



**River to Sea TPO Board
Meeting Summary
September 28, 2016**

- Received public comment requesting TPO Board support for making the light at the Pelican Bay entrance and SR 400 (Beville Road) fully operational
- Received three part public comment requesting an alternative pedestrian crossing on Clyde Morris Boulevard between Big Tree Road and Madeleine Avenue; requesting that Votran begin serving the Halifax Humane Society in Daytona Beach once they start service to the Tanger Outlet Mall; noting that Big John will follow up with FDOT regarding the Dune Daisies in Daytona Beach
- Received public comment supporting the allocation of \$1.6 million in SU Set Aside funding for the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement
- Approved the Consent Agenda including the approval of the August 24, 2016 TPO Board meeting minutes
- Received nine public comments regarding the request to allocate \$1.6 million in SU Set Aside funding for the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement, five of which were in support of the allocation and three were in opposition to the allocation of SU Set Aside funding for the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement
- A motion was made to allocate \$600,000 in excess SU Set aside funding to the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement project
- An amendment to the motion was made to allocate \$1.6 million instead of \$600,000 in excess SU set aside funding to the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement
- Approved by roll call vote an amendment to the main motion to allocate \$1.6 million instead of \$600,000 in excess SU set aside funding to the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement
- Motion to call the previous question on the amended motion failed on a roll call vote
- Discussion on funding for the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement project occurred

- Amendment to the main motion to develop a policy so that projects similar to the Turnbull Bay Bridge Replacement can fit within the policy guidelines failed on a roll call vote
- Approved the amended motion to allocate \$1.6 million of SU Traffic Operations/Safety set aside funding to the Turnbull Bay Bridge replacement project via a roll call vote
- Approved Resolution 2016-27 adopting the SR/CR A1A Pedestrian Safety & Mobility Study Report
- Approved the Central Florida MPO Alliance (CFMPOA) Regional Lists of Project Priorities
- Approved the update and authorized a representative to the Central Florida MPO Alliance (CFMPOA) to execute the Interlocal Agreement
- Approved Resolution 2016-28 adopting the Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment Report
- Received a PowerPoint presentation on Votran's Transit Development Plan (TDP)
- Deferred the presentation on Votran's Trip Planner tutorial until the October meeting due to time constraints
- Received a staff presentation on the River To Sea TPO's Draft Public Participation Plan (PPP)
- Received a presentation on the Shared-Use Non-Motorized (SUN) Trail
- Deferred a presentation on the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act until the October meeting due to time constraints
- Received a staff presentation on the draft Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Performance Measures Report
- Received the FDOT report in the agenda
- Received the Executive Director's report including an update on the I-95 to SR 417 Connector Environmental Study and the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate Financial Review

Items Requiring Follow Up:

- Executive Committee to discuss an update to the TPO's policy for SU Set Aside Funding
- Executive Committee to discuss Noranne Downs retirement

The next River to Sea TPO Board meeting will be on Wednesday, October 26, 2016



2016 Application for Project Prioritization

Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects

January 2016

General Instructions:

For the 2016 Call for Projects, the R2CTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

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. When applying for Project Implementation, the applicant 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.

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**¹:

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;

1. Transportation Alternatives as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) (MAP-21 1103):
 - 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 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.

-
- 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.

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 2016-## 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 applicant (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), compatible with MS Windows and Adobe Acrobat® Version 9.5 or earlier.
2. Electronic documents may be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive.
3. The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one electronic PDF file.
4. All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.
5. Page size shall be either 8-1/2" by 11" (letter) or 11" by 17" (tabloid).
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Submit any available right-of-way information.
9. **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".

10. 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 to any member local government that requests it.



2016 Application for Project Prioritization – FEASIBILITY STUDY

**Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives
Projects**

Project Title: _____

Applicant (project sponsor): _____ **Date:** _____

Contact Person: _____ **Job Title:** _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **FAX:** _____

E-mail: _____

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

[If not the same as Applicant, attach letter of support for 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 applicant's responsibility will be.]

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applicant: _____

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;
- 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 should 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 10 points will be assessed.

Commentary:



2016 Application for Project Prioritization – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives
Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (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:

Priority Criteria	Points
(1) Proximity to Community Assets	20
(2) Connectivity and Accessibility	20
(3) Safety/Security	20
(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community	10
(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System	10
(6) Project Readiness	5
(7) Public Support/Special Considerations	5
(8) Local Matching Funds > 10%	10
(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary)	variable
Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)	100

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	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Residential developments, apartments, community housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
School bus stop (K-12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Schools (K-12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Maximum Point Assessment		20

Criterion #1 Description (if needed): _____

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.

Network Connectivity and Accessibility	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Project provides access to a transit facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g., comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Maximum Point Assessment		20

Criterion #2 Description (if needed): _____

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.

Safety/Security	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		20

Criterion #3 Description (if needed): _____

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

Criterion (4) Describe how this project contributes to the “Liveability” 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 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.

Special Considerations	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Maximum Point Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	5

Criterion #7 Description (if needed): _____

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

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

	Check One	Max. Points
Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	3

17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	7
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	9
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		10

Criterion #8 Description (if needed): _____

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.



2016 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



**THIS FORM SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR ALL PROJECTS
NOT CURRENTLY IN THE FDOT WORK PROGRAM.
FDOT PROJECT INFORMATION APPLICATION FORM**

DATE:

1. Project Information:

Project ID (SR, CR, Etc...):

From/At (South or West Termini):

To (North or East Termini):

County: -

Project Length (Miles):

Project Type: Other If *other*, please specify: -

2. Title of Project Priority List and Project Ranking:

Central Florida MPO Alliance List and Project Ranking (if applicable):

3. Managing Agency Contact Information:

Applicant:

Contact Person:

Title:

Address:

Phone Number:

E-mail Address:

4. Phase(s) Being Requested (click to select all appropriate boxes):

Study PD&E Design

Right-of-way Construction Other:

5. Project Description:

a. Project Scope/Description (please be as detailed as possible):

b. What fiscal year will this project be ready for production/construction:

Work Type	Requested Fiscal Year (July 1-June 30)
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	
Design	
Right-of-way Acquisition	
Construction/CEI	
Other	

- c. Please state the purpose and need for this project.
- d. What data from the statement above was obtained and/or used to support this analysis?

Note: If a study was done, then please provide a copy of the study. If no study was done, please provide documentation to support the need of the project and that the proposed improvements will address the issue.

- e. Is this project within 5 miles of a Public Airport? If yes, which one(s)?
- f. Is this facility a designated SIS corridor, connector, or hub or adjacent to a SIS facility?
- g. Is this project on a transit route? If yes, which one(s)?
- h. Is this project within the Federal Aid system?
(If yes, FDOT staff needs to verify and check here)

6. Consistency with Local and MPO Plans

- a. Is this project consistent with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan?

If no, please state when an amendment will be processed to include the project in the Plan.

- b. Is the project in an MPO Cost Feasible component of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)?
No. If necessary, the City will work with the River to Sea TPO to include this project in the LRTP.

If yes, please attach a copy of the page in the LRTP.

If no, please state when an amendment will be done to include the project in the LRTP (if applicable). It is not necessary to specifically identify traffic planning studies in the LRTP.

7. Other Information:

- a. Has the Applying Agency been certified by FDOT to perform the work under the Local Agency Program (LAP) process? Yes- Certification in process
- b. What year was the agency last certified?

8. If this is a non-state road project, to be located outside of State Right-of-Way, is there sufficient right-of-way for the project is currently owned by the local government entity?

If yes, please provide proof of right-of-way ownership (right-of-way certification, right-of-way maps or maintenance maps).

Provide an estimate of the total cost of the project phase(s) and attach supporting documents that supports the requested phase estimate (i.e. man-hour estimate and rates, equipment cost and right of way cost).

Work Type	Phase Complete? Yes/No/NA	Responsible Agency (Who performed or who will perform the work?)	Procurement Method? In-house/Advertise	Project Cost Estimate
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	-		-	\$
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	-		-	\$
Design	-		-	\$
Right-of-way Acquisition	-		-	\$
Construction	-		-	\$
CEI	-		-	\$
Other:	-		-	\$
Total Project Cost Estimate:	\$0			

- **Include a map showing location of the area of interest. Label important features, roadways, or additional description to help FDOT identify the location and understand the nature of the project.**

• **When requesting the Construction phase please include the following documents, if available:**

- Signed and sealed plans
- Engineer's estimate
- Bid Documents and Specifications Package
- Signed LAP Construction Checklist
- Right of Way Certification
- Environmental Certification
- All necessary permits

EXHIBIT "A"

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 18 (Planning)

FPN (If Known): [redacted] FAN: TBD

Name of Project: [redacted]

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager): [redacted]

Phone: [redacted] Email Address: [redacted]

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

[redacted]

Procurement Method:

Advertisement

Fee Estimate: \$0 [redacted] (include backup documentation)

Tentative Schedule (MMDDYY):

FDOT issues NTP for Study:

Advertise/Award/NTP for Study

Services:

Begin Study:

Final

Submittal:

Final Invoice:

Date Agreement needed:

Board Date:

EXHIBIT "A"

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 28 (PD&E)

FPN (If Known): [redacted] FAN: [redacted]

Name of Project: [redacted]

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager): [redacted]

Phone: [redacted] Email Address: [redacted]

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

[redacted]

Procurement Method:

Advertisement

Fee Estimate: \$0 [redacted] (include backup documentation)

Tentative Schedule (MMDDYY):

FDOT issues NTP for Study:

Advertise/Award/NTP for Study

Services:

Begin Study:

Final

Submittal:

Final Invoice:

Date Agreement needed:

Board Date:

EXHIBIT "A"

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 38 (Design)

FPN (If Known): [redacted] FAN: [redacted]

Name of Project: [redacted]

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager): [redacted]

Phone: [redacted] Email Address: [redacted]

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

[redacted]

Design Procurement Method:

- In-House Advertisement

Design Fee Estimate: \$0 [redacted] (include backup documentation)

Tentative Design Schedule (MMDDYY):

FDOT issues NTP for Design:

Advertise/Award/NTP for Design

Services:

Begin Design:

60% Plans Submittal (including Reviews):

90% Plans Submittal (including Reviews):

Final Plans Submittal:

Final Invoice:

Date Agreement needed:

Board Date:

Construction Funded: Yes No Fiscal Year:

EXHIBIT "A"

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 58 (Construction)

FPN (If Known): FAN:

Name of Project:

Project Manager: Phone:

Email Address:

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

CEI Procurement Method:

- In-House
- Advertisement

CEI Estimate (LAP Projects Only) (Attach supporting man-hours and rates)

Const Estimate (LAP Projects Only): (Attach engineer's estimate)

Tentative Construction Schedule (MMDDYY):

Ad Date:

Bid Opening Date:

Award Date:

Executed Contract Date:

Pre Construction Date:

NTP to Contractor

Date:

Construction Duration

:

Completion

Date:

Final Acceptance

Date:

Date Agreement

Needed:

Board

Date:

2017 Priority Project Process Schedule

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

Issue Call for Projects/"
Notice of Funding Availability"

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

TCC Meeting/Priority
Project Process Workshop

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

Application Deadline

9 weeks

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

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

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

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

BPAC reviews preliminary rankings

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

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

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

BPAC reviews/recommends rankings

CAC/TCC review/recommend rankings

TPO Board reviews/approves final rankings

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

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

Deadline to submit Project Priorities to FDOT

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION 2016-~~02~~XX

**RESOLUTION OF THE RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
REAFFIRMING THE POLICY FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING TRANSPORTATION
PRIORITY PROJECTS**

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that every urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more, as a condition to the receipt of federal capital or operating assistance, shall 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 the designated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) comprised of Volusia County and the urbanized areas of Flagler County including the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

WHEREAS, 23 C.F.R. 450.104 provides that the River to Sea TPO shall annually endorse, and amend as appropriate, the plans and programs required, among which is the Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects list of the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) submission; and

WHEREAS, each year the appropriate River to Sea TPO committees made up of a cross-section of interested citizens and technical staff are charged with the responsibility of drafting a list of prioritized projects; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the River to Sea TPO to establish project priorities for all areas of the TPO's MPA; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO reaffirms its commitment to the priority process and related policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the River to Sea TPO that the following policies are established to prioritize transportation projects throughout the TPO's MPA:

1. The project application and evaluation criteria approved by the River to Sea TPO Board shall be used to solicit and evaluate projects for priority ranking in the transportation program categories listed below:
 - a. Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects;
 - b. Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects and Major Bridge Projects;

- c. Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects;
 - d. Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives Projects;
 - e. Public Transit Projects; and
 - f. Transportation Planning Studies.
2. River to Sea TPO projects that were previously ranked and have a Financial Management (FM) number and are in the Florida Department of Transportation Work Program will automatically be prioritized above projects that are not currently in the FDOT Five-Year Work Program;
 3. Projects which are ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects are deemed to be protected, and will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;
 4. Projects which are ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects and Major Bridge Projects are deemed to be protected, and will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;
 5. Projects which are ranked one through eight on Tier "B" of the Prioritized List of Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects are deemed to be protected, and will be ranked in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;
 6. Projects which are ranked one through three on Tier "B" of the Prioritized List of Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives Projects are deemed to be protected, and will be ranked in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;
 7. If, at any time, two or more lists of prioritized projects are merged into a new list, every project that was protected prior to the merger shall retain its protected status, and no new or previously unprotected project shall be deemed to be protected unless and until it advances to the protected rank prescribed for the new, merged list.
 8. The River to Sea TPO will ~~not only~~ re-prioritize ~~or add protected~~ projects ~~when unless~~ the TPO Board determines unusual circumstances support such action; dictate otherwise;
 - ~~8.9.~~ Requests to change the priority or to add a project must include a statement of hardship by the requestor along with supporting documentation that includes detailed justification of need and an assessment of the impacts to the programming of prioritized projects;

~~9.~~10. It is the responsibility of the River to Sea TPO and FDOT staffs to provide the River to Sea TPO members with current information and data on project status and to assist the members in their efforts to make informed decisions regarding the prioritized projects lists;

~~10.~~11. The River to Sea TPO shall, in its discretion, make all decisions regarding the final prioritized project lists that are annually submitted to FDOT;

~~11.~~12. Once a project has attained protected status, it should be programmed within 3 years. If it has not been programmed during that time due to inactivity on the part of the project sponsor, then the project will be removed from the list of priority projects. The project sponsor may resubmit the project for open ranking on any subsequent call for projects.

~~12.~~13. The policies set forth in this resolution shall remain in effect unless and until they are repealed by the TPO; and

~~13.~~14. the Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO, (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the:

- a. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);
- b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and
- 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 ____ day of _____ 2016.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

~~VOLUSIA COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER PAT PATTERSON~~
CITY OF FLAGLER BEACH COMMISSIONER MARSHALL SHUPE
CHAIRMAN, 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 _____, 2016.

ATTEST:

PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

R2CTPO Priority Project Process Review – Starter List of Considerations September 2016

The following is a starter list of considerations relating to the TPO's Priority Project Process for discussion by the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee. It is not intended to limit discussion.

I. General Considerations:

- A. Is the proposed Priority Project Process schedule acceptable? (See attached draft schedule.)
- B. Are the instructions and project applications clear and concise?

II. Feasibility Study Application:

- A. Local Agency Program (LAP) certification, a prerequisite for project programming, continues to be an issue, particularly for smaller cities. When an agency is unable to get certified, the project cannot advance unless and until a LAP certified agency or FDOT agrees to manage the project. To save time and expense of producing a feasibility study for a project that may not advance for lack of a qualified agency to manage it, should the feasibility study application be revised to require the applicant to indicate whether they intend to become LAP certified for the project or, if not, indicate what governmental agency will manage the project?
- B. Should the R2CTPO exclude applications for feasibility studies that are eligible for SUN Trail funds?

III. Project Implementation Application:

- A. Is the project description sufficient to understand the full scope, limits, and character of the project and is it consistent with the feasibility study recommendations?
- B. Is the feasibility study included with the application and does it address the following considerations?
 - 1. Does the feasibility study show that the project can likely be completed successfully?
 - 2. Is the project the preferred alternative for satisfying the identified purpose and need?
 - 3. Does the feasibility study identify all required project phases (PD&E, PE, ENV, ROW, CST, etc.)?
 - 4. Does the feasibility study include an engineer's opinion of the probable cost for each required phase of the project for the current year and for 3 consecutive years ahead?
- C. Are the current project evaluation criteria appropriately defined and weighted to promote the types of projects that best advance our transportation goals and objectives?