



# MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO) TIP SUBCOMMITTEE will be meeting on:

**DATE:** Tuesday, October 13, 2015  
**TIME:** 2:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** River to Sea TPO  
2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100 (Conference Room)  
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145

\*\*\*\*\*

## 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 chairman*)
- III. **ACTION ITEMS**
  - A. **Evaluate the the Project Prioritization Process and Recommend Program Improvements**  
(*contact Bob Keeth*) (*enclosures*)
- IV. **R2CTPO STAFF COMMENTS**
- V. **TIP SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**
- VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

TIP Subcommittee Members:

Bob Storke, Scott Leisen, Richard Belhumeur, Elizabeth Lendian, Nora Jane Gillespie, Gilles Blais, Judy Craig, Ron Paradise, Jon Cheney, Heather Blanck, Chris Walsh, Fernand "Tib" Tiblier

cc: TCC, CAC, BPAC Members  
Gene Ferguson, FDOT  
Press

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

**MEETING SUMMARY  
TIP SUBCOMMITTEE  
October 13, 2015**

**III. ACTION ITEM**

**A. Recommend Improvements to the Project Prioritization Process**

**Background Information:**

Each year as we complete another cycle of the project prioritization process, the TPO staff asks the TIP Subcommittee to evaluate the process and recommend 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. In addition, consideration must be given to the Local Initiatives program and funding identified in the 2040 LRTP.

A starter list of discussion items are attached.

***ACTION REQUESTED:***

***RECOMMEND REVISIONS TO THE PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE.***



## MEETING SUMMARY

### TIP SUBCOMMITTEE

October 13, 2015

The following items are presented for consideration and members are encouraged to suggest additional input for the purpose of improving the project identification, evaluation, and ranking.

1. Project Categories – Consider merging project categories to reduce the number of priority project lists. When projects from two or more lists are merged into a single prioritized list, it reduces the question for FDOT regarding project priorities. Consider the following potential mergers:
  - a. Regionally Significant Non-SIS Roadways list and the Major Bridges list;
  - b. Traffic Operations/Safety Projects list and Local Initiatives;
  - c. Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects list, Transportation Alternatives Program Projects list, Regional Trails list and Local Initiatives.
2. Local Match – Consider a revision to the local match requirement (now 20% on TAP funds and 10% of SU funds).
3. Planning Studies – Last year was the first year of identifying planning studies for the area. The criteria and program description should be revisited to ensure it represents TPO priorities and screens requests appropriately.
4. Identification of Responsible Agency – LAP certification, a prerequisite for project programming, continues to be a problem, particularly for small 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 the time and expense of producing a feasibility study for a project that might not be constructed for lack of a qualified agency to manage it, should we ask in the feasibility study application whether the applicant expects to manage it and, if not, what agency will be expected to manage it? We can then begin to consider potential options and decide whether it is worthwhile to proceed with a feasibility study.
5. Minimum Threshold for Qualifying Projects – Projects that best satisfy our project prioritization criteria score high; those that don't very well satisfy the criteria score low. Consider setting a minimum threshold for projects to be ranked as a priority project to be funded.
6. Project Funding Caps/Ranges – Some programs currently have project funding caps (maximum funding amounts). However, with the de-coupling of the priority project lists for Traffic Operations & Safety Projects and Bicycle & Pedestrian Projects from the SU funds, these projects became eligible for other types of funding which offer opportunities above the SU funding amounts.

The following documents may be helpful for this discussion and are available on the TPO website:

1. River to Sea TPO Lists of Priority Projects



## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **TIP SUBCOMMITTEE**

**October 13, 2015**

2. Priority Project Applications for Traffic Operations and Safety Projects, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Projects, and Transportation Planning Studies
3. Memorandum Announcing the 2015 Annual Call for Projects
4. Draft 2016 Priority Process Schedule (calendar 10-1-15)
5. Executed Resolution 2014-38 (reaffirming policy for establishing and maintaining priority projects)
6. Executed Resolution 2015-05 (delineating local match requirements)
7. Executed Resolution 2015-06 (Reaffirming XU Set Aside Percentages)