



## L RTP SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

\*\*\*\*\*

Please be advised that the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization's (VTPO) LRTP Subcommittee will be meeting on:

**DATE:** Wednesday, October 20, 2010  
**TIME:** 2:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Volusia TPO (Board Conference Room)  
 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100  
 Daytona Beach, Florida

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. John Decarie, Chairman**

### AGENDA

- I. **CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**
- II. **ACTION ITEMS**
  - A) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY**  
*(Contact: Lois Bollenback) (Enclosures, pages 2-4)*
- III. **PRESENTATION AND STATUS REPORTS**
  - A) **DISCUSSION OF 2035 LRTP NEEDS PLAN** *(Contact: Karl Welzenbach) (Enclosures, pages 5-15)*
- IV. **STAFF COMMENTS/INFORMATION ITEMS** *(Enclosure, page 16)*
  - Final VTPO 2035 LRTP Summary
- V. **LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS** *(Enclosure, page 16)*
- VI. **PRESS/CITIZEN COMMENTS** *(Enclosure, page 16)*
- VII. **ADJOURNMENT** *(Enclosure, page 16)*

**MEETING SUMMARY  
LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 20, 2010**

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**A) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY**

**Background Information:**

A meeting summary is prepared subsequent to each LRTP Subcommittee meeting to outline the key activities that took place. These summaries are provided as information to the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (VTPO) Board as well as the other committees to keep them informed of LRTP subcommittee's activities.

***Action Requested:***

***Motion to approve the September 15, 2010 LRTP Subcommittee meeting summary***

LRTP Subcommittee  
Meeting Summary  
September 15, 2010

**Members Present:**

Mike Marcum  
Ron Paradise  
Blanche Hardy  
Ferd Heeb  
Gilles Blais  
A.J. Devies  
Wendy Hickey  
Bobby Ball  
Dan D'Antonio  
Tomm Friend  
Jon Cheney  
Heather Blanck

**Members Absent:**

County Chair Frank Bruno  
John Decarie, Chairman (excused)  
Bill McCord (excused)  
Barbara Goldstein (excused)  
Gail Camputaro

**Others Present:**

Robert Baker  
Lois Bollenback  
Melissa Booker  
Carole Hinkley  
Ella Jordan  
Bob Keeth  
Jean Parlow  
Judy Pizzo  
Karl Welzenbach  
Melissa Vos

**Representing:**

Daytona Beach  
Deltona  
DeLand  
Edgewater  
Holly Hill  
Volusia County  
Orange City  
Port Orange  
Volusia County  
Volusia County  
VC Traffic Engineering  
Votran

**Representing:**

Volusia County  
Port Orange  
Port Orange  
Disabled Citizens  
Elder Affairs

**Representing:**

Citizen (Turnbull Bay Community)  
TPO Staff  
VC Traffic Engineering  
TPO Staff  
Citizen (Turnbull Bay Community)  
TPO Staff  
TPO Staff  
FDOT  
TPO Staff  
TPO Staff

L RTP Subcommittee  
Meeting Summary  
September 15, 2010

- Approved the July 21, 2010 LRTP Subcommittee meeting summary
- Received a brief presentation on the year 2035 LRTP public outreach meetings
- Reviewed and recommended approval of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Project Lists and Financial Plan
- Received a brief presentation of the year 2035 Traffic Model results based on the “cost feasible” transportation plan developed by the Volusia TPO
- Discussed creating a separate “needs” plan as part of the 2035 LRTP and the challenges associated with defining this activity
- Agreed to pursue developing a needs plan and directed TPO staff begin developing a definition and set of criteria for assessing system needs
- Directed TPO staff to send an email to the subcommittee members in an effort to get everyone on the same page
- Announced that Votran flex service, a new strategy for delivering public transit service, will begin in New Smyrna Beach area
- Received comments from a Turnbull Bay resident regarding the need for improvements to the bridge at Turnbull Bay and discussed current status. Volusia County staff agreed to add his contact information to a list of persons receiving updates on this activity.
- Adjourned meeting at 3:00 pm

**\*\*\*Next meeting of the LRTP Subcommittee will be October 20, 2010\*\*\***

**MEETING SUMMARY  
LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 20, 2010**

**III. PRESENTATION AND STATUS REPORTS**

**A) DISCUSSION OF 2035 LRTP NEEDS PLAN**

**Background Information:**

During the September meetings of the LRTP Subcommittee and Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), members agreed to pursue the development of a "Needs" plan as part of the Volusia TPO 2035 LRTP. Committee members were asked to provide input regarding ways to define a transportation "need" and to provide input regarding evaluation criteria that should be considered in identifying the areas transportation needs.

This agenda includes a summary of the input received along with a copy of the evaluation criteria used in the previous long range plan.

***Action Requested:***

***No action is required at this time unless otherwise directed by the Subcommittee***

**Need** – three considerations were offered for discussing and defining a “need.”

A project and/or system enhancement, currently unfunded, that addresses an unmet trip destination or transportation system provision that cannot reasonably be met within current plans and/or construction schedules and would improve the ability of the TPO and member local governments to meet or exceed the stated goals of the LRTP:

1. Considers the mobility needs of all user groups
2. Contributes to the economic vitality of the region
3. Preserves and enhances existing urban areas
4. Promotes a wide range of transportation options
5. Improves the quality of life for residents

All modes of transportation need to be considered when we discuss projects (including bike lanes, pedestrian utilization and HOV opportunities). Alternative transportation opportunity should be a standard part of any project’s consideration. If the funding isn’t there now, then at least the concept will be in place in the event financial feasibility follows.

In order to effectively and efficiently meet the determination of “need” regarding unfunded transportation deficiencies the following criteria shall be utilized:

- 1) Project serves **existing** population centers with the intent of protecting urban areas and enhancing urban infill activities.
- 2) Promotes and encourages the expansion of multi-modal transportation options such as pedestrian, bicycle, transit, including transit centers.
- 3) Involves the maintenance of existing facilities – resurfacing, etc.
- 4) Represents other methods of enhancing traffic flow and safety besides adding lane miles – intersection/signalization improvements, etc.
- 5) Ensures a high level of fiscal prudence by yielding the greatest return on investment regarding the present population served.

**Project Priorities** – three messages were received providing criteria for evaluating projects.

The lowest priorities shall be as follows:

- 1) Projects that do not serve existing populations.
- 2) Projects that extend into existing rural, non-urban areas.
- 3) Improvements that will promote the conversion of non-urban areas to urban uses.
- 4) Projects, because of costs, that will inordinately deprive the accepted LRTP projects of expected funding.
- 5) Improvements that will result in the dislocation of homes and businesses.

First priority should be given to improvements identified in an area-wide long-range study, such as the one done by Volusia County/NSB/Port Orange and Edgewater. Second priority should be given to “wish list” type items (with even wish list items included in the plan).

The following list was also provided but is not intended to be in order of priority.

1. Traffic congestion relief – to define where most of congestion is located and then we can start to tackle ways to address.
2. Fix current problems first.
3. Improve traffic flow other than adding lanes, intersection improvements, timing, etc.
4. Encourages development in urban areas.
5. Movement of freight locally, not excited about helping them move around in Orlando (this goes with Metro's request to see if we want to participate in their study)
6. Expand transportation choices.
7. Focus on bicycle and pedestrian movement which may not necessarily be facilities
8. Safety improvements.
9. Connection to adjacent counties
10. Protection of the environment.

**APPENDIX D: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION**

Prioritization of the improvements proposed in the Multimodal Improvement Plan is required in order to determine which projects should be funded first, where the transportation fees should be applied, and develop a schedule of improvements to be incorporated into the Capital Improvements Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Evaluation Criteria**

The purpose of evaluation criteria is to have a method to measure whether potential projects meet the policy goals of the Southwest Regional Transportation Study (SWVRTS) and to compare projects in order to develop a priority order. The priority criteria from the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (VCMPO) 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) were used as a basis to develop the evaluation criteria used in this study but were modified based on their applicability to the study and region. Further modifications were made through a survey process in which the Study Partners provided feedback and suggestions for criteria that were important to the southwest region. The VCMPO weights for criteria were applied as strictly as possible.

The evaluation criteria are categorized by mode (roads, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian) and measured numerically based on an assigned. An indicator with zero points describes the least desirable result, while an indicator with the highest point value describes the most desirable result. Therefore, a project that yields the highest total cumulative score would rank highest among projects under consideration. Tables D-1 through D-3 depict the prioritization criteria for each mode.

**Table D-1: Prioritization Criteria - Roads**

**Roads**

All road projects must have the support of the maintenance agency and must be “regionally significant” to be ranked for inclusion in the Multimodal Improvement Plan. A road is regionally significant if it is on the SHS, a designated hurricane evacuation route, or a designated truck route. In addition, a collector or higher classified road that satisfies at least two of the following criteria may be considered regionally significant:

1. provides direct access to an interstate;
2. provides access to major traffic generators/attractors; or,
3. traverses local jurisdictional boundaries (county or cities).

Criteria	Points	Weights
<b>Congestion/Designations</b>		<b>30%</b>
* Is identified in an approved plan (i.e. MPO Priority List, DRI Master Plan, Transportation Element, Vision Plan, etc.)	5	
* Is part of a designated truck route system	5	
* Is parallel to a SIS facility or other State highway	5	
* Reduces congestion by <sup>1</sup>		
>=20%	15	
15.1-19.9%	10	
10.1-15.0%	5	
5-10.0%	3	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>30</b>	

Criteria	Points	Weights
<b>System Management</b>		<b>25%</b>
* Project intersection(s) have already been improved to maximum extent	8	





Criteria	Points	Weights
* Project segment has maximized turn lanes	8	
* Access management plan for the corridor is:		
existing	3	
will be implemented within one year	1	
* Policy goal to achieve a minimal 25% internal capture considering the adjacent land uses within a one-mile radius of project is:		
existing	3	
will be implemented within one year	1	
* Adopted requirements for rearage and/or frontage roads is:		
existing	3	
will be implemented within one year	1	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Evacuation</b>		<b>15%</b>
* Is a primary evacuation route (road signed with evacuation signs)	15	
* Is a shelter route (road signed with shelter signs)	6	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Multimodal Benefits</b>		<b>15%</b>
* Project includes a bike lane (with signed markings)	3	
* Project includes pedestrian facility (i.e. sidewalks)	3	
* Project includes a dedicated transit lane with transit stops or transit bays that will not interfere with traffic mobility	5	
* Project includes access to a new park-n-ride facility or other multimodal facility	4	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Funding</b>		<b>15%</b>
* Project phases completed or funding committed		
Planning Study (i.e. AIS, PLEMO)	1	
PD&E/Alignment Study	2	
Design	3	
Right-of-way Acquisition	4	
* Financial partnerships (public-public, public-private, etc) as a means to reduce overall cost and expedite project construction	3	
* Total project costs (PD&E, design, permits, ROW roadway, ROW drainage ponds, environmental mitigation, construction, CEI, etc.) in		
<\$5 Million	2	
\$5.1-10 Million	1	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Grand Total Maximum Points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Reduction of congestion was determined using the travel demand model.

Table D-2: Prioritization Criteria – Public Transit

**Public Transit**

All public transit projects must have the support of the service provider (i.e. VOTRAN) and be regionally significant. A public transit facility/service may be considered regionally significant if it is one of the following:

1. is a major transfer station or hub;
2. is a commuter rail station; or,
3. is within 1/2 mile of a major traffic generator/attractor located along a regionally significant road, as defined above; or,
4. provides transit service along a regionally significant road, as defined above.

Criteria	Points	Weights
<b>Congestion</b>		<b>60%</b>
* Projected to meet or exceed minimum passenger trips requirements	3	
* Improves frequency/headway		
>= 100%	10	
75-99%	8	
50-74%	6	
25-49%	4	
<25%	2	
* Increase ridership		
>= 100%	10	
75-99%	8	
50-74%	6	
25-49%	4	
<25%	2	
* Extends weekend/weekday service	2	
* Provides or improves service to a high traffic generators (i.e. shopping center, hospital, university)	5	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>System Coordination</b>		<b>40%</b>
* Link to a transfer center etc.	5	
* Area is dense or has a high concentration of mixed uses within ¼ mile	5	
* Identified in the Transit Development Plan, MPO Priority List, or Comprehensive Plan	5	
* Jurisdiction has implemented Votran's Transit Development Guidelines	5	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Grand Total Maximum Points</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table D-3: Prioritization Criteria – Bicycle/Pedestrian

**Bicycle/Pedestrian**

All bicycle/pedestrian projects must have the support of the maintenance agency and provides direct access to a regionally significant public transit facility.

Criteria	Points	Weights
<b>Proximity</b>		<b>50%</b>
* Proximity to traffic generators in miles		
< ¼	10	
¼ - ½	5	
½ - 1	3	
* Distance from a public school (in miles)		
=< ¼	5	
¼ - ½	3	
½ - 1	2	
1-2	1	

Criteria	Points	Weights
* Proximity to transit facilities		
< ¼	10	
¼ - ½	5	
½ - 1	3	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Connectivity</b>		<b>30%</b>
* Connectivity of segments	5	
* Identified as a BPAC priority	5	
* Feasibility study has been completed	5	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>System Coordination</b>		<b>20%</b>
* Jurisdiction requires bicycle and pedestrian facility provisions with all new development projects	5	
* Jurisdiction implements the MPO Transit Development Guidelines	5	
<b>Total Maximum</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Grand Total Maximum Points</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Chapter 12

# Project Evaluation Criteria

### Introduction

The following project evaluation criteria were developed to help the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) prioritize projects based on limited funding. Criteria was developed for both Highway and Public Transportation projects. The criteria were not developed to be applied unilaterally based solely on quantifiable statistics. The criteria were developed to be used in conjunction with qualitative measures and assessments. Therefore, it was expected that the criteria would be more of a guide than anything else.

### All Projects

1. It was recognized that numerical Evaluation Criteria cannot address the needs of all projects. The intent of the Evaluation Criteria was not to exclude projects that are supportive of the Vision and Goals of the *2025 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)*. Therefore, projects that do not meet the numerical thresholds listed below may still be considered for the *2025 Long Range Transportation Plan*, if those projects meet the qualitative principles established in the Vision and Goals of the Plan. If a proposed project does not meet the minimum thresholds listed below the governmental unit that has maintenance jurisdiction over the proposed project (or the local governmental entity proposing to be the maintaining agency) will need to provide supporting documentation as to how the proposed project supports the Vision and Goals of the *2025 Long Range Transportation Plan*.

### Highway Projects

2. For highway projects (i.e., new roads and roads to be widened) to be included in the Plan, the highway needs to exceed the following thresholds:
  - a. The governmental unit that has maintenance jurisdiction over the road must support the proposed project. If the governmental unit that has maintenance jurisdiction over the road is not in support of the proposed project, said governmental unit must show reasonable cause for its rejection; and
  - b. All governmental units that geographically abut the highway must agree to the proposed improvement, except for all Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS), Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), and SIS Connector system roadways.
3. For a proposed **new** road (i.e., a road that currently does not exist – this also includes the extension of an existing road) to be included in the Plan, the proposed new road needs to have a minimum projected level of traffic of 7,000 vehicles a day for the year 2025, as determined by the current MPO traffic model.
4. For an **existing** road, widened from 2 to 4 lanes, to be included in the Plan, the existing road must exceed the following **two** thresholds:

- a. The existing road, with its current number of 2 lanes, needs to be projected to operate at or below its adopted level-of-service in 2025; and
  - b. The widened road, with its proposed future number of 4 lanes in 2025, needs to have a minimum projected level of traffic of 13,000 vehicles a day for the year 2025, as determined by the current MPO traffic model.
5. For an **existing** road, widened from 4 to 6 lanes, to be included in the Plan, the existing road must exceed the following **two** thresholds:
- a. The existing road, with its current number of 4 lanes, needs to be projected to operate at or below its adopted level-of-service in 2025; and
  - b. The widened road, with its proposed future number of 6 lanes in 2025, needs to have a minimum projected level of traffic of 27,000 vehicles a day for the year 2025, as determined by the current MPO traffic model.
6. For an **existing** road, widened from 6 to 8 lanes, to be included in the Plan, the existing road must exceed the following **two** thresholds:
- a. The existing road, with its current number of 6 lanes, needs to be projected to operate at or below its adopted level-of-service in 2025; and
  - b. The widened road, with its proposed future number of 8 lanes in 2025, needs to have a minimum projected level of traffic of 67,000 vehicles a day for the year 2025, as determined by the current MPO traffic model.
7. For a **new** proposed Interstate Interchange to be included in the Plan, it must exceed the following **three** thresholds:
- a. The proposed Interstate Interchange needs to connect to a two-lane arterial that is at or below its adopted level-of-serve, or connect to a four-lane arterial roadway by 2025;
  - b. The proposed Interstate Interchange needs to connect to an arterial roadway that will have a minimum projected level of traffic of 20,000 vehicles a day for the year 2025, as determined by the current MPO traffic model; and
  - c. The proposed Interstate Interchange needs to meet the State Florida Department of Transportation Interchange spacing requirements. An exception to these standards can be granted if the Interchange can operate in a safe manner without interfering with adjacent Interchanges.

## **Public Transportation Projects**

8. For public transportation projects (i.e., new busses, new bus routes, and commuter rail) to be included in the Plan, Volusia County's public transportation provider Votran must support the proposed project.
9. For a new proposed Bus Route to be included in the Plan, the new proposed Bus Route needs to have a minimum projected farebox recovery of 20% by the Plan horizon year of 2025.
10. For an additional Bus to be added to an existing Bus Route, the additional Bus needs to have at least as many passengers as the average of all other Busses on that route by the Plan horizon year of 2025 (measured in passengers per mile).

11. For Commuter Rail to be included in the Plan, the daily projected ridership for a Commuter Rail system needs to equal or exceed 5,000 person trips per day (system-wide) in 2025.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

---

**The annual average daily traffic volumes (AADT) were developed in the following manner:**

- 2 Lane AADT      The average of all 2 lane roads at the average level-of-service (LOS) “C” volume.
- 4 Lane AADT      The average of all 2 lane road capacities at the maximum LOS “D” volume, which represents the need a local government may experience when it needs to widen a 2 lane road to 4 lanes.
- 6 Lane AADT      The average of all 4 lane road capacities at the maximum LOS “D” volume, which represents the need a local government may experience when it needs to widen a 4 lane road to 6 lanes.
- 8 Lane AADT      The average of all 6 lane road capacities at the maximum LOS “D” volume, which represents the need a local government may experience when it needs to widen a 6 lane road to 8 lanes.

**Avg. Level-of-Service “C” Capacities (AADT’s) for 2 Lane Roads  
Max. Level-of-Service “D” Capacities (AADT’s) for 4-8 Lane Roads**

Urban	Transitioning	Rural - Developed	Rural - Undeveloped
2 lane – 7,000	2 lane – 7,500	2 lane – 8,000	2 lane – 6,000
4 lane – 14,614	4 lane – 12,960	4 lane – 12,933	4 lane – 12,250
6 lane – 30,067	6 lane – 28,300	6 lane – 29,400	6 lane – 23,000
8 lane – 48,000	8 lane – 45,925	8 lane – 87,400*	8 lane – 87,400*

\* only includes Interstate capacities

Average of Urban through Rural Capacities (AADT’s)

- 2 lane – 7,125
- 4 lane – 13,189
- 6 lane – 27,692
- 8 lane – 67,181

**MEETING SUMMARY  
LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 20, 2010**

- IV. STAFF COMMENTS/INFORMATION ITEMS**
  
- V. LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**
  
- VI. PRESS/CITIZEN COMMENTS**
  
- VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Note: Individuals covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in need of accommodations for this public meeting should contact the VTPO office, 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145; (386) 226-0422, extension 21, at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.