC reviewed and provided feedback on an initial draft Complete Streets Policy. The revised final draft Complete Streets Policy and Resolution 2019-## will be provided under separate cover.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## ADOPTING A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
III. ACTION ITEMS

C. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## AMENDING THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The River to Sea TPO is seeking to amend the 2040 LRTP to reflect updated funding of the following three (3) projects as included in the updated Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Long Range Cost Feasible Plan dated June 25, 2018:

- **I-95 at US 1 Interchange Modifications**: This project includes proposed improvements to the interchange at I-95 and US 1. This project is being proposed to be moved from the 2040 LRTP Unfunded Needs List to the Strategic Intermodal Systems (SIS) Cost-Feasible Projects List
- **SR 40 Widening from Cone Road to SR 11**: Advancing funding from years 2031-40 of the 2040 LRTP to years 2026-30 on the SIS Cost Feasible Projects List
- **SR 40 Widening from SR 11 to SR 15 (US 17)**: Advancing funding from years 2031-40 of the 2040 LRTP to years 2026-30 on the SIS Cost Feasible Projects List

Since adoption of the 2040 LRTP in January 2016, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) updated their long range revenue estimates and updated the “cost feasible” SIS plan that extends out to the year 2045. In that updated plan, funding for the three projects was identified. The interchange project was identified as needed, but unfunded, in the TPO plan.

In addition, as a result of new requirements for transportation planning and Transportation Performance Management (TPM), the TPO will also be required to develop an amendment that incorporates the new planning requirements and performance measures into the LRTP. Resolution 2019-## and 2040 LRTP Amendment #2 are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

**MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2019-## AMENDING THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)**
RESOLUTION OF THE RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AMENDING THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) TO REFLECT UPDATED FUNDING OF THE I-95 INTERCHANGE AT US 1 AND WIDENINGS ON SR 40 AND TO INCLUDE NEW REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT (TPM)

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 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; and 23 CFR 450.324(a) require that each metropolitan planning organization shall prepare and update a transportation plan for its metropolitan planning area that addresses at least a 20-year planning horizon; the River to Sea TPO’s 2040 LRTP has developed a 25-year planning horizon plan; and

WHEREAS, 23 CFR 450.324(g)(11) requires that each long range transportation plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented; and

WHEREAS, 23 C.F.R. 450.306 establishes the planning factors that must be considered by each metropolitan planning organization in the development of a long range plan; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO Board is seeking to amend the 2040 LRTP to reflect updated funding for one interchange project on I-95, two road widenings on SR 40 and incorporate new planning rule requirements; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO has solicited public comment on the proposed amendment during a public review period meeting the required 30 days as prescribed in Chapter 10 of the adopted plan; and

WHEREAS, after due consideration of the recommendations of its staff and advisory committees and input from the public, the board has determined that approval of these amendments are necessary and/or appropriate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the River to Sea TPO that:
1. The River to Sea TPO's 2040 LRTP is hereby amended as described below and more particularly shown in "Amendment 2":
   a. Moving the I-95 Interchange at US 1 from the Unfunded SIS Needs Projects List (Table 32) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 28);
   b. Advancing funding of the SR 40 Widening from Cone Road to SR 11 from years 2031-40 of the 2040 LRTP to years 2026-30 on the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 28);
   c. Advancing funding of the SR 40 Widening from SR 11 to SR 15 (US 17) from years 2031-40 of the 2040 LRTP to years 2026-30 on the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 28);
   d. Incorporating FAST ACT requirements into the 2040 LRTP (Appendix N).

2. The Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit the 2040 LRTP as amended to the:
   a. Florida Department of Transportation;
   b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and the
   c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation).

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 23rd day of October 2019.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

________________________________________
COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
CHAIRPERSON, RIVER TO SEA TPO

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 a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on October 23, 2019.

ATTTEST:

______________________________________
DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
### Table 2 – 2040 LRTP SIS Cost Feasible Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Funding Period</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2026-30</td>
<td>I-4 widen to 10 lanes (I-4 Beyond the Ultimate)²</td>
<td>Seminole County</td>
<td>SR 472</td>
<td>$644.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2026-30</td>
<td>SR 472 widen from 4 to 6 lanes²</td>
<td>Graves Ave</td>
<td>Kentucky/ MLK Blvd</td>
<td>$62.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2026-30</td>
<td>Saxon Blvd Ramp/Roadway²</td>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Normandy Blvd</td>
<td>$54.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2026-30</td>
<td>Rhode Island Extension²</td>
<td>Veterans Memorial</td>
<td>Normandy Blvd</td>
<td>$53.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>SR 15 (US 17) widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>Ponce De Leon Blvd</td>
<td>SR 40</td>
<td>$77.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>SR 40 – widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Williamson Blvd</td>
<td>Breakaway Trails</td>
<td>$59.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>SR 40 – widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>Cone Rd</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>$83.668670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>SR 40 – widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SR 15 (US 17)</td>
<td>$22.387575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>SR 100 – widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Old Kings Rd</td>
<td>Belle Terre Parkway</td>
<td>$66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>I-95 Interchange (Farmon)³</td>
<td>@ Maytown Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>I-95 Interchange/LPGA Blvd Modifications</td>
<td>Williamson Blvd</td>
<td>Tymber Creek Ext.</td>
<td>$32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>I-95 /Pioneer Trail New Interchange</td>
<td>@ Pioneer Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2031-40</td>
<td>I-95/US 1 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>@ US 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL BY YEAR OF EXPENDITURE (YOE)** $1,237,671,303.27

**Abbreviations:** PE/PD&E (Preliminary Engineering/Project Development and Environment); ROW (right of way); CST (construction); YOE (year of expenditure)

**Notes:**
1. In millions; inflated from Present Day Costs (PDC) to year of expenditure (YOE) dollars per Revenue Forecast Handbook
2. Part of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Project
3. Developer Funded - $12.9 million (provided for informational purposes)

* Funded in Other Arterial Category, not in FDOT’s SIS Cost Feasible

**Amendment 1:** Per Resolution 2019-01, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on January 23, 2019, moving two projects, #11 and 12, from the Unfunded Needs List (Table 3) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (above)

**Amendment 2:** Per Resolution 2019-##, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on XX, 2019, advancing funding for two projects, #7 and 8, from years 2031-40 to years 2026-30; and moving project #13 from the Unfunded Needs List (Table 3) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (above)
Table 3 – SIS Needs Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Est. Present Day Cost (in millions)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 15 (US 17) Preliminary Design and Engineering (PD&amp;E)</td>
<td>SR 40 to Putnam Co. Line</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Safety Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95/US 1 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>At I-95 &amp; SR 5 (US 1)</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>Interchange Improvements (Safety &amp; Capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95/SR 44 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>At I-95 &amp; SR 44</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>Interchange Improvements (Safety &amp; Capacity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment 1: Per Resolution 2019-01, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on January 23, 2019, moving two projects, I-95 @ LPGA and I-95 @ Pioneer Trail, from the Unfunded Needs List (above) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 2).

Amendment 2: Per Resolution 2019-##, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on XX, 2019, moving the I-95/US 1 Interchange modifications project from the Unfunded Needs List (above) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 2).
Chapter 7

COST FEASIBLE PLAN
### Table 28 – 2040 LRTP SIS Cost Feasible Projects List (State/Federal Funding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROW Cost¹</th>
<th>CST Cost¹</th>
<th>Project Cost¹</th>
<th>2019-2020²</th>
<th>2021-2025³</th>
<th>2026-2030⁴</th>
<th>2031-2040⁵</th>
<th>Y.O.E. Cost Total⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PDC)</td>
<td>(PDC)</td>
<td>(PDC)</td>
<td>ROW CST</td>
<td>ROW CST</td>
<td>ROW CST</td>
<td>ROW CST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-4 widen to 10 Lanes (I-4 Beyond the Ultimate)⁷</td>
<td>Seminole County</td>
<td>SR 472</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$46.36</td>
<td>$372.07</td>
<td>$418.43</td>
<td>$71.39</td>
<td>$757.99</td>
<td>$644.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SR 472 widen from 4 to 6 lanes⁸</td>
<td>Graves Ave</td>
<td>Kentucky/MLK Blvd</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$40.48</td>
<td>$40.48</td>
<td>$62.34</td>
<td>$62.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saxon Blvd Ramp/Roadway⁹</td>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Normandy Blvd</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$35.38</td>
<td>$35.38</td>
<td>$54.49</td>
<td>$54.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rhode Island Extension¹⁰</td>
<td>Veterans Memorial</td>
<td>Normandy Blvd</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$34.87</td>
<td>$34.87</td>
<td>$53.70</td>
<td>$53.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR 15 (US 17) widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>Ponce De Leon Blvd</td>
<td>SR 40</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$39.40</td>
<td>$39.40</td>
<td>$77.62</td>
<td>$77.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 40 - widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Williamson Blvd</td>
<td>Breakaway Trails</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$22.99</td>
<td>$30.42</td>
<td>$14.64</td>
<td>$45.29</td>
<td>$59.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 40 - widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>Cone Rd</td>
<td>SR 11</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$41.50</td>
<td>$43.80</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$34.70</td>
<td>$34.70</td>
<td>$83.46</td>
<td>$83.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR 40 - widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>SR 15 (US 17)</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$30.40</td>
<td>$37.90</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$72.90</td>
<td>$38.06</td>
<td>$75.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR 100 - widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Old Kings Rd</td>
<td>Belle Terre Parkway</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$3.17</td>
<td>$31.70</td>
<td>$34.87</td>
<td>$6.05</td>
<td>$60.55</td>
<td>$66.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-95 Interchange (Farmland Interchange)¹¹</td>
<td>At Maytown Rd</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-95/PGA Blvd Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>Williamson Blvd</td>
<td>Tymber Creek Ext.</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$32.50</td>
<td>$32.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-95/Pioneer Trail New Interchange</td>
<td>At Pioneer Trail</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>$30.06</td>
<td>$30.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-95/US 1 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>At US 1</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>$32.20</td>
<td>$32.20</td>
<td>$383.35</td>
<td>$383.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. In millions, shown in present day costs (PDC)/"constant" 2013, 2014 or 2015 dollars (Added projects 11 & 12 are in 2017 dollars)
2. In millions, inflated to year of expenditure (YOE) dollars per Revenue Forecast Handbook
3. Part of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Project
4. Cost estimates were sourced from the FDOT SR 400 (I-4) PD&E Study, Preliminary Engineering Report for I-4 Beyond the Ultimate, Segment 4 (December 2014)
5. Developer Funded - $12.9 million (informational purposes)
6. Amendment 1: Per Resolution 2019-01, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on January 23, 2019, moving two projects, #11 and 12, from the Unfunded Needs List (Table 32) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (above)
7. Amendment 2: Per Resolution 2019-08, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on XX, 2019, for two projects, #7 and 8, advancing ROW funding from years 2031-40 to years 2021-25 and advancing CST funding from years 2031-40 to years 2026-30; and moving project #13 from the Unfunded Needs List (Table 32) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (above)
Table 32 – SIS Needs Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Est. Present Day Cost (in millions)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 15 (US 17) Preliminary Design and Engineering (PD&amp;E)</td>
<td>SR 40 to Putnam Co. Line</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>Safety Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95/US 1 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>At I-95 &amp; SR 5 (US 1)</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>Interchange Improvements/Safety &amp; Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-95/SR 44 Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>At I-95 &amp; SR 44</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>Interchange Improvements/Safety &amp; Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Unfunded

Amendment 1: Per Resolution 2019-01, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on January 23, 2019, moving two projects, I-95 Interchange at LPGA and I-95 interchange @ Pioneer Trail, from the Unfunded Needs List (above) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 28).

Amendment 2: Per Resolution 2019-##, the 2040 LRTP was amended by the River to Sea TPO Board on XX, 2019, moving the I-95/US 1 Interchange modifications project from the Unfunded Needs List (above) to the SIS Cost-Feasible Projects List (Table 28)
INCORPORATING FAST ACT REQUIREMENTS INTO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN
Background of the Transportation Planning Rule

Pursuant to the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) Act enacted in 2012 and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act enacted in 2015, state Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan/Transportation Planning Organizations (M/TPOs) must incorporate certain planning activities into the planning processes of the organization and they must apply a transportation performance management approach in carrying out their federally required transportation planning and programming activities.

On May 27, 2016, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan/Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (The Planning Rule). This rule details how state DOTs and MPOs must implement new MAP-21 and FAST Act transportation planning requirements, including the incorporation of new planning factors, planning activities and transportation performance management provisions. Additional guidance has been provided by the FHWA Florida Division and the Florida DOT Office of Policy Planning.

Long Range Planning Activities

During development of the 2040 LRTP, the River to Sea TPO considered eight planning factors as established by federal requirements. Goals established in the plan were linked to these planning factors (See Chapter 2 – Table 2, Page 13). At that time, the new planning rules had been established, however, guidance had not been provided regarding the implementation of these new requirements. The new planning factors include:

- **Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation**
- **Enhance travel and tourism**

Additional planning activities are also required by the new planning rule. These include:

- **Incorporating intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses and intercity bus facilities and commuter vanpool providers.**
- **Including public ports and intercity bus operators, and employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool or vanpool programs, transit benefit programs, parking cash-out programs, shuttle programs, or telework programs, to the list of interested parties for the MPO’s Public Participation Plan.**
- **Add tourism and natural disaster risk reduction agencies to the list of agencies the MPO should consult with when developing the LRTP and TIP.**

The following few sections of this appendix address the planning factors, as well as the additional planning considerations as they’ve been incorporated into the planning activities of the River to Sea TPO.

Improving Resiliency and Reliability

The River to Sea TPO planning area is shaped by the presence of water; the Atlantic Ocean, Intracoastal Waterway, St. Johns River and numerous canals, springs and lakes weave through our communities. Proximity to these beautiful waterways is what attracts many of us to live here and encourages so many others to visit. In planning for our communities, it’s important that we monitor, predict, plan for, and live with the water that surrounds us.
In October 2016, the coastal area was hit by Hurricane Matthew. The resulting storm surge caused significant damage to SR A1A in Flagler County and northern Volusia County, which left the road impassable in many locations. Emergency management organizations responded immediately to secure the area. FDOT also worked quickly to stabilize the shoreline, construct temporary travel lanes and re-open the road in record time. The damage caused by Hurricane Matthew and the subsequent response provide a valuable example of effective cooperation, communication and action.

Severe weather events are predicted to become more commonplace in future years. If these predictions are correct, the strength and success of our community will be defined by our ability to respond effectively to unpredictable and potentially disruptive events. Severe weather events include flooding from rising tides and extreme rainfall, significant fluctuations in temperature, high winds, heatwaves, droughts and windstorms (including tornadoes and tropical storms). The consequences of these events can include damage and deterioration of existing infrastructure, interference with evacuation plans, reduced effectiveness of storm water systems, limited access to property and reduced bridge clearances for vessels. Preparing for future events will require adaptation and resiliency. Adaptation involves changing or modifying our community to suit new conditions in order to reduce potential negative effects. Resiliency is the ability to anticipate, prepare for, and withstand changing conditions and recover rapidly from disruptions.

Creating more adaptive and resilient communities will require a variety of actions involving planning efforts, infrastructure changes, operations and response activities, and proactive governance. The River to Sea TPO has been proactive in addressing issues of transportation resiliency and reliability including the following activities:

- **Project Ranking Criteria in the 2040 LRTP (January 2016)** – Emergency evacuation in response to crisis events has been an emphasis area for the River to Sea TPO for many years. In the assessment of prioritization of projects considered for the 2040 LRTP, the TPO considered additional weighting for improvements to evacuation routes identified by local emergency agencies (see Chapter 6, Table 21 and Appendix I).

- **2016 Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment (August 2016)** – In partnership with the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, the River to Sea TPO completed an initial and conservative assessment of the potential vulnerabilities of the planning area for issues associated with sea level rise.

- **River to Sea TPO Fiscal Year 2015/16 Annual Report (December 2016)** – In a follow-up to coastal damage resulting from flooding and storm surge, the annual report was used as a mechanism to promote awareness of resiliency and system reliability.

- **River to Sea TPO Annual Planning Retreat (March 3, 2017)** - In partnership with Volusia/Flagler Association for Responsible Development (V/FCARD), the River to Sea TPO held a planning workshop to discuss transportation issues associated with sea level rise.

- **2017 Resilient Volusia County Assessment (September 2017)** - In partnership with the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, the River to Sea TPO analyzed impact areas resulting from 100-year coastal flooding levels inclusive of storm surge based on sea level rise projections from the Sea Level Scenario Sketch Planning Tool, identified a resiliency stakeholder working group, and identified implementation strategies and educational materials to enhance community resiliency.

- **2018 Resilient Flagler County Assessment (September 2018)** - In partnership with the Northeast Florida Regional Council, the River to Sea TPO analyzed impact areas resulting from 100-year coastal...
flooding levels inclusive of storm surge based on sea level rise projections from the Sea Level Scenario Sketch Planning Tool, identified a resiliency stakeholder working group, and identified implementation strategies and educational materials to enhance community resiliency.

- **Interagency Partnering (Ongoing)** – The River to Sea TPO continues to partner with local Emergency Management agencies/departments, local governments, regional planning councils, and other agencies that meet periodically to review and assess resiliency efforts.

- **Incorporation of Resiliency in Project Ranking Criteria (January 2019)** – In updates currently being considered by the TPO transportation improvement projects that address resiliency have been added to the project application criteria used to rank projects during the annual call for projects.

### Enhancing Travel and Tourism

Tourism represents a significant portion of the local and state economy. The River to Sea TPO has considered tourism as an integral part of the transportation planning efforts of the organization and actively partners with local tourism agencies during the development of the LRTP. The following activities represent the efforts of the River to Sea TPO to ensure transportation matters involving travel and tourism are considered in the transportation planning activities of the TPO:

- **Considerations in the 2040 LRTP (January 2016)**
  - Project Ranking Criteria for access and connectivity to Activity Centers has been an emphasis area for the River to Sea TPO for many years. In the assessment of prioritization of projects considered for the 2040 LRTP, the TPO considered additional weighting for multimodal improvements to corridors providing access to designated activity centers.
  - Presentations and Stakeholder involvement for agencies directly related to tourism such as the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Lodging & Hospitality Association.

- **Partnering with the Lodging & Hospitality Association in the dissemination of the “Tell the TPO Survey”**
- **Presentations regarding Tourism in Transportation to the River to Sea TPO Board and the International Speedway Boulevard Coalition**
- **Participation and support in various events such as: the Annual Tourism and Travel Recognition Celebration and the Annual Bike Florida Tour event.**
- **Participation in the Central Florida Regional Visitor Study (estimated completion Spring 2019)**

### Additional Planning Considerations

The River to Sea TPO recognizes the value of integrating additional planning considerations into the planning activities of the organization. The following information outlines the planning activities pursued by the River to Sea TPO with regards to the planning considerations.

### Incorporating Intermodal Facilities

Intercity Bus, Intercity/Commuter Rail and Commuter Vanpools are important elements in supporting a healthy transportation system. These services provide important intercity travel choices for residents and visitors. They also help play a role in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption through automobile vehicle trip reductions, fuel savings and lower emissions. Identifying intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses, intercity bus facilities and commuter vanpool
providers can be important to the long term success of these services. The River to Sea TPO has been engaged in efforts to support these services as follows:

- **Participation in the Intermodal Transit Station Study (March 2014)** – Completed by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in collaboration with Votran, the City of Daytona Beach, Volusia County, International Speedway Boulevard (ISB) Coalition and other stakeholders to support the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system which is economically efficient and safely moves people and goods in an energy-efficient manner.

- **Considerations were included in the 2040 LRTP (January 2016)** - In the assessment of prioritization of projects considered for the 2040 LRTP, the TPO considered additional weighting for projects that improved access and connectivity to the Designated Intermodal Terminal.

- **Partnering with ReThink Your Commute (Ongoing)** – The River to Sea TPO collaborates with reThink Your Commute to promote ridesharing transportation solutions and to incorporate ride sharing into the planning processes of the TPO.

- **Participation in the Volusia County Transit Connector Study (February 2017)** - Completed by FDOT in collaboration with Votran, Volusia County, and other stakeholders to evaluate the potential for developing a premium transit connection between SunRail and Daytona Beach (including a multimodal hub).

- **Outreach to various providers (Ongoing)** – The R2CTPO maintains an open dialogue with existing service providers such as SunRail, Greyhound, and Daytona Beach International Airport as well as potential service providers such as Brightline.

**Expanding the Stakeholders in Public Participation**

Additional planning considerations include involving intercity bus operators and commuting programs such as carpool or vanpool programs in the planning activities of the TPO and adding them to the list of interested parties as part of the TPO’s Public Participation Plan. Public outreach requirements also include adding tourism and natural disaster risk reduction agencies to the list of agencies the MPO should consult with when developing the LRTP.

As stated previously, the River to Sea TPO has routinely collaborated with reThink Your Commute, with the Lodging & Hospitality Association and with the Convention and Visitors Bureau on planning activities, including the development of the 2040 LRTP. These activities are documented in Chapter 5 of the 2040 LRTP titled “Public Outreach” and in Appendix E. As a key component of the local economy, tourism activities (including the employees who support the industry) are central to many of the transportation considerations in the planning area. The TPO has also worked with emergency management teams from Volusia and Flagler Counties as part of resiliency planning efforts. Members of emergency management are also represented on the Technical Coordinating Committee, an advisory committee of the TPO board. The TPO has had limited communication with intercity bus providers who often communicate with FDOT Central Office staff regarding state-wide planning needs and capital funding opportunities.

Long range transportation planning activities will begin in 2019 as the River to Sea TPO updates the metropolitan transportation plan and extends the planning horizon to the year 2045. The update will continue to build on previous practices of the TPO in considering the added planning factors of resiliency and tourism. In keeping with the spirit and intent of the FAST Act, the public outreach activities will be expanded and more clearly documented to demonstrate the inclusion of interested parties such as intercity bus operators, commuter program managers, tourism agencies and natural disaster risk reduction agencies.
Transportation Performance Management

Performance Management is a strategic approach to connect investment and policy decisions in order to help achieve performance goals. Performance measures are quantitative criteria used to evaluate progress. Performance measure targets are the benchmarks against which collected data is gauged. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) required State DOTs and MPOs to conduct performance-based planning by tracking performance measures and setting data-driven targets to improve those measures. Performance-based planning ensures the most efficient investment of federal transportation funds by increasing accountability, transparency, and providing for better investment decisions that focus on key outcomes related to national goals including:

- Improving Safety;
- Maintaining Infrastructure Condition;
- Reducing Traffic Congestion;
- Improving the Efficiency of the System and Freight Movement;
- Protecting the Environment; and,
- Reducing Delays in Project Delivery.

Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act supplements the MAP-21 legislation by establishing timelines for State DOTs and MPOs to comply with the requirements of MAP-21. State DOTs are required to establish statewide targets and MPOs have the option to support the statewide targets or adopt their own.

There are several milestones related to the required content of the System Performance Report:

- In any LRTP adopted on or after May 27, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Highway Safety (PM1) measures;
- In any LRTP adopted on or after October 1, 2018, the System Performance Report must reflect Transit Asset Management measures
- In any LRTP adopted on or after May 20, 2019, the System Performance Report must reflect the Bridge Condition Measures and Pavement Condition Measures (PM-2) and the System Performance Measures (travel time reliability, PM-3)

The River to Sea TPO recognizes the importance of linking goals, objectives, and investment priorities to stated performance objectives, and that establishing this link is critical to the achievement of national transportation goals and statewide and regional performance targets. As such, the LRTP directly reflects the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets as they are described in other public transportation plans and processes, including:

- **Project Ranking Criteria in the 2040 LRTP (January 2016)** – Improving transportation safety has been an emphasis area for the River to Sea TPO for many years. In the assessment of prioritization of projects considered for the 2040 LRTP, the TPO considered additional weighting for improvements that address safety concerns on the transportation network (see Chapter 2 and 6 of the 2040LRTP).
- **Incorporation of Measures in Project Ranking Criteria (Ongoing)** – The TPO has a long history of emphasizing safety in the prioritization of transportation projects as a weighted factor in the criteria used to rank projects during the annual call for projects.
- **Interagency Partnering (Ongoing)** – For many years, the River to Sea TPO has participated in various partnerships to promote safety awareness and to identify and address safety concerns throughout the community. This includes involvement in the Community Traffic Safety Teams and Safe Kids Coalition.
• **Congestion Management Process and Plan (October 2018)** - The congestion management process requires the establishment and use of a coordinated, performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals for the federal-aid highway and public transportation programs. In addition to congestion resulting from traffic volume, this report incorporated additional transportation measures used in performance management.

• **Roadway Safety Evaluation & Improvement Study (September 2018)** – Building upon a crash analysis performed in 2017, this study developed a process to identify and mitigate the causes of crashes at high crash locations throughout the planning area.

**Safety Performance Measures (PM-1)**

Safety is the first national goal identified in the FAST Act. In March of 2016, the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Safety Performance Management Measures Rule (Safety PM Rule) was finalized and published in the *Federal Register*. The rule requires MPOs to set targets for the following safety-related performance measures and report progress to the State DOT:

- Fatalities;
- Serious Injuries;
- Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries;
- Rate of Fatalities per 100M Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); and
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT.

The 2016 Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is the statewide plan focusing on how to accomplish the vision of eliminating fatalities and reducing serious injuries on all public roads. The SHSP was developed in coordination with Florida’s 27 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) through Florida’s Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC). The SHSP development process included review of safety-related goals, objectives, and strategies in MPO plans. The SHSP guides FDOT, MPOs, and other safety partners in addressing safety and defines a framework for implementation activities to be carried out throughout the state.

The Florida SHSP and the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) both highlight the commitment to a vision of zero deaths. The FDOT Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Annual Report documents the statewide interim performance measures that move the state toward the vision of zero deaths. The River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization has had a longstanding commitment to improving transportation safety, which is demonstrated through planning and programming activities. Activities included in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), such as the completion of school safety studies for all elementary and middle schools within the planning area, pedestrian law enforcement training and exercises, health and safety partnerships with local agencies, participation on the Community Traffic Safety Teams and helmet distribution programs, have led to increased safety awareness and project specific recommendations to reduce injuries and fatalities throughout the planning area.

In January 2018, the River to Sea TPO adopted safety performance targets in support of FDOT’s 2018 safety targets. The TPO targets include a decrease in each of the safety measurements of 2% per year. In order to achieve the reduction established by the safety targets, the TPO has evaluated projects that fall into specific investment categories established by the TPO in the project application, evaluation, and ranking process. The River to Sea TPO recognizes the limitations of their role in affecting transportation safety. At this point, the TPO has not set long range targets for crash reduction, but has signaled support for the FDOT goal of zero.
The TPO has long utilized an annual project ranking criteria that identifies and prioritizes projects aimed at improving transportation safety. The ranking criteria are updated annually and are included in the appendices of the TIP. Going forward, the project evaluation and prioritization processes used in the LRTP and the TIP will continue to use a data-driven strategy that considers stakeholder input to evaluate projects that have an anticipated effect of reducing both fatal and injury crashes. The following information reflects the data and goals approved by the River to Sea TPO in January 2018.

**Fatalities:** This target reflects a two percent (2%) annual reduction in the number of fatalities from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the annual fatalities to 136 with a resulting five-year rolling average of 123.3 in 2018.

- **Number:** 136
- **5-Year Rolling Average:** 123.3

**Serious Injuries:** This target reflects a two percent (2%) annual reduction in the number of serious injuries from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the annual serious injuries to 743 with a five-year rolling average of 722.0 in 2018.

- **Number:** 743
- **5-Year Rolling Average:** 722.0

**Fatalities Rate***: This target reflects a two percent (2%) annual reduction in the fatalities rate from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the fatality rate to 1.929 with a five-year rolling average of 1.783 in 2018.

- **Number:** 1.929
- **5-Year Rolling Average:** 1.783

**Serious Injuries Rate***: This target reflects a two percent (2%) annual reduction in the serious injuries rate from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the serious injuries rate to 10.343 with a five-year rolling average of 10.256 in 2018.

- **Number:** 10.343
- **5-Year Rolling Average:** 10.256

**Non-Motorized Serious Injuries and Fatalities:** This target reflects a two percent (2%) annual reduction in the number of non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities from the year 2016. This sets a target of reducing the non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities to 108 with a five-year rolling average of 102.9 in 2018.

- **Number:** 108
- **5-Year Rolling Average:** 102.9

*VMT specific to the planning area is not currently available, which includes all of Volusia County and a portion of Flagler County. As such, the fatalities rate was calculated using the data available for the entirety of Volusia and Flagler County, pending the provision of data at the planning area level.

The TPO’s goal of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes is linked to the LRTP and the TIP and the process used in prioritizing the projects is consistent with federal requirements.
Transit Asset Performance Measures

On July 26, 2016, FTA published the final Transit Asset Management rule. This rule applies to all recipients and sub-recipients of Federal transit funding that own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets. The rule defines the term “state of good repair,” requires that public transportation providers develop and implement Transit Asset Management (TAM) plans, and establishes state of good repair standards and performance measures for four asset categories as shown in the following table. The rule became effective on October 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Percentage of non-revenue, support-service and maintenance vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock</td>
<td>Percentage of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have either met or exceeded their useful life benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Percentage of facilities within an asset class rated below condition 3 on the TERM scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To support progress towards TAM performance targets, transit investment and maintenance funding in the River to Sea TPO 2040 LRTP totals $265.9 million, approximately 14 percent of total LRTP funding. In addition, the TPO allocates 30% of the Transportation Management Area (TMA) funding or roughly $31 million to assist local transit agencies in meeting their State of Good Repair (SGR) goals.

TAM Plans and Targets

The Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule requires that every transit provider receiving federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 develop a TAM plan or be a part of a group TAM plan prepared by a sponsor (i.e. FDOT). As part of the TAM plan, public transportation agencies are required to set and report transit targets annually. Transit providers or their sponsors must also share these targets with each M/TPO in which the transit provider’s projects and services are programmed in the M/TPOs TIP. M/TPOs can either agree to support the TAM targets, or set their own separate regional TAM targets for the M/TPOs planning area.

The River to Sea TPO planning area is served by three (3) transit service providers: Flagler County Public Transportation (FCPT), Votran, and SunRail. Votran and SunRail are considered Tier I providers and, as such, each must develop a TAM Plan. FCPT is considered a Tier II provider and thus is included in a group TAM plan developed by the FDOT Public Transit Office in Tallahassee.

The River to Sea TPO will continue to collaborate in transit planning activities and provide support to transit providers including continued inclusion in long range planning activities and transit asset management. The following tables represent the transit data reported by each transit agency for each of the applicable Asset Categories along with the 2019 targets.
FDOT - Statewide Tier II Group Report
Flagler County Public Transportation – Bus Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category Performance Measure</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Asset Class Condition</th>
<th>2019 Target</th>
<th>2020 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolling Stock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cutaway Bus</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-Bus</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-Van</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUV</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Non-Revenue/Service Automobile</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route &amp; Scheduling Software</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: FCPT inventory includes one revenue service vehicle in poor condition (an automobile)
## Votran – Bus Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>2019 Target</th>
<th>2020 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolling Stock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cutaway Bus</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-Van</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Non-Revenue/Service Automobile</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trucks and other Rubber Tire Vehicles</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route &amp; Scheduling Software</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment/Hardware</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Structures</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Facilities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration/Maintenance</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Votran TAM plan lists the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) rating but not the % at or above the target*
## SunRail - Fixed Guideway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Useful Life Benchmark</th>
<th>Asset Class Condition</th>
<th>2019 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rolling Stock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Locomotives</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coach Cars</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cab Cars</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - % of non-revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>Non-Revenue/Service Automobile</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trucks &amp; Other Rubber Tire Vehicles</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of track segments with performance restrictions (as applicable)</td>
<td>Rail fixed guideway track</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2% DRM with speed restriction**</td>
<td>&lt; 3% DRM with speed restriction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition - % of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operating Center</td>
<td>&gt; 3 on TERM Scale</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>100% ≥ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance (VSLMF)***</td>
<td>&gt; 3 on TERM Scale</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>100% ≥ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>&gt; 3 on TERM Scale</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>100% ≥ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Lots</td>
<td>&gt; 3 on TERM Scale</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>100% ≥ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Equipment is provided through the operations contract and is not reported as a federally funded asset.

**DRM is Directional Route Miles

***VSMLF is the Vehicle Storage & Light Maintenance Facility

In support of the transit providers, the River to Sea TPO adopted these targets on October 24, 2018. Adoption of the transit asset targets represents an agreement by the TPO to plan and program projects in the LRTP and the TIP that will, once implemented, make progress toward achieving the transit provider targets.
The TPO’s goal of supporting local transit providers to achieve transit asset condition targets is linked to this investment plan, and the process used to prioritize the projects within the TIP is consistent with federal requirements.

**Bridge and Pavement Condition Measures (PM-2)**

The bridge and pavement condition performance measures rules issued by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) became effective on May 20, 2017, establishing measures to assess the condition of the pavements and bridges on the National Highway System (NHS). On October 24, 2018 the River to Sea TPO approved measures and targets associated with these facilities utilizing data provided by the FDOT. The data and targets are reflected in the following tables.

### Bridge Performance Measures and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th># of Bridges</th>
<th>Total Deck Area</th>
<th>% Deck Area</th>
<th>2-year Target</th>
<th>4-year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of NHS bridges classified as in <strong>Good</strong> condition by deck area</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,199,517</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of NHS bridges classified as in <strong>Poor</strong> condition by deck area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,742.5</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pavement Performance Measures and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>% of Pavement</th>
<th>2-year Target</th>
<th>4-year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of <strong>Interstate</strong> pavements in <strong>Good</strong> condition*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>≥ 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of <strong>Interstate</strong> pavements in <strong>Poor</strong> condition*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>≤ 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of <strong>non-Interstate NHS</strong> pavements in <strong>Good</strong> condition</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of <strong>non-Interstate NHS</strong> pavements in <strong>Poor</strong> condition</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>≤ 5%</td>
<td>≤ 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** 25% of the Interstate system was not measured due to ongoing construction projects.

Ratings categorized as “GOOD” suggest that no major investment is needed. Facilities rated as “POOR” indicate that major investments are needed.

**System Performance Management Measures (PM-3)**

The third category of performance measures rules issued by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) became effective on May 20, 2017, establishing measures to assess the performance of the National Highway System (NHS), freight movement on the Interstate System, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ). Air quality in the River to Sea TPO planning area is above thresholds required for the CMAQ program and therefore monitoring and reporting is not required.

On October 24, 2018 the River to Sea TPO approved measures and targets associated with these facilities utilizing data provided by the FDOT. The data and targets are reflected in the following table.
System Performance Management Measures and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Current TTR</th>
<th>2-year Target</th>
<th>4-year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>≥ 75%</td>
<td>≥ 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck travel time reliability ratio (TTR) on the Interstate</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>≤ 2.0</td>
<td>≤ 1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel time reliability seeks to assess how reliable the highway network is by creating a ratio (called level of travel time reliability, or LOTTR) that compares the worst travel times on a road against the travel time that is typically experienced. Road miles with a LOTTR less than 1.5 are considered reliable. It does not mean that there is not congestion on the road. It means that the amount of time a trip will take is predictable. This calculation is completed for the Interstate system, the National Highway System (NHS) and for Freight traffic utilizing the Interstate system.

Closing Statements

The River to Sea TPO recognizes that ongoing efforts must be made to continue incorporating new planning requirements and transportation system performance into the institutional decision-making and documents of the organization. This includes expanding stakeholder involvement, documenting the added planning factors of resiliency and tourism, and further incorporating transportation performance management. The TPO will continue to coordinate with FHWA, FTA, FDOT, and area transit providers to take the actions to further incorporate performance measures as they are established and are more fully understood. As further guidance is provided and transportation data reports are developed, the TPO expects to continue expanding its planning and public outreach activities and strengthening the connection between project programming and improved performance of the transportation system as required.
III. ACTION ITEMS

D. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL RESILIENCE COLLABORATIVE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

September, 2018: East Central Florida Regional Planning Council passed Resolution #03-2018 reaffirming their commitment to regionalism and requesting the development of a structure and framework for a regional resilience collaborative for the 8 counties and 78 cities in East Central Florida. Two committees were formed:

- Council Subcommittee: drive and provide direction; consider recommendations from a steering committee
- Steering Committee: Develop structure and framework, draft memorandum of understanding; provide recommendations to Council Sub Committee

Council Subcommittee direction: Under the Resilience umbrella, the Collaborative will focus on (people) Health + Equity, (places) Built Infrastructure + Natural Environment, and (prosperity) Economic Resilience; woven throughout each of the pillars will be an emphasis on reducing our carbon footprint, reducing the regions vulnerabilities and risks through emergency management, and increasing our sustainability goals.

Steering Committee was identified, comprised of differing disciplines and expertise around the region as well as state, as called for in September, ECFRPC Resolution.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlines the structure and framework establishing a shared vision for resilience increasing the collective impact potential. ECFRPC formalized the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative by unanimous vote on May 15. River to Sea TPO Resolution 2019-14 supporting the East Central Florida Regional Resiliency Action Plan (ECF RRAP) is provided with this agenda packet for reference purposes. The draft MOU is provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL RESILIENCE COLLABORATIVE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)
The East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative

Memorandum of Understanding

This memorandum of understanding (MOU) is entered into on this 23rd day of October, 2019 among the undersigned members of the East Central Florida Region. All Parties are collectively referred to as the members or collaborative members.

Recalling the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council’s (ECFRPC) resolution 03-2018 of 19 September 2018, in which the unanimous decision was made by the ECFRPC Board to support a program to convene stakeholders across disciplines and the East Central Florida region to develop the framework for a regional resilience collaborative, herein including the undersigned Members that include government agencies and entities that serve the eight counties and municipalities of Brevard, Lake, Marion, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, Sumter, and Volusia:

1. Express profound gratitude to the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Council Sub-Committee and Steering Committee, who have articulated the importance of establishing a collaborative framework for action and are committed to implementing resilience measures as a guiding principle to enhance the efforts of our local jurisdictions, individually and collectively, for the future; and

2. Endorse the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative and the aforementioned resolution, which is contained in Annex I to the present resolution.

WHEREAS, the East Central Florida Region is home to more than 4.1 million residents as of 2018, approximately 20% of the population of the State of Florida, includes two of the four majority-minority counties in the State, hosts over 60 million visitors annually, and comprises one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States; and

WHEREAS, while the East Central Florida Region remains a service-driven economy where 45% of households qualify as asset-limited, income-constrained, employed according to the United Way’s 2018 ALICE report, it is also considered a globally competitive marketplace ranking 38th in the nation according to the Stats America Innovation Index, and is a top ten metropolitan region for various patenting technologies thus indicating a high level of innovation, driving wealth creation in the region; and
WHEREAS, according to the East Central Florida Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, the region has seven innovation clusters including tourism; aviation and aerospace; boats and other marine vessels; photonics; turbines; modeling, simulation and training; and telecommunications; which positions the region for a diversified and transformative future workforce and economy; and

WHEREAS, water and natural resources are the foundation of communities and eco-tourism in the East Central Florida region and the protection of this biodiversity, its ecosystem services and the economic interdependencies are a critical issue facing the region; and

WHEREAS, recent weather, natural and manmade events have resulted in increasing shocks and stressors to our economy, human security, health and equity, natural environment and built infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, vulnerable and underserved people in our region are disproportionately impacted from the aforementioned events and from on-going stressors to their human security; and

WHEREAS, additional and enhanced regional approaches are needed to build on current efforts and increase adaptive capacities to improve resilience in confronting shocks and stressors; and

WHEREAS, this adaptation toward resilience must provide for the region’s people, places, and prosperity in ways that promote mutual progress addressing risk exposure and vulnerability in conjunction with sustainability goals; and

WHEREAS, to support further all efforts that continue to mitigate the increasing impacts of hazards and their complexity in the region, we must elevate ways to work cooperatively across disciplines to identify issues, using existing mitigation strategy research with additional technical expertise to identify ways to improve resiliency, while supporting the local mitigation strategy and post disaster recovery planning to include input to measure continual improvement in the process; and

WHEREAS, the East Central Florida 2060 Strategic Regional Policy Plan identifies effects from climate change to our water availability, agriculture and food security, public health, infrastructure, natural resources, ecosystems services, and economy, and all are therefore appropriate subjects for this regional resilience effort; and

WHEREAS, the resilience of East Central Florida Region’s people, places and prosperity rely on interconnected and multi-modal transportation infrastructure, including the spaceport, space center, seaport, trails, rail and other transit systems, roadways and airports; and

WHEREAS, promoting safe, affordable transportation, attainable housing choices, opportunities for safe physical activity, green and open spaces, local food systems, and clean energy use improves health outcomes and contributes to a region that is equitable and prosperous; and

WHEREAS, promoting high-performing, energy-efficient and resilience targets and policies for our built infrastructure reduces the region’s risks and vulnerabilities; and
WHEREAS, promoting sustainable development that includes compact urban centers, preservation of agricultural landscapes, interconnected, multi-modal corridors, conservation areas, decreases the carbon footprint, increases our Members’ fiscal sustainability and minimalizes conflicts in ‘wildland and urban interface’ areas, further supporting emergency management efforts; and

WHEREAS, the East Central Florida Region provides shelter during the evacuation of surrounding areas in times of disaster, and must plan effectively to accommodate future migration from high hazard areas; and

WHEREAS, good health is essential and instrumental to human survival, livelihood and dignity, and addressing health disparities and externalities will foster advances in our health systems, increase access to services, and build a more resilient region; and

WHEREAS, collaborating with public and private partners across jurisdictional boundaries will improve human and energy security and increase access to clean and affordable resources and sources of electricity and water; and

WHEREAS, several of our jurisdictions and agencies have taken steps to become more sustainable and resilient while continuing to advance economically and socially, all parties recognize that a coordinated and collaborative approach building on current efforts will best serve the region; and

WHEREAS, the development and success of a regional resilience collaborative depends on participation and commitment from cooperative networks and partnerships with local governments, federal, state and regional agencies, educational institutions, non-government organizations, philanthropic organizations, businesses, civil society, and other stakeholders to raise the level of our resilience; and

WHEREAS, this collaborative approach will position the region, jurisdictions and agencies to plan better for resilience, meet state and federal regulations and guidelines, and enable greater access to long-term financing sources;

NOW, THEREFORE, we call all stakeholders to action, aware that the realization of the new resiliency framework depends especially on our unceasing and tireless collective efforts to make the region and state more resilient in the decades to come for the benefit of our own and future generations, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE East Central Florida Regional Planning Council and the MEMBERS AS SIGNED BELOW, EACH MEMBER SHALL COMMIT TO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN BUDGET CONSTRAINTS:

• Regional Cooperation – Create Productive Connectivity -
Each member shall commit appropriate staff resources and expertise to participate with other members in facilitating and advancing the work of the Regional Resilience Collaborative. A steering committee appointed by the ECFRPC will identify and report on opportunities for providing sustainable solutions for the current and future resilience of our built and natural environment, economy, and health and equity. The steering committee will draw on strategies and processes that address resilience, organize and direct integrated scientific and other
technical research and analysis, and organize and structure its work and procedures toward these ends.

- **Regional Resiliency Action Plan** -
  Each member shall work collaboratively to develop a Regional Resilience Action Plan that will identify specific initiatives with supportive and actionable data.

- **Legislative Strategy** -
  Each member shall work to align individual decisions and policies in service of a shared legislative regional resilience strategy developed by the Regional Resilience Collaborative.

- **Community Involvement** -
  Each member shall work collaboratively to recognize and engage the regional community, involving a diverse stakeholder representation in developing policies and recommendations for implementation of the Regional Resilience Action Plan.

- **Annual Summit** -
  Each member shall participate in an annual regional summit to share knowledge, resources, and progress on the collaboration. In addition, the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative will coordinate with other coalitions in the State of Florida to identify opportunities and fulfill the specific initiatives of the Regional Resilience Action Plan and collaborative.

Approved for signature by the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization at a regular meeting, assembled in Daytona Beach, Florida, on the 23rd day of October, 2019.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

____________________________________
COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
CHAIRPERSON, RIVER TO SEA TPO

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 October 23, 2019.

Attest:

____________________________________
Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
Resolution #03-2018

ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE EAST CENTRAL FLORIDA REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

Support of Regional Resilience Collaborative

WHEREAS, I certify that I am Chair of the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) duly organized under the laws of the State of Florida.

WHEREAS, the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted at a meeting of the ECFRPC on the 10th day of September 2018, at which a majority of voting members was present, constituting a quorum and notice of said meeting was given in accordance with the Bylaws; and

WHEREAS, the Council recognizes the clear relationship between emergency management, planning and economic development and aims to continue to fill gaps within the region and pursue initiatives that will achieve measurable improvements and stress the importance of disaster risk reduction in building resilience;

WHEREAS, fostering resilience needs to be understood as a long-term effort and requires a holistic (whole systems approach) way of planning and preparation for the region;

WHEREAS, we recognize that the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council meetings provide a unique opportunity to come together to showcase our region’s innovative work addressing stressors and shocks which illustrate how the Council structure and staff can support these efforts;
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council reaffirms our commitment to regionalism and is supportive of a program to convene stakeholders across the region to develop the process and framework for a regional resilience collaborative (public, private, academia) to achieve a comprehensive and articulated approach that will position the Council as the mechanism for resilience. The Council further resolves to continue to actively engage in this process and encourage and participate in other resilience initiatives and enhance our contribution to sustainability efforts welcoming the opportunity to build capabilities and capacities at all levels.

Adopted by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council at a regular meeting, assembled in Orlando, Florida, on the nineteenth day of September 2018.

Attest:

Leigh Matusick  
Chair, ECFRPC

Hugh W. Harling, Jr.  
Executive Director

Executive Committee

Chair  
Leigh Matusick  
Vice Mayor  
Volusia County League of Cities

Vice Chair  
Jim Barfield  
County Commissioner  
Brevard County

Secretary  
Garry Breeden  
County Commissioner  
Seminole County

Treasurer  
John Lesman  
Governatorial Appointee  
Seminole County

Member at Large  
Lee Constantine  
County Commissioner  
Seminole County
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 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, a changing climate is increasingly causing current and future threats, such as elevated levels of flooding and erosion, changes in storm intensity and frequency, heat impacts, sea level rise, and others, calls for action at every level of government and in the private and not-for-profit sectors; and

WHEREAS, fostering resilience is a long-term effort and requires holistic planning and preparation to increase resilience in the built, natural, and social environment; and

WHEREAS, action, leadership and education of and by local governments and partners to improve resilience across disciplines provide multiple benefits; and

WHEREAS, the East Central Florida Regional Resiliency Action Plan (ECF RRAP) was formulated for and by local governments, federal, regional and state agencies, educational institutions, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders; and

WHEREAS, the ECF RRAP recognizes the clear relationship between emergency management, transportation planning, land-use planning, health & safety, and economic development and aims to continue to fill gaps within the region and pursue initiatives that will achieve measurable improvements in risk reduction and the building of resilience in the region; and

WHEREAS, the success of the ECF RRAP depends on the participation of and collaboration with all local jurisdictions and partners, and a commitment to work together towards common goals; and

WHEREAS, the ECF RRAP has been provided for review by the general public, the River to Sea TPO’s Advisory Committees and the River to Sea TPO Board.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the River to Sea TPO that:

1. The River to Sea TPO supports the East Central Florida Regional Resiliency Action Plan adopted May 15, 2019 by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council to advance the direct implementation of activities aimed to improve long-term resilience and sustainability in the River to Sea TPO’s planning area across sectors, expand economic sustainability and response to vulnerabilities within the community.

2. The River to Sea TPO will work to increase the health and resilience of the transportation network, social, natural, and built resources by furthering the following goals:
   a. Promote leadership, education and empowerment both in government, and public and private sectors to foster the implementation of resiliency strategies across disciplines and communities;
   b. Provide opportunities and strategies to foster economic prosperity and improve social equity and justice in preparation for and recovery from stressors and shocks;
   c. Create and encourage cross-discipline plans, policies and strategies to develop infrastructure, natural resources and a built environment that can reasonably withstand and adapt to natural disasters, changes to climate, and human manipulation to protect the health, safety and economic welfare of residents, businesses and visitors;
   d. Create sustainable, resilient and healthier communities, programs and opportunities for all to better respond to disaster and adapt to climate and social stressors and shocks.

3. The River to Sea TPO directs staff to work towards the implementation of relevant actions in the ECF RRAP, over the next five years, to further the following objectives:
   a. Incorporate resilience into the TPO’s 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Priority Project Process and policies;
   b. Plan fiscally to implement resilient and sustainable solutions to long-term impacts;
   c. Implement strategies to promote adaptive measures to protect people and property from natural hazards;
   d. Engage and educate stakeholders and elected officials about strategies to increase resilience in the built, natural, and social environment;
   e. Protect high-value assets from natural hazards;
   f. Improve social equity and justice in the decision making process;
   g. Enhance stormwater systems to be more resilient;
   h. Preserve and adapt the built environment to keep people safe from and mitigate current and future natural hazards;
   i. Improve community mobility while improving vulnerable transportation infrastructure;
   j. Improve the capacity of jurisdictions to better respond to hazard events;
   k. Promote sustainable practices in government owned facilities;
I. Engage residents and business owners with locally relevant information about expected future changes in natural hazards and sustainable practices;

m. Support and work with public transportation providers to serve transportation disadvantaged residents.

4. The Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit the East Central Florida Regional Resiliency Action Plan to the:
   a. Florida Department of Transportation;
   b. Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD);
   c. Florida Department of Economic Opportunity;
   d. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation);
   e. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation);
   f. East Central Florida Regional Planning Council;
   g. Northeast Florida Regional Council (NEFRC); and the
   h. Central Florida MPO Alliance.

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 26th day of June 2019.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
ACTING CHAIRPERSON, RIVER TO SEA TPO

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 a resolution adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on June 26, 2019.

ATTEST:

DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida's transportation future. It is a plan for all of Florida created by, and providing direction to, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and all organizations that are involved in planning and managing Florida's transportation system, including statewide, regional, and local partners. The FTP includes seven goals to guide transportation planning decisions:

1. Safety and security
2. Agile, resilient, and quality transportation infrastructure
3. Efficient and reliable mobility
4. More transportation choices
5. Economic competitiveness
6. Quality places to live, learn, work, and play
7. Florida’s environment and energy conservation

Ms. Lorena Cucek, FDOT, District 5 Project Manager, is scheduled to deliver a presentation on the FTP update.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
WHAT IS THE FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PLAN?

- Florida's long range transportation plan
- A plan for all of Florida
- Provides policy guidance for all transportation partners
- Establishes a policy framework for expenditure of state and federal transportation funds
WHY DOES THE FTP MATTER?

GUIDING TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS TODAY

TO ACHIEVE OUR VISION FOR TOMORROW

FTP's HAVE RESHAPED FLORIDA

- Creation of Strategic Intermodal System

2025 FTP (2005)
- Emphasis on regional visioning and collaboration

Current FTP (2015)
- Added 'Choices' as a new Goal
- Renewed emphasis on Safety and alignment with the SHSP

2060 FTP (2010)
- Alignment with Florida Strategic Plan for Economic Development
- Investments in trade and logistics: FMTP
- Maximizing use of existing facilities (e.g. managed lanes)
- Future Corridor Planning Process

- Greater emphasis on Workforce
- Greater focus on implementation
FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Vision Element
Trends, uncertainties, and themes that will shape the future of transportation in Florida (50 years)

Policy Element
Goals and objectives to guide the Florida Department of Transportation and partners toward the vision (25 years)

Implementation Element
Emphasis areas with key actions (5-25 years)

FTP GOALS & CROSS-CUTTING TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Statewide and Interregional</th>
<th>Regional and Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agile, resilient, and quality transportation infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient and reliable mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More transportation choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality places to live, learn, work, and play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida’s environment and energy conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FTP GOALS & CROSS-CUTTING TOPICS**

### Technology
- Automated, connected, electric & shared vehicles
- Transportation system management & operations
- Big data
- New materials & processes

### Resilience
- Extreme weather events
- Emergency evacuation & emergency response
- Sea level rise, flooding
- Economic or societal changes

### Statewide and Interregional
- SIS, including modal facilities
- Trade & logistics
- Multi-use/multi-modal facilities
- Global, statewide, interregional connectivity

### Regional and Local
- Urbanized, non-urbanized, rural
- Congestion relief
- Land use/community planning
- Regional visions

---

**FTP SUBCOMMITTEES**

- **2 subcommittees**
  - Automated, Connected, Electric, and Shared (ACES)
    - [http://www.floridatransportationplan.com/aces.htm](http://www.floridatransportationplan.com/aces.htm)
  - Resilience
    - [http://www.floridatransportationplan.com/resilience.htm](http://www.floridatransportationplan.com/resilience.htm)

- Representatives of the steering committee organizations make up the members

- Others are able to become “friends” of the subcommittees
  - Receive updates on subcommittee activities
  - Attend and participate at meetings

- Become a friend of the subcommittees and stay engaged
RELATED PARTNER EFFORTS

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
  - Long Range Transportation Plans

- State Agency Plans/Initiatives
  - DEO, DEP, Enterprise Florida, Space Florida, etc.

- Local Governments
  - Comprehensive Plans, etc.

- Regional Planning Councils
  - Strategic Regional Policy Plans

- Modal Partners
  - Transit, expressway, seaport, airport and other authorities

- Regional and Community Visions
SHARING OUR IDEAS

Poll Everywhere – multiple ways to access the polls:

» Visit www.pollev.com/FTP2045 from your phone, tablet, or laptop to access the polling questions

» Text “FTP2045” to 22333 to join the poll and respond to the polls via text message

» Scan the QR code to the right to go directly to the website

» Important note: A record of the poll responses will be kept for statutory records retention requirements
Who do you represent?

City/County Government
MPO/RPC/TPO
Other State Government
Private Industry Partner
Private Citizen
Non-Governmental Industry Organization

Choose the top trend affecting the FTP

Increase in ride sharing
New micromobility options
Fewer gas-operated vehicles
Growth in e-commerce
Rate of adoption of AV/CV
What else will change in our lives due to new technology?

In your opinion, what is the greatest challenge for Florida to overcome related to changing technology and our transportation system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid rate of development and adoption of new technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating old/existing and new/emerging technologies in the same system at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and design challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data security and privacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are effective strategies to prepare our transportation system for changes in technology?

WHAT WILL WE DO WITH YOUR INPUT?

Input is received at meetings, online, through survey, etc.

Provided to the FTP Steering Committee and Subcommittees for review and consideration

Based on applicability, your input is used to shape the plan
FTP EVENTS, MEETINGS & CAMPAIGNS

2019

FTP Visioning Session

Technology Campaign

Resilience Campaign

Steering Committee meetings

ACES & Resilience Subcommittee meetings

Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec

FTP EVENTS, MEETINGS & CAMPAIGNS

2020

Regional/Local Campaign

State/Interregional Campaign

Steering Committee meetings

Regional Workshops

Draft the Policy Plan

TransPlex

Present Policy Plan to management

Post Policy Plan for Public Comment (30d)

Publish Final Policy Plan

Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec
STAY CONNECTED

QUESTIONS?

LORENA CUCEK
District 5
Florida Department of Transportation
Lorena.cucek@dot.state.fl.us
386-943-5392
www.fdot.gov/planning/policy
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT’S HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT (HVE) PROGRAM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Daytona Beach Police Department’s (DBPD) High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) Program is aimed at reducing crashes involving motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians by enforcing Florida Statutes. DBPD conducted HVE field operations from March 17 to May 17, 2019 along Nova Road (SR 5A), International Speedway Boulevard (US 92) and Ridgewood Avenue (US 1). DBPD issued over 430 warnings, 30 citations, made 10 misdemeanor arrests and distributed 130 sets of bicycle lights during the field operations. Last July, the Florida Department of Transportation recognized DBPD for the HVE Program.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
PIO Messod Bendayan
386-225-6870 (m); bendaynamessod@dbpd.us

Subject: DBPD Wins FDOT Award For Traffic Safety Efforts

Location(s):
- Nova Road/State Road 5A corridor from Brentwood Drive to Beville Road
- International Speedway Boulevard/US 92 corridor from Bill France Boulevard to Ridgewood Avenue
- Ridgewood Avenue/US 1 corridor from Mason Avenue to Beville Road

Dates: March 17, 2019 to May 17, 2019 (two months)

Details:
The Daytona Beach Police Department was awarded by the Florida Department of Transportation today (July 31st) for superior work and results in a recently completed operation aimed at improving traffic safety in the city.

DBPD was formally recognized (photos posted below) during the final day of a two-day statewide forum held by FDOT at the Florida Turnpike Enterprise headquarters in Orlando (Mile Post 263).

The agency ranked tops in all the categories FDOT utilizes in its scoring system, such as quality of operations and compliance with reporting requirements.

The two-month education and enforcement effort was funded by a $30,000 FDOT grant administered by the University of North Florida and the University of South Florida. See the grant paperwork for more details.
The goal was to reduce accidents by having officers focused on the behaviors of drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians, taking corrective action when needed.

The operation focused on three of Daytona Beach’s busiest roads:
- Nova Road/State Road 5A corridor from Brentwood Drive to Beville Road.
- International Speedway Boulevard/US 92 corridor from Bill France Boulevard to Ridgewood Avenue.
- Ridgewood Avenue/US 1 corridor from Mason Avenue to Beville Road.

Those corridors were chosen for High Visibility Enforcement (HVE) Details because of the large number of accidents reported in those areas. See below for a map highlighting those areas.

During the operation, DBPD officers:
- Issued over 430 warnings
- Gave out 130 sets of bicycle lights
- Handed out over 30 citations
- Made 10 misdemeanor arrests

FDOT statistics show Daytona Beach ranks 4th highest of all Florida cities (population between 15,000 and 74,999) for traffic crashes resulting in serious and fatal injuries to pedestrians and bicyclists. That rank is the average over a four-year period between 2013 and 2017. See the FDOT Highway Safety Matrix for a more detailed explanation.

In the year 2016, 3,176 people were killed during traffic accidents on Florida’s roadways. Over 21% were pedestrians (667). Another 4% were bicyclists (140).
Daytona Beach Police Department
NEWS RELEASE

129 Valor Boulevard  Daytona Beach, FL  32114-8169
Main Line: 386-671-5100  Media Line: 386-671-5113  Website: http://www.DBPD.us

---

Map of areas covered during the HVE operation

ISB/92 Corridor
(Bill France east to US 1)

Ridgewood/US 1 Corridor
(Beville/400 north to Mason/430)

Nova/5A Corridor
(Beville north to Brentwood)

---

Facebook: DBCops | Instagram: DaytonaBeachPolice | Twitter: @DaytonaBchPD
Other Social Media: Android Phone App | Apple Phone App | Nextdoor | YouTube

Anonymous Web Tips | News Releases

Anonymous Text Tipline: Text “DBTIPS” plus message to CRIMES (274637)


All Crime Stoppers tips are anonymous and may lead to a cash reward.
Captain Scott Goss (center) holds the poster given to DBPD on the second day of the Florida’s Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Coalition meeting. He’s flanked by DBPD officers Ryan Forrest (left) and Marcus Booth (right).
Close-up of the award given to DBPD by FDOT
Close-up of the poster given to DBPD by FDOT

Anonymous Web Tips | News Releases

Anonymous Text Tipline: Text “DBTIPS” plus message to CRIMES (274637)


All Crime Stoppers tips are anonymous and may lead to a cash reward.
C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE GRAHAM SWAMP TRAIL, PHASE 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Graham Swamp Trail is programmed for design ($1,500,000) in FY 2019/20 and construction ($6,393,744) in FY 2020/21. The trail will start on the south side of SR 100, cross over SR 100 with a pedestrian bridge, and end at the Lehigh Trail. A sidewalk will connect the pedestrian bridge to an existing sidewalk along Old Kings Road. The project will allow for a future connection of the trail south to the Bulow Preserve property.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
River to Sea TPO | October 9, 2019

Professional Services for:
Design of Graham Swamp Trail and Pedestrian Bridge over SR 100
PROJECT OVERVIEW

Intent of Project

- **Create opportunities to enjoy the natural beauty of Flagler County (Add to existing network of trails)**
- **Link Lehigh Trail with SR 100 crossing allowing connection to future Bulow Trail**
- **Provide ADA accessible trail and grade separation for the trail over SR 100**
- **Provide a sidewalk connection from the SR 100 Trail Overpass to the intersection of Old Kings Highway along the south side of SR 100**
- **Construct elevated portions of trail and SR 100 Trail Overpass with cost effective, durable and aesthetically pleasing structures**
- **Minimize impacts to sensitive conservation lands**
Initial Design (Trail)

- Conducted a desk top study
  - SJRWMD wetland maps
  - USGS Quad maps with contours
  - NRCS soil maps
  - FNAI habitat and vegetative community maps
  - FEMA Flood Rate Insurance maps
  - Historic and cultural resources maps
- Established a 100-foot wide trail corridor and preliminary alignment
- Performed survey within the corridor
  - Elevations and contours
  - Wetland delineation
  - Significant trees and vegetation
  - Preliminary Geotechnical investigation
TRAIL DESIGN- APPROACH

Final Design (Trail)

- Established the final alignment to minimize impacts
  > Minimize wetland impacts
  > Avoid significant trees
  > Avoid areas of deep organic soils
  > Meandering trail to be appealing to trail users

- Currently preparing final contract documents
  > Plans (Trail, Bridge and Elevated Walkways)
  > Specifications
  > Bid Quantities
**SR 100 TRAIL OVERPASS**

**SR 100 Overpass Conceptual Design**

- Evaluated structures concepts that were consistent with the local community
- Safety enclosure a prominent item

> Focus of Aesthetic Design
> Nearby Iconic Flagler Beach Pier

Flagler Beach Pier A-Frame Structure
Renderings of Final Design Concept

- Emulates the nearby Flagler Beach Pier
Structural Components

**SUBSTRUCTURE**

- **Subsurface Suitable for Spread footing Foundations**
  - Cost effective to construct
  - Avoids disruptive pile driving

**SUPERSTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES**

- **Precast Concrete U-Beams**
  - Aesthetically-pleasing
  - Cost-effective
  - Minimal to no maintenance
ADA Ramp Structures

- Continual grade of less than 5.00%
  - Generally preferred by bicyclists
  - 43% Longer than ramp with landings and 8.33% max grade

- MSE wall approaches (height to 12 feet)

5.00 % Continuous Grade
IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT R2CTPO FY 2018/19 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES SUMMARY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

A primary responsibility of the River to Sea TPO is public involvement and outreach in the transportation decision-making process. This involves developing various strategies to engage the community, including posting information on the TPO website (www.R2CTPO.org) and Facebook page (www.Facebook.com/RivertoSeaTPO), attending community meetings, building business relationships, joining local organizations and providing presentations to organizations. Another component of the outreach program includes participation in community events, bicycle helmet fittings and the distribution of documents and promotional safety materials.

The R2CTPO measures the effectiveness of this through a variety of measures. TPO staff will provide an overview of the public involvement and outreach efforts that occurred during FY 2018/19.

ACTION REQUESTED:

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

E. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT COMMUNITY SAFETY ACTION PLAN (CSAP)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The River to Sea TPO staff will provide an overview of the draft Community Safety Action Plan, which will be provided under separate cover.

ACTION REQUESTED:

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

F. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE GUIDING RESOLUTIONS AND PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANNUAL CALL FOR PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Each year, after completion of the project prioritization process, the TPO staff and committees evaluate the process and recommends improvements for the next cycle. The aim is to achieve the best possible outcomes in terms of identifying and promoting transportation-related priorities consistent with the community’s goals and objectives as prescribed in the adopted long-range transportation plan. Draft Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Project Applications are included in this agenda packet for your review. Text additions are underlined and deletions are stricken. Draft resolutions will be provided under separate cover.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
2019-2020 Application for Project Prioritization

Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects

January 2019-2020

General Instructions:

For the 2019-2020 Call for Projects, the R2CTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

Feasibility studies assess the engineering and planning characteristics of bicycle/pedestrian projects. Feasibility studies must include, but not be limited to, the determination of available right-of-way, documentation and identification of the solutions of obstacles that may impede the project’s constructability, permitting and socioeconomic constraints, landscaping, drainage and an engineer’s estimate of related planning, design, right-of-way and construction costs.

The R2CTPO has two different application forms for Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects. One is to be used when applying for a Feasibility Study; the other is to be used when applying for Project Implementation. For a given project, applications for Feasibility Study and Project Implementation must be submitted in separate application cycles.

When applying for Project Implementation, the applying agency will also be required to submit a completed copy of FDOT’s Project Information Application Form. No project will advance beyond a Feasibility Study unless the R2CTPO receives an application for prioritization of the Project Implementation phase. Applications for prioritization of the Project Implementation phase will be accepted only if a Feasibility Study has already been completed or if the project does not require a Feasibility Study.

Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application. The TPO is not obliged to consider information pertaining to the project request that is not included in the project application. However, applying agencies are encouraged to be present for the evaluation of their applications to provide clarification, if needed. Updated cost estimates for projects on the bicycle/pedestrian list of prioritized projects are to be submitted with a letter of continuing support by March 29, 2019 March 31, 2020.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

Eligible Project Sponsors for Transportation Alternatives Funds

Transportation Alternatives funds can only be obligated for projects submitted by “eligible entities” defined in 23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(B) as follows:

- Local governments;
- Regional transportation authorities;
- Transit agencies;
- Natural resource or public land agencies;
- School districts, local education agencies, or schools;
- Tribal governments; and
• Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible.

The following are the only activities related to surface transportation that can be funded with Transportation Alternatives funds:

   a) Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).
   b) Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.
   c) Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users.

2. The recreational trails program under section 206 of title 23.

3. The safe routes to school program under section 1404 of the SAFETEA-LU.
   a) Infrastructure-related projects. Planning, design and construction of infrastructure-related projects on any public road or any bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail in the vicinity of schools that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, including sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bicycle facilities, off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, secure bicycle parking facilities, and traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools.
   b) Non-infrastructure-related activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school, including public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs.

All construction and pre-construction work phases will be administered by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) or other Local Agency Program (LAP) certified local government. Reimbursements are distributed only to a LAP certified agency responsible for completing the tasks. FDOT assigns a LAP Design and LAP Construction Liaison for each project. Federal law requires that each project be administered under the

---

1 It is the River to Sea TPO’s intent to extend eligibility to all of the activities included within the meaning of the term “Transportation Alternatives” pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) except the following:
   1. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas;
   2. Community improvement activities, including –
      a. inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
      b. historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
      c. vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
      d. archaeological activities related to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23;
   3. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to –
      a. address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in sections 133(b)(11), 328(a), and 329 of title 23; or
      b. reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats
   4. Safe Routes to School coordinator
   5. Planning, designing, or construction boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
rules and procedures governing federally funded transportation projects. Certified Local Agencies comply with all applicable Federal statutes, rules and regulations.

Initial Project Screening:
Any project submitted by a local government for consideration needs to meet the following screening criteria:

For any proposed facility to be considered eligible through the TPO process, the project must be included on the River to Sea TPO’s Regional Trails Corridor Plan or an adopted Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

Is this **Shared Use Path** project at least 12 feet wide?
- If Yes – the project is eligible.
- If No – justification is required to determine eligibility.

Is this **Sidewalk** project at least 5 feet wide?
- If Yes – the project is eligible.
- If No – the project application is not acceptable.

Is this an activity that can be funded with Transportation Alternatives Funds?
- If Yes – the project is eligible.
- If No – the project application is not acceptable.

Local Match Requirement:
R2CTPO Resolution 2019-03 provides that the governmental entity requesting state and/or federal transportation funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratio of 10% local funds to 90% state and/or federal funds. The match shall be by project phase for each programmed phase including feasibility study. A non-federal cash match is required for a feasibility study. For all other phases, the local match is defined as non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services that advance the project. This resolution also reaffirms the R2CTPO’s policy that the applying agency (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with state and/or federal transportation funds unless the project is on the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns.

Other Funding Requirements:
All project applications are subject to approval by the R2CTPO Board. Other funds (in addition to SU funds) may be used to fund project phases or overall costs.

Electronic and “Hard Copy” Submittal Requirements:
Any project submitted by a local government for consideration MUST include the following information/materials:

1. Applications and supporting documentation shall be submitted as digital media in Portable Document Format (PDF).


2. The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one electronic PDF file.
3. All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.

4. Page size shall be either 8-1/2” by 11” (letter) or 11” by 17” (tabloid).

5. PDF documents produced by scanning paper documents are inherently inferior to those produced directly from an electronic source. Documents which are only available in paper format should be scanned at a resolution which ensures the pages are legible on both a computer screen and a printed page. We recommend scanning at 300 dpi to balance legibility and file size. If you are unable to produce an electronic document as prescribed here, please call us to discuss other options.

6. In addition to the digital submittal, we require one (1) complete paper copy of the application and all supporting documents. This must be identical to the digital submittal.

7. Submit any available right-of-way information.

8. Each application MUST include a Project Map that clearly identifies the termini of the project, Proximity to Community Assets and Network Connectivity through the use of a one (1) mile radius buffer for Shared Use Path projects and Transportation Alternatives Activities and a one-half (½) mile radius buffer for Sidewalk projects. Maximum map size is 11” x 17”.

9. In addition, all maps MUST include a Scale (in subdivisions of a mile), North Arrow, Title and Legend. Photographs are optional.

Projects that contribute directly to the completion or enhancement of the following trail systems may be eligible for inclusion as Regional Trail Projects:

1. SunTrail Network
2. Priority and Opportunity Land Trails of the Florida Greenways and Trails System (FGTS) Plan

Will this proposed project contribute directly to the completion or enhancement of any of the aforementioned regional trail systems?  

Yes □  No □

R2CTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an application at the request of any member local government.
Project Title: ________________________________________________________________

Applying Agency (project sponsor): ______________________________________ Date: __________________________

[Attach a copy of the completed Feasibility Study, or explain in the space provided below for commentary why a Feasibility Study is not attached.]

Commentary: _________________________________________________________________

Attach a completed copy of FDOT’s Project Information Application Form.

Criteria Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Proximity to Community Assets</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Connectivity and Accessibility</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Safety/Security</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Project Readiness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Public Support/Special Considerations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Local Matching Funds &gt; 10%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary)</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

List and describe how the facilities link directly to community assets and who is being served by the facility. Show each of the Community Assets on a Project Area Map through the use of a buffer and describe in the space provided.
Proximity to Community Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to Community Assets</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential developments, apartments, community housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings,</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus stop (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment 20

Criterion #1 Description (required): ____________________________________________

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

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

List and describe how this project fits into the local and regional bicycle/pedestrian networks and/or a transit facility. Depict this on the map and describe in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Connectivity and Accessibility</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project provides access to a transit facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g., comprehensive plan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master plan, arterial study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment 20

Criterion #2 Description (required): ____________________________________________

Criterion #3 – Safety/Security (20 points maximum)

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

List and describe whether the proposed facility is located within a “hazardous walk/bike zone” in the River to Sea TPO planning area and provide documentation that illustrates how bicycle or pedestrian safety could be enhanced by the construction of this facility.

For more information, contact Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and refer to Florida Statute 1006.23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety/Security</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. The project helps the River to Sea TPO meet or exceed adopted Transportation Safety Targets for Non-Motorized Serious Injuries and Fatalities. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Point Assessment**

**20**

**Criterion #3 Description (required):**

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

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

**Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (Maximum 10 Points)**

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

**Criterion (4) Describe how this project contributes to the “Livability” and Sustainability of the Community:**
Criterion #5 Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)

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

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

Enhancements to the Transportation System (Maximum 10 Points)

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- **Does the project conform to Complete Streets principles?**
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

Criterion #5 Describe how this project enhances the Transportation System:

Criterion #6 Project “Readiness” (5 Points maximum)

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

Project Readiness (Maximum 5 Points)

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

Criterion #6 Describe the state of Project “Readiness”:

Criterion #7 – Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)

Describe whether the proposed facility has public support and provide documentation (e.g., letters of support/signed petitions/public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). Describe any special issues or concerns that are not being addressed by the other criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Considerations</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is documented public support provided for the project?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any special issues or concerns?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment

Criterion #7 Description (required):  

---
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Criterion #8 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost?</th>
<th>Check One</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0% &lt; Local Matching Funds &lt; 12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 15.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 27.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 32.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment 20

Criterion #8 Description (required): ____________________________________________

Criterion #9 – Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.
2019 2020 Priority Process for Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local initiatives Projects

Feasibility Studies

1. Local government submits project(s)
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for feasibility studies
3. The TPO Board will approve a final ranking of all projects
4. TPO requests a Fee Proposal from consultant to perform a feasibility study
5. TPO schedules a scoping meeting with the consultant, FDOT and local government(s)
6. Consultant provides Fee Proposal to TPO
7. Local government pays the 10% local match for the feasibility study based on the Fee Proposal. TPO pays the majority of the cost for a consultant to perform feasibility studies on the highest ranking projects. (Local governments can bypass the TPO Study if they pay for the feasibility study themselves.)
8. TPO gives the consultant a Notice to Proceed on the feasibility study
9. Draft feasibility study is reviewed and approved by the TPO, FDOT and local government(s)
10. Final feasibility study is completed

Project Implementation

1. Local government submits project(s) and an official letter agreeing to pay 10% of the programmed project implementation cost, and agreeing to pay for any cost overruns
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for project implementation
3. The TPO Board will approve a final ranking of all projects
4. TPO coordinates with FDOT to program the project in the next available fiscal year of the FDOT Work Program
5. Construction of top ranked project: 2-4 years
**Project Title:**

**Applying Agency (project sponsor):**

**Date:**

**Contact Person:**

**Job Title:**

**Address:**

**Phone:**

**FAX:**

**E-mail:**

Does the Applying Agency expect to be certified by FDOT to perform work under the Local Agency Program (LAP) process?  

- [ ] YES  
- [ ] NO

If not, what local government agency will perform the work on behalf of the Applying Agency?  

[Attach a letter of intent from the agency that will perform the work.]

**Governmental entity with maintenance responsibility for roadway facility on which proposed project is located:**

[If not the same as Applying Agency, attach letter of support for the proposed project from the responsible entity. This letter of support must include a statement describing the responsible entity's expectations for maintenance of the proposed improvements, i.e., what the applying agency's responsibility will be.]

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applying Agency:

**Project Description:**

**Project Location** (include project length and termini, if appropriate, and attach location map):

**Project Eligibility for Federal Funds (check the appropriate box):**

- [ ] the proposed improvement is located on the Federal-aid system. (Reference the Federal Aid Road Report at http://www.fdot.gov/planning/statistics/fedaid/);
- [ ] the proposed improvement is not located on the Federal-aid system, but qualifies as a type of improvement identified in 23 U.S.C. §133 that is not restricted to the Federal-aid system.

**Project Purpose and Need Statement:**

In the space provided below, describe the purpose and need for this proposed project. It is very important that the Purpose and Need Statement is clear and complete. It will be the principle consideration in ranking the project application for a feasibility study. It must convince the public and decision-makers that the expenditure of funds is
necessary and worthwhile and that the priority the project is being given relative to other needed transportation projects is warranted. The Purpose and Need Statement will also help to define the scope for the feasibility study, the consideration of alternatives (if appropriate), and project design.

The purpose is analogous to the problem. It should focus on particular issues regarding the transportation system (e.g., mobility and/or safety). Other important issues to be addressed by the project should be identified as ancillary benefits. The purpose should be stated in one or two sentences as the positive outcome that is expected. For example, “The purpose is to provide a connection between a park and a school.” It should avoid stating a solution as a purpose, such as: “The purpose of the project is to add a sidewalk.” It should be stated broadly enough so that no valid solutions will be dismissed prematurely.

The need should establish the evidence that the problem exists, or will exist if anticipated conditions are realized. It should support the assertion made in the Purpose Statement. For example, if the Purpose Statement is based on safety improvements, the Need Statement should support the assertion that there is or will be a safety problem to be corrected. When applying for a feasibility study, you should support your Need Statement with the best available evidence. However, you will not be expected to undertake new studies.

The Purpose and Need Statement must address all of the following Priority Criteria:

1. **Proximity to Community Assets**: this measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed.

2. **Connectivity and Accessibility**: this measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, bike paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed.

3. **Safety/Security**: this measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns. A maximum of 25 points will be assessed.

4. **Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community**: this measure considers factors that have an impact on “livability” and sustainability in the community. A maximum of 10 points will be assessed.

5. **Enhancements to the Transportation System**: this measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. A maximum of 10 points will be assessed.

6. **Public Support/Special Considerations**: describe whether the proposed facility has public support and provide documentation (e.g., letters of support/signed petitions/public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). Describe any special issues or concerns that are not being addressed by the other criteria. A maximum of 5 points will be assessed.

7. **Local Matching Funds > 10%**: if local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail. A maximum of 20 points will be awarded.

**Commentary (required):**
V. **STAFF COMMENTS**

→ 2045 LRTP Subcommittee Membership
→ Mobility Week Events
→ Update on SU Funding/Work Program
→ Update on FDOT D-5 Proposed Local Agency Program (LAP) Policy

VI. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ September 2019 TPO Outreach & Activities
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VII. **BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS**

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**
### BPAC Attendance Record 2019

#### Name

<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>Dec</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Ryan/Doug Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daytona Beach (appt. 3/12) (alt. appt. 02/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Sandler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeBary (appt 4/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wendler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeLand (appt. 05/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Leisen</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deltona (appt. 12/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Eik (19/20 Chairman)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler Beach (appt. 7/14) (alt appt 9/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Coletti (19/20 Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt 2/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Wolfarth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Hill (appt 9/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic Mostert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach (appt. 03/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Storke</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange City (appt. 12/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Belin</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ormond Beach (appt. 01/15 - 07/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Anderson/Andrew Dodzik</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Coast (Appt. 02/16) (Alt appt 9/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Martindale</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Orange (Appt 2/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Gillis</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Daytona (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Walters/Jason Aufdenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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>Patrick McCallister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County D-1 (appt. 10/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Burgess-Hall/Chris Daun</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County D-2 (appt 2/14) (alt. appt 3/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Hickey (non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>ex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt. 12/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Perney (non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large City - Port Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cotton/Edie Biro (non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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 (non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</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 Kozieki (non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County School Board (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT(non-voting)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vacancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X = Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exc = Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs = Absent (Unexcused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CODES

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Beverley Beach
- Daytona Beach (appt. 3/12) (alt. appt. 02/14)
- DeBary (appt 4/19)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcited)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)

### Codes

- X = Present
- exc = Excused
- abs = Absent (Unexcused)
September 2019 TPO Outreach & Activities

1 Palm Coast/FCARD Development Meeting
   Date: Thursday, September 12, 2019
   Location: Palm Coast
   Description: TPO staff attended this meeting regarding development, permitting and customer service

2 Florida Public Transit Association (FPTA) & Commission for the Trans. Disadvantaged (CTD) Annual Conference
   Date: Monday, September 16, 2019
   Location: Orlando
   Description: TPO staff attended the FPTA and CTD Annual Conference in Orlando

3 DeBary Wellness and Safety Fair
   Date: Friday, September 20, 2019
   Location: DeBary
   Description: TPO staff participated in this event staffing a booth to distribute safety information and inform the public about the role of the TPO

3 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Amendment Public Notice/Legal Ad
   Date: Tuesday, September 24, 2019
   Description: The TPO issued a legal ad and public notice to solicit input on a proposed amendment to the 2040 LRTP: [www.r2ctpo.org](http://www.r2ctpo.org)

4 Port Orange Family Days Helmet Fitting
   Date: Saturday, September 28, 2019
   Location: Port Orange
   Description: TPO staffed a booth with safety promotional items and flyers and fit and donated 203 bicycle helmets to adults and children

**OCTOBER EVENTS:**

2: Int’l Walk to School Day, multiple locations
3: Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) Resiliency Discussion—TPO Panel Participation, Webinar

   District 5 Office, DeLand

23: VCARD Icebreaker, Daytona Beach

25- Nov 1: Central Florida Mobility Week

29: MPO Advisory Council Meeting, Orlando

31: Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission Meeting, Orlando

31: Trail Walk Helmet Fitting, Palm Coast

**OTHER UPCOMING EVENTS:**

Nov 2: Halifax Art Fest Helmet Fitting, Daytona Beach
Nov 4-5: MPO-FDOT Leadership Meeting, Tallahassee
Nov 20: Volusia County Legislative Delegation Mtg.
Nov 21: Flagler County Legislative Delegation Mtg.

**ONGOING PROJECTS & STUDIES:**

- Walkability Action Institute Grant Project & Complete Streets Policy & Implementation Plan
- Central Florida Regional Planning Model Update
- Development of FY 2018/19 Public Outreach Summary and Evaluation Matrix
- Development of FY 2018/19 Annual Report
- Development of 2045 LRTP (Public Involvement Plan, Data Collection, Established Subcommittee)
- Amendment to the 2040 LRTP
- Development of Community Safety Action Plan
- FY 2018/19 TPO Audit
- Update of the Congestion Management Process
- Regional Resiliency Action Plan Implementation
- Connected and Automated Vehicle Readiness Study
River to Sea TPO Board
Meeting Summary
September 25, 2019

• Approved the Consent Agenda including approval of: June 26, 2019 meeting minutes; and the expenditure for CAV Study (Not to exceed $65,000)

• Approved the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Public Involvement Plan (PIP) and requested details of 2045 LRTP Subcommittee representatives

• Received a presentation and discussed the draft R2CTPO 2020 Legislative Positions

• Received a presentation of an amendment to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

• Received a presentation of updated Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) List for the R2CTPO

• Received a PowerPoint presentation of the draft Community Safety Action Plan (CSAP)

• Received a presentation of the Walkability Action Plan and Complete Streets Policy Template

• Received the FDOT report and announced the FDOT D-5 Work Program will be available for public review from October 21, 2019 through October 24, 2019, 24 hours a day at www.d5wpph.com; and announced an informational outreach meeting on Thursday, October 24, 2019 from 4:30 pm to 6:30 pm at the D-5 office in DeLand

• Received the Executive Director’s report including details of Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Subcommittee representatives and directed staff to reach out to advisory committee members in Southeast Volusia to serve on the 2045 LRTP Subcommittee; update on SU funding/Work Program; and the Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials and sales tax referendum

• Directed staff to add to the draft R2CTPO 2020 Legislative Positions for funding of driver’s education

The next River to Sea TPO Board meeting will be on Wednesday, October 23, 2019