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

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

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press/citizen comments.

III. Action Items
A. Review and Approval of September 19, 2019 CAC Meeting Minutes

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Peterson to approve the September 19, 2019 CAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Storke and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2019-## Amending the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Ms. Nicolin stated this amendment was spurred by the advancing of funding for the right-of-way on two SR 40 projects and moving the I-95 and US 1 interchange modifications from the unfunded needs list to the funded needs list. There are also additional transportation performance measures being incorporated. This has been out for public review; no comments were received.

Mr. Peterson referred to the additional planning activities on page 30 of the agenda, the fourth bullet point, and asked for an explanation of the “parking cash-out programs” and “telework programs”.

Ms. Nicolin replied the “telework program” is working remotely.

Mr. Peterson asked how working remotely affects transportation.

Ms. Nicolin replied if someone is working from their home they are not commuting and adding trips to the roadway network. She is not sure of the parking cash-out program but will find out and follow up with an email.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Storke to recommend approval of Resolution 2019-## amending the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson and carried unanimously.

C. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2019-## Adopting the Walkability Action Plan and Complete Streets Policy Template

Mr. Harris stated the draft resolution and Complete Streets Policy are included in the agenda. Feedback was received last month from Volusia County and other stakeholders and those comments have been addressed in the revised draft policy.

Mr. Ball asked what technical comments were received.

Mr. Harris replied it was asked if the policy would apply to trails and the answer is no; if it includes all funds approved by the TPO and the answer is yes. In regards to low volume roads, the original document had less than 1,000 trips per day; it has been changed to less than 5,000 trips per day to be consistent with Volusia County.

Chairperson Gillespie stated several CAC members wanted clarification on what the definition of a complete street is, how it applies and whether the TIP Subcommittee could award extra points if a project meets the requirements. She checked the “Smart Growth” website and the federal code recommends no curbing; it is better for the environment and for elderly citizens to not have curbing. She understands that a complete street can be just a road if that is all a community needs.

Mr. Harris replied correct; it is context sensitive.

Mr. Peterson referred to the exceptions section of the draft policy and the four exceptions listed; there is not an exception for the cost being astronomical and detrimental to other projects proposed for funding in a current year. He also asked for the definition of a complete street. He referred to the SR 100 project on the priority list and noted this is the only road in Flagler County that goes from the Atlantic Ocean to Putnam County. It is mostly a major business district and yet the sidewalk is either nonexistent or does not exceed four feet; he asked if a four-foot wide sidewalk qualifies as bicycle and pedestrian path.
Mr. Harris replied no.

Mr. Peterson stated this is a six-lane, divided road that is on the priority list for funding to widen to eight lanes. It is very questionable from an economic standpoint, with these requirements and a bicycle/pedestrian path or transit not defined, to not give an exception for inappropriate financial requirements. Fortunately, he does not see anything changed in the TIP ranking or extra points given for streets that qualify for complete streets. He does not think this has been drilled down enough as to when it is appropriate and at what cost; complete streets are going to cost everyone and every community and possibly delay or eliminate projects. He is glad to see the defined exception for roads that have only 5,000 vehicles a day but the other problems have not been addressed; particularly for roads that are already developed. It will be very expensive, if not impossible, to get the needed right-of-way for complete streets items. He asked about scooters; the TPO Board had concerns about scooters as those have not been addressed in this policy at all.

Mr. Harris replied the definition for complete streets is on the first page of the policy. This policy does not tackle cost elements because every project is different. When a project application comes in, it should address the cost elements. The plan for this policy is each project application submitted will be reviewed to see if it lines up with the goals stated in the policy; reducing injuries and fatalities, providing transportation options, etc. This is a template for a regional policy that the TPO hopes to apply to individual projects to the extent it can. Many of the issues raised have to be addressed on a project specific level and the project application will do that.

Ms. Habel asked which jurisdictions within Volusia County have adopted a complete streets policy.

Mr. Harris replied Orange City has and it is currently undergoing revisions.

Ms. Winsett stated Volusia County has one.

Ms. Habel stated Mr. Peterson’s concern regarding right-of-way can be applied to the Clyde Morris Boulevard widening project from Beville Road to US 92. She asked if the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University students that walk to classes have been taken into consideration.

Chairperson Gillespie stated the city did not submit it as a complete streets project and she sees problems for small communities with this policy.

Mr. Storke stated the design for the widening of Clyde Morris Boulevard does include sidewalks and bike paths.

Ms. Winsett replied yes; they were not called complete streets when the project was submitted. It is an urban area so FDOT, the county and the city will provide a multi-modal facility. Volusia County has a policy and is required to do this in an urban area.

Mr. Castagnacci commented the Clyde Morris Boulevard project could be a model of what a complete street should be.

Ms. Winsett stated every area is unique; population and environment must be taken into consideration before deciding what can be done. The definition of a complete street is unique to each specific area. The county will do as much as it can to fit an area’s needs but the cost/benefit ratio also must be taken into consideration. Every area is unique and it is up to the cities to explain in the project application why a project is a complete street project.

Chairperson Gillespie replied that she would like to see that as a TIP Subcommittee member; that an explanation be given as to why a project is a complete street because she would be hesitant to give extra points without it.

Mr. Peterson referred to the exceptions again and commented that there are places where it would be inappropriate to provide bicycle, pedestrian or transit facilities. These are the only four exceptions listed that can be considered inappropriate; it should say that these are examples of a legitimate exception. He does not want the policy to say the only exceptions are these four listed.
Mr. Harris replied that could be addressed.

Mr. Peterson asked for an explanation why health rankings are important to this policy.

Mr. Harris replied it goes back to the goals by promoting a healthy lifestyle for long term health benefits; the health rankings will help to see if that goal is satisfied.

Mr. Peterson replied that is a stretch; a little bit could be the result of the inability to provide walking or bike paths. We control our own health ranking and he does not feel it needs to be feature of this policy; he fails to see the importance of including that.

Mr. Harris replied there is a link between non-motorized transportation and an active lifestyle; activity and health go hand-in-hand.

Ms. Habel commented that there is a health component in every road built; the more cars on the road, the more carbon monoxide. This applies to every road and she does not want to take out the health section.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Storke to recommend approval of Resolution 2019-## adopting the Walkability Action Plan and Complete Streets Policy template as amended adding to the exceptions “not limited to”. The motion was seconded by Ms. Elliott and carried unanimously.

D. **Review and Recommend Approval of the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

Mr. Harris stated the memorandum of understanding (MOU) was provided in the agenda as well as a resolution passed by the TPO Board in June supporting the Regional Resiliency Action Plan (RRAP). The initiative started with a focus on two counties within the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC); Volusia and Brevard. It has expanded to include all eight counties within the planning council; Seminole, Sumter, Orange, Lake, Marion, Osceola in addition to Volusia and Brevard. The eight counties comprise what is now called the “Collaborative”; the MOU is the document that establishes the Collaborative and lays out what is expected of them. There are four sections to what is expected; regional cooperation, the RRAP itself, legislative strategy, and community involvement. An annual summit will also be held. The TPO has been working with the other partners and agencies and fully supports the efforts in this initiative. The TPO also recommends execution of the MOU.

Ms. Foltz asked why Flagler County was not included in this.

Mr. Harris replied Flagler County is in the Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council and not the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council. The TPO works with Flagler County and is involved in parallel efforts to address resiliency.

Ms. Foltz asked if Flagler County had something similar.

Mr. Harris replied yes, they have a version of this MOU.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Blais to recommend approval of the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The motion was seconded by Ms. Elliott and carried unanimously.

IV. **Presentation Items**

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

Ms. Nicoulin introduced Mr. Jim Wood, Kimley Horn and Associates, to give the presentation.
Mr. Wood gave a PowerPoint presentation update of the development of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and announced the “Connect 2045” logo will be the brand throughout the process. They are currently working on the data summary which is a critical component; they pulled together studies and plans as a baseline. They are local, regional and state studies. The website will be launched within the next week; it will include information to help understand what the LRTP is and provide a platform to provide comments as well as events the public can attend. Another dimension of public involvement will be the focus groups and the LRTP Survey which will be available on the website and on paper. The goals and objectives are being developed and will include the new requirements for performance-based planning process. The goals and objectives will be presented for a recommendation for approval next month. He gave an overview of the schedule and stated they are preparing for the needs assessment which will prioritize and select projects for the LRTP.

B. Presentation and Discussion of the 2045 Florida Transportation Plan

Ms. Judy Pizzo, FDOT, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the update to the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP). She explained the FTP is Florida’s long range transportation plan which provides policy guidance for all transportation partners and all organizations involved in transportation planning. It establishes a policy framework for allocating state and federal transportation funds. The FTP not only sets the long range vision but guides transportation planning decision needs today. She reviewed the vision, policy and implementation elements of the plan. She explained the objectives and strategies of the FTP and the cross-cutting topics. There are two FTP subcommittees; one for automated, connected, electric and shared (ACES) vehicles and one for resilience. During the FTP update process, FDOT relies on public and partner outreach efforts and mobile processes to provide input on the issues. She asked members to use their cell phones to access a survey; she guided them through the survey. She thanked members for their participation and stated FDOT values their input which will be provided to the FTP steering committee who will refine the plan. She reviewed the schedule; there will be a 30-day public review period in the fall of 2020. She gave the website, www.floridatransportationplan.com, which shows everything done to date and the progress of the plan.

Ms. Elliott asked how “big data” is different from just “data”.

Ms. Pizzo replied it is not personal data but community data.

Mr. Blais referred to future corridors and asked about rail transportation to Orlando or Jacksonville; there could be routes just for trucks and freight. Rail transportation is going to have to be a future consideration as we need to learn to move people not cars.

Ms. Pizzo replied that is a good point and she will take that suggestion back as part of the feedback.

Chairperson Gillespie remarked she was glad to see seaports were part of the plan.

Ms. Pizzo replied seaports are a part of moving freight and transit.

C. Presentation and Discussion of Draft R2CTPO FY 2018/19 Public Involvement Activities Summary

Ms. Blankenship gave a PowerPoint presentation of the draft R2CTPO FY 2018/19 Public Involvement Activities Summary. At the end of each fiscal year the TPO reviews everything done regarding public outreach and develops a summary and public outreach matrix. She reviewed the social media outreach, explained the public involvement contact logs kept by each TPO staff member, and the public meetings held including the Federal Certification Review which occurs every four years. She gave an overview of the community and business presentations given and the safety and informational materials distributed. The TPO participated in 42 community events and fit and donated 855 bicycle helmets. She announced she would be participating in White Cane Awareness Day on October 29, 2019 at the intersection of Wilder Boulevard and Ridgewood Avenue from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm. A big part of public outreach this year will have to do with the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). She referred to the matrix and the low attendance at advisory committee meetings and vacancy rates which Ms. Nicoulin will address. Staff has met and there is a plan moving forward.
Chairperson Gillespie noted that public participation at meetings has dropped. She suggested members invite friends who are interested in transportation to attend the meetings.

Ms. Blankenship replied the TPO does not have a lot of control over participation but continues to be welcoming.

Chairperson Gillespie commented that the TPO does a great job with bike helmet fittings and she wishes the safety village could get going again.

Mr. Peterson referred to the Public Records Requests section and the statement that the TPO “responds to requests in an efficient manner”; he would prefer it state “respond to requests in a timely manner in accordance with state law”. He referred to the list of staff presentations given to the Volusia Chamber of Commerce and the Daytona Beach Association of Realtors and asked why presentations were not given to the Flagler Chamber of Commerce and the Flagler Association of Realtors.

Ms. Blankenship replied that the TPO gives presentations to those who ask but she can reach out to them and see if they are interested.

Mr. Peterson referred to the attendance record included in the matrix and stated the TPO would like to have 80% attendance; he is surprised at how low attendance is and even the TPO Board did not meet the 80%. He asked how excused absences are counted and if it is an absence.

Ms. Blankenship replied it is an absence.

Mr. Peterson referred to the statement if a committee member is unable to attend a meeting the TPO requests they send an alternate; the TPO cannot request attendance. It should be softened to “ask” rather than request. He asked if a member is unable to attend a meeting if the TPO asks the city to send an alternate.

Ms. Blankenship replied if a member alerts the TPO that they will be absent, the TPO asks them to send their alternate if they have one.

Chairperson Gillespie commented that she sent an alternate and the alternate was not allowed to speak.

Ms. Blankenship replied they have to be appointed by the city or commission in writing; however, anyone is welcome to speak.

Mr. Peterson stated he has a problem with asking for an alternate because it would be someone that has not been attending. He would prefer the policy be if a member misses a meeting or several meetings they should be contacted and then ask for an alternate.

Ms. Blankenship replied the TPO does not take action until there have been three consecutive absences.

Mr. Peterson asked who notifies the alternate.

Ms. Nicoulin replied sometimes the member will contact the alternate and sometimes staff will.

Mr. Peterson asked if non-voting member absences were counted the same as voting members.

Ms. Nicoulin replied yes.

Discussion continued.

D. Presentation and Discussion of Draft Community Safety Action Plan (CSAP)

Ms. Blankenship stated the draft Community Safety Action Plan (CSAP) was discussed last month. She reviewed the implementation plan and stated it was drafted from the input received. The details and specifics of the
items on the implementation plan will be fleshed out later; the point is to get the plans included in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and incorporate them into the budget for the next two years. The implementation plan includes developing an education and awareness campaign for speeding and distracted driving, creating a targeted print and social media campaign, developing a speaker’s group and continuing the existing programs and activities.

Mr. Castagnacci asked if the crosswalks on SR A1A were strictly FDOT because the county has installed more parking on the west side and a number of them do not have crosswalks.

Ms. Winsett replied she would speak with him after the meeting to get those locations.

E. Presentation and Discussion of the Guiding Resolutions and Project Applications for the Annual Call for Projects

Ms. Nicoulin stated the TPO has a solid application process and resolutions that guide that process. Minor changes have been incorporated into the resolutions; she referred to the resolution defining the local match requirements and stated it is being clarified that the 10% match is the minimum ratio and local governments can match more than that. The resolution for reaffirming the policy for establishing and maintaining priority projects, item 13, requires a local government provide a letter of support and updated costs estimates and now also requires a letter of support and commitment of a match for Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) projects. The applications have not changed other than updating them to the current year. The only change other than the date is clarifying no extra points are given for a 10% local match.

F. Presentation and Discussion of Tomoka Farms Road (CR 415) and Pioneer Trail (CR 4118) Intersection Evaluation

Due to time constraints, this presentation was not given.

G. FDOT Report

Ms. Wyche gave an update of the tentative Five-Year Work Program for FY 2020/21 to 2024/25. She reviewed the type of projects included and stated they are based on MPO priorities and SIS/FDOT priorities. After the Work Program has been out for public review, it is sent to the Florida Legislature and the Governor for review and signature. Once the Governor signs the Work Program it officially becomes part of the state budget. She reviewed the schedule for the Work Program and announced the online public hearing will be held October 21, 2019 to October 25, 2019; the website to participate is www.d5wpph.com. There will be an open house at the FDOT D-5 office in DeLand on October 24, 2019 from 4:30 pm to 6:30 pm. This year there were a couple of appropriations which affect the first year of the Work Program and may result in other projects being deferred or moved out. There were three appropriations this year; Deltona crosswalk lighting for $750,000, Williamson Road widening for $2 million, and Ormond Beach Municipal Airport access roads for $472,500.

Ms. Wyche referred to a comment made last month regarding the roundabout at US 1 and Old Dixie Highway and stated she looked into it and did not find anything; that was the only complaint made.

Mr. Peterson commented the speed coming up to the roundabout needs to be reduced; it is 65 miles per hour (mph) on US 1 then 25 mph through the roundabout and there needs to be a downgrade. He referred to the green exit and direction signs on the interstate and asked how the location of those signs were determined; some of them do not give enough time to be in the correct lane before you hit the exit.

Ms. Wyche replied there is but she did not know it and will look into it.

Mr. Cheney stated it is usually based on speed and the decision point of where the driver needs to be; there is guidance on where those signs should be placed so that the driver has adequate decision time to make the turn.
Ms. Habel asked when the I-4 right lane from US 92 to Beville Road will be reopened.

Ms. Wyche replied she will check and get back to her.

H. **Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports**

Ms. Winsett stated the Volusia County Construction Report is provided in the agenda and contains more detail than in the past as well as new projects.

The Flagler County Construction Reports was provided in the agenda.

V. **Staff Comments**

→ 2045 LRTP Subcommittee Membership
→ CAC/TCC Attendance
→ Update on FDOT D-5 Proposed Local Agency Program (LAP) Policy

CAC attendance was addressed during the Public Involvement Summary presentation. Due to time constraints staff comments were not given.

VI. **CAC Member Comments**

Ms. Blais announced Harley-Davidson has a new electric bicycle that will go 70 mph and stated we need to plan for traffic accidents to occur because of this.

Ms. Foltz followed up on Mr. Peterson’s comment regarding the exit signs and stated the new LED sign on I-4 is nice but the exit to US 92 is confusing if you do not know it is US 92; for first time visitors they do not know it is US 92 and miss the exit. The same with the exit for South Daytona; the sign is too close to get to the exit. There needs to be additional signage that directs people to the appropriate exits.

VII. **Information Items**

→ CAC & TCC Attendance Records
→ September 25, 2019 River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
→ September 2019 TPO Outreach and Events
→ TRIP Letters
→ 09-17-19 2045 LRTP Subcommittee Report
→ 2020 R2C TPO Meeting Schedule

VIII. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the CAC meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
CERTIFICATE:
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