

Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)
Meeting Minutes
October 20, 2020

****NOTE: THIS MEETING WAS HELD AS AN ONLINE VIDEO/AUDIO CONFERENCE AS PERMITTED UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDERS 20-69, 20-114, 20-179 and 20-246 (A physical presence was also supported)**

TCC Members Present:

Andrew Holmes
Stewart Cruz
Matt Boerger
Darren Lear
Brian Walker, Vice Chairperson
Rebecca Witte
Becky Mendez, Chairperson
Shawn Finley
Jose Papa
Mark Karet
Aref Joulani
Tim Burman
Jon Cheney
Jake Lunceford
Anna Taylor (non-voting advisor)

TCC Members Absent:

Rodney Lucas
Mike Holmes
Ron Paradise
Brian Peek
Lauren Possinger (excused)
Adam Mengel

Others Present:

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
Colleen Nicoulin
Lois Bollenback
Pam Blankenship
Stephan Harris
Tony Nosse
Chad Lingenfelter

Representing:

Daytona Beach
Daytona Beach Shores
DeBary
Edgewater
Holly Hill
Lake Helen
Orange City
Ormond Beach
Palm Coast
Pierson
Ponce Inlet
Port Orange
V.C. Traffic Engineering
Votran
FDOT District 5

Representing:

Bunnell
DeLand
Deltona
South Daytona
V.C. Emergency Management
F.C. Traffic Engineering

Representing:

TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
FDOT
FDOT

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

Chairperson Mendez called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) to order at 3:00 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present; due to the COVID-19 virus, the meeting was held virtually via GoToMeeting.

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press/citizen comments.

III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of September 15, 2020 TCC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Holmes to approve the September 15, 2020 TCC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walker and carried unanimously.*

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Adopting the Draft R2CTPO FY 2019/20 Public Involvement Activities Summary

Ms. Blankenship stated a presentation of the draft R2CTPO FY 2019/20 Public Involvement Activities Summary was given last month.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Walker to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## adopting the draft R2CTPO FY 2019/20 Public Involvement Activities Summary. The motion was seconded by Mr. Papa and carried unanimously.*

C. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Supporting a PD&E Study of the I-95/LPGA Boulevard Interchange Including the Tomoka River Bridge and Funding Commitment

Ms. Nicoulin stated that as part of the development of the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), improvements to the LPGA Boulevard bridge over the Tomoka River were identified as needed and prioritized in the adopted Cost Feasible Plan. FDOT recently conducted an interchange modification report (IMR) at the I-95/LPGA Boulevard interchange to determine what improvements are needed as a result of increased pressure from growth in the area. It was determined that replacing the two-lane bridge over the Tomoka River is required to implement the recommended improvements at the interchange. In order to include the Tomoka River Bridge as part of the interchange project, a PD&E study is required to be conducted. As directed by the TPO's Executive Committee, this draft resolution provides support for the advancement of a PD&E study at the I-95/LPGA Boulevard interchange including improvements to the Tomoka River Bridge and commits \$250,000 of current year SU funding for this study. In addition to the TPO's support, the city of Daytona Beach, Volusia County and FDOT are also coordinating similar commitments to this project.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Walker to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## supporting a PD&E study of the I-95/LPGA Boulevard interchange including the Tomoka River Bridge and funding commitment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and passed unanimously.*

D. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2020-## Amending the FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Nicoulin stated this TIP amendment was requested by FDOT for two projects; to add \$322,902 for a new railroad crossing safety project in Pierson at West Hagstrom Road; and to add \$2.7 million in additional construction funding for the Graham Swamp Multi-Use Trail and Pedestrian Bridge project in Flagler County. This project is a federally funded Flagler County project that is not on the TPO's priority project list. The funding source for this project includes funds available for allocation through FDOT D-5 in rural areas.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Cheney to recommend approval of Resolution 2020-## amending the FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Papa and passed unanimously.*

IV. Presentation Items

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

Ms. Nicoulin stated at this time of year the TPO reconvenes the TIP Subcommittee and BPAC Project Review Subcommittee to discuss the Call for Projects which ended earlier in the year. They identify any issues that came up as well as any potential changes to the guiding resolutions, project applications and priority process schedule. She reviewed the draft project priority schedule provided in the agenda. The end result of the Call for Projects process is an update to the priority list. Typically, the guiding resolutions and project applications

have been approved in January. The Call for Projects opens at the end of January and closes at the end of March which is approximately 9 weeks. However, the last couple of years, the resolutions and applications were approved in November so instead of waiting until January to open the Call for Projects, the TPO is proposing to open it on December 1, 2020 and close it at the end of February. This will give local member governments approximately 12 weeks to prepare their project applications and also provides an extra month for the subcommittees to review and rank the project applications and for staff to compile a draft priority list. The proposed schedule was presented for discussion at both the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee and TIP Subcommittee meetings, the BPAC meeting last week and the CAC meeting earlier today and there were no objections.

Mr. Cheney commented he is concerned when the notice will be sent as there are no TPO meetings in December and he typically ignores emails from the TPO in December until January. He asked if the opening date for the Call for Projects could be moved to the end of November or immediately following the November TPO Board meeting.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the November TPO Board meeting will be the day before Thanksgiving so the Call for Projects could open the following Monday, November 30, 2020.

Mr. Papa stated he supports moving the date to November 30, 2020 as it gives more time to prepare the applications.

Chairperson Mendez stated the TCC's recommendation is to move the opening date of the annual Call for Projects to November 30, 2020.

Ms. Nicoulin reviewed the proposed changes to the first guiding resolution which defines the local match requirements placed on member governments. A change is being proposed for paragraph 1 that indicates a minimum match of 10% but local governments can pledge a higher percentage to receive more points. This same language is also shown in paragraph 2 so the proposed change provides consistency. There are also proposed changes to paragraph 5, which references paragraphs 1 and 2; previously it only referenced paragraph 2 so paragraph 1 is added. Also, it adds language stating that if a higher local match is committed, they are expected to provide that amount. The other change is to paragraph 13 to provide consistency throughout the three guiding resolutions as the same sentence is included in all three resolutions.

Ms. Nicoulin continued to review the next resolution which reaffirms the policy for establishing and maintaining transportation priority projects. The change is to paragraph 13 which requires the local governments to provide updated cost estimates annually; language is being added to this resolution that identifies that updated costs are for all unfunded phases of a project on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) list, Tier A and Tier B. If a phase or project is already programmed it is subject to the cost overrun policy. It has been noticed that updated cost estimates are sometimes provided for projects that are already programmed in FDOT's Work Program; if a project is already programmed, the cost estimate update is not accepted. If there is an increase in cost, it is considered a request for additional funding. She noted a small amendment was also made to paragraph 15; that particular sentence is in all three resolutions and was amended to maintain consistency.

Ms. Nicoulin continued to review the proposed changes to the third guiding resolution which establishes the policy for the annual allocation of SU funding. The title references the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and will be updated to reference the 2045 LRTP. In the third "whereas" clause and paragraph 1, the Surface Transportation Program has been rescinded and replaced by the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. Paragraph 3 discusses mixed projects which are defined as projects that are not stand-alone bicycle or pedestrian projects. This year during the Call for Projects, three separate bridge project applications were submitted in both the bicycle/pedestrian and traffic operations categories because they contained components of both. There were concerns during the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee and TIP Subcommittee meetings regarding the scoring those projects; members did not feel the applications were designed for those types of projects. She reviewed the proposed change to the mixed-use project policy and stated the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee agreed the bicycle/pedestrian cost component of a mixed-use project should be greater than 50% and the TIP Subcommittee agreed on 20%. The CAC met prior to this meeting and approved a motion that

20% of a project needed to be bicycle/pedestrian related before receiving funding from the bicycle/pedestrian set aside.

Mr. Papa asked if once discussion is finished regarding this resolution if he could ask a question regarding the previous resolution.

Chairperson Mendez replied yes and asked if members had any questions regarding this particular resolution.

Mr. Cheney suggested splitting the difference and going with 35%.

Ms. Nicoulin replied it is important to note that almost all traffic operations projects have some sort of bicycle/pedestrian component associated with them but very rarely do bicycle/pedestrian projects have a traffic operations component. The TPO is trying to decide what threshold of a project should be bicycle/pedestrian related before receiving bicycle/pedestrian funding. Most bicycle/pedestrian components of a project are not going to be 50%; if it is set lower, we need to be cautious because most traffic operations projects have some bicycle/pedestrian component. If the bicycle/pedestrian component does not meet the threshold, all of the funding will come from traffic operations.

Mr. Cheney asked if FDOT has any historical information that could assist with a decision.

Ms. Nicoulin replied she does not know if they have that kind of breakdown. This past year, the TPO received three bridge projects that were mixed use projects. One of those was the Saul Street Bridge over Reed Canal submitted by South Daytona which identified the multi-use trail component at 43% and the traffic operations component was 57%. She noted this will be presented to the TPO Board next week and will be back for action in November.

Mr. Cheney asked if the other two bridge projects had similar cost breakdowns.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the other two bridge projects were in New Smyrna Beach and she does not recall them providing that breakdown. She asked if Mr. Fegley had any information.

Mr. Fegley replied he is inclined to go with the lower percentage of 20% because usually bicycle/pedestrian improvements are less than the capital improvements, especially for a bridge. They only added a 5' wide pedestrian walkway on the 5th Street Bridge which is approximately 20% of the overall project cost. It will be hard to get a bicycle/pedestrian component higher than 25% of the overall cost.

Chairperson Mendez stated Mr. Cheney recommended 35% and she also heard 20%.

Mr. Cheney stated he would be fine with 25%.

Chairperson Mendez asked if Mr. Papa could now ask his question regarding the previous resolution.

Mr. Papa stated his question is specific to paragraph 13 of the previous resolution and asked what the difference is between a cost increase and a cost overrun and which is an expansion of a project.

Ms. Nicoulin replied a cost overrun is considered to be an expansion of a project and a cost increase is something that is attributed to the market. A cost overrun is something the project sponsor should have foreseen or it could be a change in scope.

Mr. Papa asked if when updated cost estimates are provided each year will they be considered requests for additional funding and if the application is opened back up for rescoring. He is unsure what the intent here is.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the intent is to clarify that when local governments provide updated cost estimates, they are for any unfunded projects on Tier B or any unfunded phases of projects on Tier A; these are not considered

requests for additional funding. It becomes a request for additional funding if the project or phase is already programmed in the Work Program.

Discussion continued.

Chairperson Mendez asked if members had any comments regarding the percentage for a mixed-use project.

Mr. Joulani stated from his perspective, he definitely would look at a higher percentage; he would accept 35% at a minimum. The lower percentage does not make sense on bigger projects.

Chairperson Mendez commented she is having a hard time understanding the significance of this and asked if this could be brought back next month with examples of how it would impact real life projects.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the resolutions and project applications will be brought back next month for action and at that time she can identify real life examples. The only project examples we have now that have been submitted and broken down are the three bridge projects from this year's Call for Projects.

Chairperson Mendez suggested looking at projects that have been completed how it would have affected the budget and funding of those projects if this policy had been in place.

Mr. Cheney asked if the two Volusia County overpass trail projects could be included in that example and if a pedestrian overpass is considered a bicycle/pedestrian project.

Ms. Nicoulin replied yes, they are considered to be bicycle/pedestrian projects. She does not know if past projects that have both components have been broken down as to what cost was attributed to bicycle/pedestrian components or traffic operations components. The only ones she knows of are the ones received this year; the city of South Daytona broke it down when they submitted their application because they had undergone a feasibility study that was broken down in that way. Staff can dig a little deeper to see if any additional information is available. She noted that other types of projects that could be considered mixed-use projects are Complete Streets projects which could have both bicycle/pedestrian components and traffic operations components. There is currently a Complete Streets project on both lists; the North Nova Road corridor improvement project north of Granada Boulevard. Additionally, the East International Speedway Boulevard corridor improvement project; when these projects were submitted, there was no threshold and thus both projects were submitted and adopted on both the bicycle/pedestrian and traffic operations project lists.

Chairperson Mendez asked if a mixed-use project could be a Complete Streets project, why a threshold is needed. She asked why it could not be submitted as a mixed-use project and require the project sponsor to provide a cost breakdown for what is attributed to bicycle/pedestrian and to traffic operations.

Ms. Nicoulin replied that when these projects were received, the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee had a difficult time with the applications; they felt all three bridge projects should be funded through the traffic operations set aside even though each project had percentages that were bicycle/pedestrian components. They did not initially score those projects but had to reconvene to score them. The TPO is not requiring projects to be submitted as mixed-use projects but is offering if projects do have components of both and the bicycle/pedestrian component is significant enough, to be able to access bicycle/pedestrian funding. The question is what that threshold should be in order to access bicycle/pedestrian set aside funding. She reminded members the TPO receives approximately \$5.5 million per year in SU funding of which 40% is for traffic operations, 30% is for bicycle/pedestrian and 30% for transit. That amount most likely will decrease so depending on the overall cost of a project, there may not be enough money in the traffic operations box to fully fund it; therefore, this resolution language provides the ability to use bicycle/pedestrian funds for that component.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Nicoulin referred to the project applications and stated the criteria and points scoring remain unchanged. However, TPO staff is in the process of reformatting the applications to meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and to be able to be read by a document reader so the appearance may be different but the content and criteria will remain unchanged. She noted that FDOT has adopted new Local Agency Program (LAP) guidelines with funding thresholds for different project phases; all projects submitted through the Call for Projects; projects are required to have a minimum of \$250,000 for design, right-of-way and construction phases. The Call for Projects was already underway when the new guidelines were issued and a few project applications did not meet this threshold so the TIP Subcommittee will be working with those project sponsors to resubmit those projects as a bundle to meet that minimum threshold. New projects that are submitted must meet the minimum threshold requirements or be bundled. The only other change, which was discussed earlier at the CAC meeting, is for Criterion 1, the federal functional classification of a road will be completed by TPO staff because local governments do not always classify a road the same as on the federal level

Mr. Cheney referred to the discussion that just occurred regarding mixed-use projects and suggested adding a box to check to indicate if the project being submitted is a mixed-use project. He asked also if it is a bridge project, to have project sponsors indicate what the FDOT bridge index is because under a certain level, the federal government will pay for it automatically and make any ADA or multi-modal improvements. If a bridge is under a certain level of sufficiency it will automatically be replaced. Whereas if it has a high sufficiency or index, what the problem is; that will help the subcommittee members when ranking the projects.

Ms. Nicoulin agreed.

B. Presentation and Discussion of Mobility Week's "Love to Ride" Challenge

Ms. Blankenship gave a PowerPoint presentation on Mobility Week's "Love to Ride" Florida challenge. FDOT's Mobility Week is the statewide celebration of making smart, efficient and safe transportation choices. This year Mobility Week will be held October 30, 2020 through November 6, 2020 and it will be virtual; FDOT will host a virtual conference center where attendees can check out plans and programs from across the state. The TPO will also have some recently completed plans and projects on display. This year, the "Love to Ride" challenge is a fun, free, statewide competition for individuals and organizations that is designed to get more people riding bikes. It kicks off with Mobility Week on October 30, 2020 and runs through November 30, 2020. The website to access the program and register for the event is www.lovetoride.net/florida. She noted you must be 13 years or older to participate in the challenge. She explained the purpose of the challenge, how it works and reviewed the prizes and incentives. The TPO's goal is 20% participation from its advisory committees and board and to log 1,200 miles total. She encouraged members to register as part of the TPO and to spread the word to their friends and family.

B. FDOT Report

The FDOT report was provided in the agenda.

Ms. Taylor announced FDOT has resumed public meetings; they are using a hybrid platform of in-person and virtual. They hosted public meetings for the East International Speedway Boulevard roundabout project as well as the Pioneer Trail roundabout project this month. FDOT D-5 has announced its FY 2022/26 Work Program public hearing will be held December 7, 2020 through December 11, 2020 with an in-person public meeting on December 10, 2020. They are finalizing the details and she will share them as they become available.

C. Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports

The Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports were provided in the agenda.

Mr. Cheney referred to the Volusia County Construction Report and noted Project 14, Old Mission Road, is currently being advertised for design. Probably in the future, the county will partner with FDOT's PD&E study on Project 12, the LPGA Boulevard widening project as part of the I-95/LPGA Boulevard interchange and Tomoka River Bridge project; the project limits will be from Tymber Creek Road to I-95.

V. Staff Comments

Ms. Nicoulin stated the TPO has been operating under a virtual platform since March; we have been able to do so through an executive order from the Governor which is set to expire November 1, 2020. It is not expected to be extended again which means in order to conduct an official meeting, we will need to have a physical quorum; 11 members for the TCC. The TPO will ask for 11 members to attend in person plus one to ensure a physical quorum is met. The TPO is looking to hold hybrid meetings and have the minimum number of members for a physical quorum plus one and other members attend virtually. Staff will be reaching out to TCC members to identify those who are able to attend in person and those who need to attend virtually. The TPO will be conforming to social distancing guidelines and mask requirements. The TPO will be updating its bylaws to identify how these hybrid meetings will work; updates will be presented to the Executive Committee and the TPO Board in November.

Ms. Nicoulin referred to the information items provided in the agenda, the TSM&O Coalition Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and stated it is a coalition along the I-4 corridor. It is intended to identify projects or strategies specifically along the I-4 corridor working with the different government agencies from the west coast to the east coast. MetroPlan Orlando received a grant to form this coalition and the intent is to provide an opportunity for agencies to share ideas, experiences and education as we move forward into new technology.

VI. TCC Member Comments

There were no member comments.

VII. Information Items

- CAC & TCC Attendance Records
- September 25, 2020 River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
- September 2020 TPO Outreach and Events
- 2021 R2CTPO Meeting Schedule
- TSM&O Coalition Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the TCC meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION



MS. BECKY MENDEZ, CHAIRPERSON
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)

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 the minutes of the October 20, 2020 regular meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), approved and duly signed this 17th day of November 2020.



DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION