



MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (VTPO) **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC)** will be meeting on:

DATE: Wednesday, November 14, 2012

TIME: 3:00 PM

PLACE: Volusia TPO
2570 W. International Speedway Blvd.,
Suite 100 (Conference Room)
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145

Mr. Michael Chuven, Chairman

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) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 10, 2012 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
(*Contact: Stephan C. Harris*) (*Enclosure, pages 3-10*)
 - B) REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT URBAN ATTRIBUTABLE (XU) BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECT PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND SCORING CRITERIA
(*Contact: Stephan C. Harris*) (*Enclosure, pages 11-18*)
 - C) REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A REQUIRED LOCAL MATCH FOR URBAN ATTRIBUTABLE (XU) BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS
(*Contact: Stephan C. Harris*) (*Enclosure, page 19*)
 - D) REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2012-XX AMENDING THE FY 2012/13 TO FY 2016/17 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
(*Contact: Robert Keeth*) (*Enclosure, pages 20-24*)

III. ACTION ITEMS *(continued)*

- E) CANCELLATION OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2012 BPAC MEETING** *(Contact: Michael Chuven) (Enclosure, page 25)*

IV. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A) PRESENTATION ON BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN SAFETY: AWARD-WINNING PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS CREATED BY STUDENTS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY SCHOOLS** *(Contact: Greg Akin, Volusia County Schools) (Enclosure, page 26)*

- B) DISCUSSION OF THE BPAC'S ROLE IN RANKING TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROJECT APPLICATIONS** *(Contact: Stephan C. Harris) (Enclosure, page 27)*

V. STAFF COMMENTS *(Enclosure, page 28)*

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS *(Enclosures, pages 28-44)*

- **BPAC Attendance Record**
- **FHWA Transportation Alternatives Interim Guidance**
- **Walking School Bus Workshop Flyer**

VII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS *(Enclosure, page 28)*

VIII. ADJOURNMENT *(Enclosure, page 28)*

*****The next BPAC meeting will be on Wednesday, January 9, 2013*****

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

NOTE: If any person decides to appeal a decision made by this committee with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings including all testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. To that end, such person will want to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

III. Action Items

A) Review and Approval of October 10, 2012 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Background Information:

Minutes are prepared for each meeting and must be approved by the BPAC. The October 10, 2012 BPAC meeting minutes are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

Action Requested:

Motion to approve the October 10, 2012 BPAC meeting minutes

Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
Meeting Minutes
October 10, 2012

Members Present:

Holly Idler
John Schmitz
Rani Merens
Tim Bustos
Sandra Mason
Nick Mostert
Bob Storke, Vice Chair
Phyllis Campbell
Colleen Nicoulin
Jason Aufdenberg
Mike Chuven, Chair
William "Bill" Pouzar

Non-Voting Technical Appointees Present:

Joan Carter
Wendy Hickey
William "Bill" McCord
Helen LaValley
Melissa Winsett
Heather Blanck

Members/Technical Appointees Absent:

Michelle Grenham (excused)
Jim Mascola
A.J. Devies (excused)
Amanda Vandermaelen

Others Present:

Lois Bollenback
Pamela Blankenship, Recording Secretary
Stephan Harris
Jean Parlow
Jesse Clark
Jose Papa

Representing:

Daytona Beach
Daytona Beach Shores
DeBary
DeLand
Flagler Beach
Holly Hill
Orange City
Ponce Inlet
Port Orange
Volusia County, At-Large
Volusia County, At-Large
Volusia County, District 5

Representing:

FDOT, District 5
Orange City
Port Orange
Volusia County School Board
Volusia County Traffic Engineering
Votran

Representing:

Edgewater
Ormond Beach
Volusia County, District 2
Volusia County Parks, Rec. & Culture

Representing:

TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
Volusia County Schools
Palm Coast

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

The meeting of the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Chairperson Michael Chuven. The roll was called and it was determined that there was a quorum.

II. Public Comment/Participation

Ms. Linda Richards, resident of Deltona, stated that she was visually impaired and requested audible (accessible) pedestrian signals at the intersections of Providence Boulevard/Doyle Road and Deltona Boulevard/Cloverleaf Boulevard.

Mr. Chuven responded Rani Merens is the BPAC representative in the city nearest to Deltona. Mr. Chuven stated the BPAC can check to see if the intersections are on a list of planned improvements.

Mr. Harris stated he would follow up with Ms. Richards regarding this request.

III. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of September 12, 2012 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Mr. Chuven stated the minutes should be corrected by changing the word “trial” to “trail.”

Mr. McCord stated he should be marked as “excused” in the September 2012 BPAC attendance record. Ms. Blankenship responded that it has been corrected.

MOTION: A motion to approve the amended September 12, 2012 BPAC meeting minutes was made by Ms. Mason. The motion was seconded by Ms. Merens and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Task 4.04

Mr. Harris stated UPWP Task 4.04 is the Pedestrian Crosswalk Safety Program. The task has been amended to reflect an award of \$52,500 in Highway Safety Funds from FDOT. The VTPO anticipates that only a portion of the grant amount will be spent on consultants from the Center for Education and Research in Safety. A portion of the grant amount will likely be spent on participating police agencies. A portion of the grant will be spent on improved pedestrian crossing signage. The UPWP has been revised to remove the list of cities participating in the program, as this is subject to change depending on the availability of cities to provide police officers for the workshops and field enforcement operations. The goals of the Pedestrian Crosswalk Safety Program

remain the same: encouraging motorists to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks and encouraging pedestrians to use crosswalks.

Ms. Nicoulin asked if the field enforcement operations would be conducted during school hours and in school areas. Mr. Harris responded that the operations in Orange City were focused in the school walk zones. Going forward, the safety campaign will address all pedestrians in general. Although crosswalk locations have not been identified, some of them are likely to be in school zones.

Mr. Chuven asked about the criteria for selecting crosswalk locations. Mr. Harris responded the crosswalk locations will be selected using input from the police agencies, Volusia Community Traffic Safety Teams, BPAC, consultants and the Bicycle & Pedestrian School Safety Review Studies.

Mr. McCord asked how the grant funds will be used for police agencies. Mr. Harris responded the grant funds can be used to reimburse the police agencies for overtime. Mr. McCord asked if BPAC members should contact their respective police agencies. Mr. Harris responded no, since the VTPO has already been in contact with the police agencies.

Mr. Mostert asked who determines the allocation of the grant funds. Mr. Harris responded the grant funds must be spent according to a budget approved by FDOT, VTPO and the consultant. This will be similar to the Best Foot Forward Pedestrian Safety Campaign in the Orlando area.

MOTION: *A motion to recommend approval of draft UPWP Task 4.04 was made by Mr. Storke. The motion was seconded by Ms. Campbell and carried unanimously.*

Review and Recommend Approval of the Amended Volusia TPO Budget

Mr. Harris stated the VTPO budget has been amended to include the \$52,500 in Highway Safety Funds from FDOT for the Pedestrian Crosswalk Safety Program.

Ms. Mason asked about the dates of the fiscal year. Mr. Harris responded the state fiscal year is from July 1st to June 30th and the federal fiscal year (which applies to FDOT Highway Safety Funds) is from October 1st to September 30th.

MOTION: *A motion to recommend approval of the amended Volusia TPO budget was made by Ms. Mason. The motion was seconded by Mr. Storke and carried unanimously.*

C. Appointment of TIP Subcommittee Members

Mr. Harris stated the TIP subcommittee currently includes Ms. Devies and Mr. Chuven. At least three representatives from the BPAC are preferred. The TIP subcommittee will be working on the scoring criteria for Transportation Alternatives funding and preparing for the 2013 Call for Projects.

Ms. Bollenback stated the new transportation act, MAP-21, changes the Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program to the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program. At one time, the VTPO Board restricted the TE program to Bicycle/Pedestrian projects, which was later opened up to other eligible TE projects. Under the TA Program, 50% is allocated statewide and 50% is allocated to planning areas, such as the VTPO's, based on population. The TIP Subcommittee, like the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee, reviews project applications and makes decisions on project priorities. If the BPAC has several volunteers, someone is likely to attend the TIP Subcommittee when one person is absent.

[Ms. Mason and Mr. Mostert volunteered for the TIP Subcommittee.]

MOTION: *A motion to appoint Ms. Mason and Mr. Mostert to the TIP Subcommittee was made by Ms. Campbell. The motion was seconded by Ms. Merens and carried unanimously.*

IV. Presentations and Discussion Items

A. Presentation on Volusia County Schools Safety Initiatives Program

Mr. Clark, Assistant Director of Volusia County Schools Student Transportation Services, stated a safety campaign was started last October to address the issues of students involved in accidents while traveling to and from schools. The safety campaign is a partnership involving the Volusia County Sheriff's Office, Volusia County Health Department, FDOT and other agencies. Memberships on committees such as the School Crossing Guards and Hazardous Walking Conditions have been established. The immediate goal of the program is to focus on safety messages to the students. Public Service Announcements promoting safety have been distributed to the schools. A safety awareness poster contest has been completed and [the contestants] will have their projects presented to the School Board at the next meeting. A long range goal is to include a sustainable safety campaign to promote walking and biking to school. Safety pamphlets have been produced and distributed to students in the schools. Accident reports involving students are tracked and analyzed. Most of the accidents have involved middle and high school students from Monday to Thursday.

Mr. Chuven stated the project applications used by the VTPO require approval from Volusia County Schools Student Transportation Services for projects in hazardous walk zone areas. Mr. Chuven asked how the Bicycle & Pedestrian School Safety Review Study

was being used. Mr. Harris responded documentation of pedestrian/bicycle crashes from the study has been used by the Safety Initiatives Program.

Ms. Merens asked if accidents were caused by students or drivers. Mr. Clark responded accidents were caused by both students and drivers.

Ms. Winsett stated most crashes involving students and cars are caused by the students [according to Volusia County Crash data].

Mr. Bustos stated there is a trend of blaming victims. Police do not always capture all of the crash information in their reports.

Mr. McCord stated the Herbert Street Sidewalk will be funded for construction this year.

Dr. Aufdenberg stated he provides presentations to hundreds of elementary school children each year and offered his assistance.

B. Presentation on Public Bicycle Sharing Programs in South Florida

Mr. Harris stated bicycle sharing is a way to rent bicycles for short term trips between bicycle stations, which are self-contained. Many of the stations are solar powered and allow users to rent bicycles using a credit card. A typical bicycle used in bicycle sharing systems is standardized with a heavy duty frame and low maintenance equipment. Bicycle Sharing Programs are operating in Miami Beach (DECOBIKE) and Broward County (B-Cycle).

[Videos featuring DECOBIKE and B-Cycle Programs were shown.]

Mr. Harris stated a regional bicycle sharing working group has been formed by the MetroPlan Orlando BPAC and meets monthly in Orlando. Bicycle sharing is coming to SunRail stations in Winter Park and Orlando.

Mr. Chuven stated Volusia County is not designed to accommodate bicycle sharing programs.

Ms. Merens asked how much does the bicycle rental cost (beyond the first half hour, which is normally free). Ms. Merens verified that a B-Cycle membership for 7 days is \$25, one year is \$45, 24-hour pass is \$5, and ½ hour is \$3 with a maximum of \$65 daily.

Mr. Mostert stated the beachside may be a viable area for bicycle sharing.

Mr. McCord asked how theft is handled. Mr. Harris responded all bicycles are equipped with GPS, some of them have integrated locks and all of them have adapters that secure

bicycles to the stations. Mr. Bustos added that the bicycles have non-standard designs and parts to deter theft.

Ms. Blankenship stated the replacement cost for a bicycle is \$800.

V. Staff Comments

Mr. Harris thanked Ms. Nicoulin for her help at the VTPO booth during the Port Orange Family Days Festival.

[TIP Amendments to be considered by the TPO Board were distributed to the BPAC.]

VI. Information Items

VII. BPAC Member Comments

Dr. Aufdenberg stated bicycle lanes are incomplete along US 1 near ISB.

Ms. Winsett stated Volusia County coordinates requests for audible pedestrian signals with mobility specialists.

Ms. Blanck stated new Votran bus signs are being installed across the county. The Wings and Waves event is expected to slow down bus service.

Ms. Idler stated an accessible pedestrian signal will be installed at the intersection of Dunn Avenue and White Street.

Mr. Storke stated the Orange City Police Department has conducted over 60 field enforcement operations at crosswalks.

Mr. Bustos stated the Florida Bicycle Association continues to fund the Best Foot Forward pedestrian safety campaign in Orlando. New Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Law Enforcement Guides are available. Flashing red lights are now legal to use on bicycles in Florida.

Ms. Carter stated 85 schools registered for International Walk to School Day in FDOT, District 5. Audible and accessible pedestrian signals are different. Accessible pedestrian signals are completely ADA compliant and cost between \$20,000 and \$50,000. Twenty-one (21) intersections are being studied for accessible pedestrian signal equipment in the area.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Volusia Transportation Planning Organization

Mr. Michael Chuven, Chairman

Bicycle /Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the Volusia TPO certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the October 10, 2012 regular meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), approved and duly signed this 14th day of November 2012.

Pamela Blankenship, Recording Secretary

Volusia Transportation Planning Organization

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

III. Action Items

B) Review and Recommend Approval of the Draft Urban Attributable (XU) Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Proposal Requirements and Scoring Criteria

Background Information:

The 2013 draft Urban Attributable (XU) Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Proposal Requirements and Scoring Criteria were reviewed by the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee at their November 7, 2012 meeting and are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

Action Requested:

Motion to recommend approval of the draft XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Proposal Requirements and Scoring Criteria



2013 Application for Project Prioritization

XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

January 2013

General Instructions:

For the 2013 Call for Projects, the VTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

Applicants must use the attached VTPO XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Project application form whether applying for a Feasibility Study or for Project Implementation.

No project will advance beyond a Feasibility Study unless the VTPO 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.

When applying for prioritization of a Feasibility Study or for Project Implementation, you must complete the entire application. Information that was provided previously in an application for Feasibility Study must be updated to reflect findings and recommendations from the completed Feasibility Study.

Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

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 *Volusia TPO's 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.

Is this Sidewalk project at least 5 feet wide?

- If **Yes** – the project is eligible.
- If **No** – the project application is not acceptable.

Funding Requirements:

VTPO Resolution 2011-03 requires a local match of ten percent (10%) of the total amount of XU funds programmed for each project. For this purpose, local match is defined as non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services that advance the project. The local match for feasibility studies can only be satisfied with a non-federal cash match. This resolution also reaffirms the VTPO's policy that the applicant (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with XU funds unless the project is on

the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns. Projects whose sponsors are willing and able to provide a local match **greater than 10%** will be awarded additional points.

Project applications submitted for bicycle/pedestrian funds that contain more than a strictly bicycle/pedestrian component (i.e. roadway improvements, bridge replacements, etc.) may be funded in part with XU funds. The limitations are as follows: a maximum of 10% of the total project cost may be funded with bicycle/pedestrian XU funds, but that amount MAY NOT exceed 10% of the total annual allotment of bicycle/pedestrian XU funds. These projects will be ranked separately and only the top two (2) projects will be recommended for funding in a given year. All project applications are subject to approval by the Volusia TPO Board.

Project Application 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 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.

VTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an
application to any member local government that
requests it.



2013 Application for Project Prioritization

XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (project sponsor): _____

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.]

Is the Applicant Local Agency Program (LAP) certified to administer the proposed project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Applicant is not LAP certified, explain how you intend to comply with the LAP requirements: _____

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): _____

The Applicant is requesting (check only one): ☐ Feasibility Study ☐ Project Implementation

[If requesting a Feasibility Study, the Applicant will be required to submit a new application for Project Implementation after the Feasibility Study has been completed. If requesting Project Implementation, attach a copy of the completed Feasibility Study, or explain in the space provided below for commentary why a Feasibility Study is not necessary.]

Commentary: _____

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.

Commentary: _____

STOP HERE IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A FEASIBILITY STUDY. COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS ONLY IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.

Criteria Summary:

Priority Criteria	Points
(1) Proximity to Community Assets	30
(2) Connectivity	30
(3) Safety	25
(4) Public Support/Special Considerations	5
(5) Local Matching Funds > 10%	10
(6) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary)	variable
Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)	100

Criterion #1 – Proximity to Community Assets (30 points max.)

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 30 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: a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Path projects or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalk projects.

Proximity to Community Assets	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Residential developments, apartments, community housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
School bus stop	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Maximum Point Assessment		30

Criterion #1 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #2 – Connectivity (30 points max.)

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.

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 document.

Network Connectivity	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"/>	10
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g., comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		30

Criterion #2 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #3 – Safety (25 points max.)

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 number of safety concerns.

List and describe whether the proposed facility is located within a “hazardous walk/bike zone” and provide documentation that illustrates how bicycle or pedestrian safety could be enhanced by the construction of this facility.

Safety	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. If applicable, provide documentation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	15
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. 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		25

Criterion #3 Description (if needed): _____

For more information, contact Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services.

Criterion #4 – Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points max.)

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	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 #4 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #5 – Local Matching Funds > 10% (10 points max.)

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

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?		
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 #5 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #6 – Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the five 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.

**Volusia TPO
2013 Priority Process for
XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects**

1. Local government submits project(s)
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for feasibility studies or project implementation
3. TPO requests a Fee Proposal from consultant to perform a feasibility study
4. TPO schedules a scoping meeting with the consultant and local government
5. Consultant provides Fee Proposal to TPO
6. 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.)
7. TPO gives the consultant a Notice to Proceed on the feasibility study
8. Draft feasibility study is reviewed and approved by the TPO and local government
9. Final feasibility study is completed
10. Local government gives the TPO an “unofficial” go-ahead for their project, based on the cost from the feasibility study and submits a project letter of commitment to the TPO
11. FDOT (i.e., Special Projects Coordinator) conducts a field review of the project
12. FDOT schedules an intake meeting with the local government, TPO and FDOT staff to review the project
13. TPO coordinates with FDOT to program the project in the next available fiscal year of the FDOT Work Program
14. Construction of top ranked project: 2-4 years

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

III. Action Items

C) Review and Recommend Approval of a Required Local Match for Urban Attributable (XU) Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Background Information:

Most federal-aid highway projects are funded with a maximum 80% federal contribution and require a 20% state and/or local match to supplement the federal funds. This includes projects funded with federal Urban Attributable (XU) funds. For projects located on the state highway system, matching funds are provided by FDOT. For projects not on the state highway system, the match is split between FDOT and the local government.

The Volusia TPO requires a 10% local match for federal XU funds, which covers whatever portion of the federally mandated match that may not be covered by FDOT. Initially, the TPO required a 50% local match. It was later reduced to 25%, then to 15%. In January 2011, the local match was further reduced to 10% by Resolution 2011-03 (as amended).

Volusia TPO staff asks that the BPAC reaffirm the current 10% local match requirement or recommend an alternative. The BPAC Project Review Subcommittee recommended retaining the current 10% local match requirement at their November 7, 2012 meeting.

Action Requested:

Motion to recommend approval of a required local match for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian projects

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

III. Action Items

- D) Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2012-XX Amending the FY 2012/13 to FY 2016/17 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Background Information:

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) identifies all federal and state funded transportation projects that are scheduled for implementation in the Volusia TPO planning area during the designated fiscal years.

Resolution 2012-XX and corresponding amendments proposed for the FY 2012/13 - 2016/17 TIP are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

Action Requested:

Motion to recommend approval of Resolution 2012-XX amending the FY 2012/13 to FY 2016/17 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

VOLUSIA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION 2012-XX

RESOLUTION OF THE VOLUSIA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AMENDING THE FY 2012/13 TO FY 2016/17 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

WHEREAS, the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for Volusia County and the cities of Beverly Beach and Flagler Beach in Flagler County; and

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that the urbanized area, as a condition to the receipt of federal capital or operating assistance, 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 Volusia TPO shall annually endorse and amend as appropriate, the plans and programs required by 23 C.F.R. 450.300 through 450.324, among which is the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Volusia TPO's adopted TIP is required to be consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation's adopted Five-Year Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Department of Transportation has programmed additional projects and/or project phases in the Five-Year Work Program which must now be added to the TIP for consistency.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Volusia TPO that the:

1. Volusia TPO's FY 2012/13 to FY 2016/17 TIP is hereby amended by adding new projects and/or project phases as shown in Attachment A, attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and the
2. Chairman of the Volusia TPO (or his designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit the FY 2012/13 to FY 2016/17 TIP as amended to the:
 - a. Florida Department of Transportation;
 - b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation);
 - c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and the
 - d. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) (through the Orlando Airport District Office).

Volusia TPO
Resolution 2012-XX
Page 2

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the Volusia TPO held on the 27th day of November 2012.

VOLUSIA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

**CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
CHAIRMAN, VOLUSIA TPO**

CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the Volusia TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the Volusia TPO held on November 27, 2012.

ATTEST:

**PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP, RECORDING SECRETARY
VOLUSIA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

4330391

Volusia County Schools Bicycle Safety Training

Non-SIS

Map

Unavailable

Work Summary: SAFETY PROJECT

From: County-wide

To:

Trans System: NON-SYSTEM
SPECIFIC

Jursidiction: Volusia County Public
School District

Phase	Fund Source	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total
OPS	SR2E	55,000	0	0	0	0	55,000
OPS	DIOH	2,420	0	0	0	0	2,420
Total		57,420	0	0	0	0	57,420

Project Description:

The requested funds will provide for purchase of safety supplies, equipment, and training including cones, signs, reflective book bags, helmets, reflective wrist/arm bands, bike bells, head/tail lights, 50 bicycles, stipends for teachers, and two (2) utility cargo trailers. Funds will also provide for cost of moving the cargo trailer between schools and maintenance. The safety program will support 14 middle schools and 45 elementary schools. Middle school and elementary school physical education teachers will be trained in the Florida Traffic and Bicycle Safety Education program. Total project cost \$57,420.

NEW PROJECT

Candidate-2012-7

2040 Long Range Transportation Plan

Non-SIS

Map
Unavailable

Work Summary: TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING

From:

To:

Trans System: NON-SYSTEM
SPECIFIC

Jurisdiction:

Volusia TPO

Phase	Fund Source	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total
PLN	PL	22,725	42,515	0	0	0	65,240
PLN	LF	1,035	0	0	0	0	1,035
PLN	XU (SU)	390,000	0	0	0	0	390,000
PLN		1,035	0	0	0	0	1,035
PLN	FTA	0	8,273	0	0	0	8,273
Total		414,795	50,788	0	0	0	465,583

Project Description:

Develop a 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan for the Volusia TPO's planning area in compliance with applicable state and federal requirements. VTPO staff will manage the project, carry-out a public involvement process, coordinate with FDOT to update the Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM) including review of network and socioeconomic input data, develop revenue forecasts, and develop a scope of work for consultant support. The VTPO will utilize a consultant to assist in completion of required activities and documents. The project is expected to be completed in September 2015. The estimated total project cost is \$465,583.

Adopted 6/26/12; amended 10/23/12

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

III. Action Items

E) Cancellation of the December 12, 2012 BPAC meeting

Background Information:

Traditionally, if there is no outstanding business which needs to be conducted before the end of the calendar year, none of the TPO Committees meet during the month of December. This tends to be a busy month for committee members who are preparing for the holidays.

Action Requested:

Motion to cancel the December 12, 2012 BPAC meeting

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

IV. Presentations and Discussion Items

A) Presentation on Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety: Award-Winning Public Service Announcements Created by Students in Volusia County Schools

Background Information:

As part of their Safety Initiatives Campaign, Volusia County Schools held a contest for creating Public Service Announcement (PSA) Videos at the beginning of the school year. The contest was open to high school students enrolled in video production classes. The theme of the PSA Video was: "There's no APP for Patience. Patience Can Save a Life."

First Place

PSA Video produced by: Alicia Zurita and Sydni Munizzi

From: University High School (Mr. Neal, Principal and Mr. Kells, TV Production Teacher)

Second Place

PSA Video produced by: Jacob Ruston, Robert Gunn and Emily Rugusa

From: University High School (Mr. Neal, Principal and Mr. Kells, TV Production Teacher)

Third Place

PSA Video produced by: Allyson Graham, Gabriella Maltoni, Alyssa McGough and Allison Snyder

From: University High School (Mr. Neal, Principal and Mr. Kells, TV Production Teacher)

Congratulations to all of the Safety Contest participants!

Action Requested:

No action is required unless otherwise directed by the BPAC

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

IV. Presentations and Discussion Items

B) Discussion of the BPAC'S Role in Ranking Transportation Alternatives Project Applications

Background Information:

From 2005 to 2009, the BPAC was involved in ranking bicycle/pedestrian projects funded with Urban Attributable (XU) and Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. In 2010, the Volusia TPO expanded eligibility requirements for TE funds to include several other categories of non-bicycle/pedestrian projects. As a result, the ranking of project applications for TE funds was assigned to the TIP subcommittee. The TIP subcommittee consists of representatives from the BPAC, CAC and TCC committees.

On October 1, 2012, with the authorization of MAP-21, the Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program was replaced by the Transportation Alternatives (TA) program. This new program encompasses most activities that were funded under the Transportation Enhancements, Recreational Trails and the Safe Routes to School programs under SAFETEA-LU. The TA Program allocates 50% of the TA funds to the state and 50% to subareas based on population. Transportation Management Areas (urbanized areas with a population of at least 200,000) are among the subareas that receive allocations of TA funds based on population. Each MPO with responsibility for a Transportation Management Area (including the Volusia TPO) now has authority to select and award TA funds to projects within its urbanized area through a competitive selection process.

The TA Program will consist of a large percentage of bicycle/pedestrian projects due to the consolidation of the TE, Recreational Trails and Safe Routes to School programs. TPO staff will lead a discussion of the roles of the BPAC in ranking TA project applications.

Action Requested:

No action is required unless otherwise directed by the BPAC

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC
NOVEMBER 14, 2012**

V. STAFF COMMENTS

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS

- **BPAC Attendance Record**
- **FHWA Transportation Alternatives Interim Guidance**
- **Walking School Bus Workshop Flyer**

VII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

BPAC Attendance Record 2012

Name	11-Jan	8-Feb	14-Mar	11-Apr	9-May	13-Jun	11-Jul	8-Aug	12-Sep	10-Oct	14-Nov	12-Dec	Notes
Holly Idler			x	x	x		x	exc	x				Daytona Beach (appt. 3/12)
John Schmitz						M			x				Daytona Beach Shores (appt. 8/12)
Rani Merens	x	x	x	x	exc	x	E	x	x	x			DeBary (appt. 3/06)
Tim Bustos - Alt: Ted Wendler	x	x	x	x	x	x	E	x	x	x			DeLand (appt. 05/11) (alternate appt. 10/11)
Michelle Grenham	x	x	x	x	exc	x	T	x	x	exc			Edgewater (appt. 1/08)
Sandra Mason							I	x	x	x			Flagler Beach (appt. 07/12)
Nick Mostert	R .Rivera	x	x	exc	x	x	N	x	x	x			Holly Hill (appt. 1/12)
Bob Storke (Vice Chairman)	x	x	x	x	x	x	G	x	x	x			Orange City (appt. 12/07)
Jim Mascola					abs	abs		x	abs	abs			Ormond Beach (appt. 4/12)
Phyllis Campbell	x	x	x	x	x	x	C	x	exc	x			Ponce Inlet (appt. 11/06)
Colleen Nicoulin	x	x	x	x	x	x	A	x	x	x			Port Orange (appt. 7/11)
Bill Pouzar	x	abs	x	exc	abs	exc	N	abs	exc	exc			Volusia County (appt. 12/10) D-5 (Northey)
A.J. Davies	x	exc	x	x	x	x	C	exc	x	exc			Volusia County (appt. 1/06) D-2 (Wagner)
Roy Walters-Alt: Jason Aufdenberg	x	exc	exc	exc	x	x	E	exc	x	x			Volusia County At-Large (appt. 03/05) (alt appt 07/12)
Mike Chuven (Chairman)	x	x	x	x	x	x	L	x	x	x			Volusia County Council Chair (appt 4/11) (Bruno)
							L						
							D						
NON-VOTING MEMBERS													
Melissa Winsett	x	x	x	J. Cheney	x	x		J. Cheney	J.Cheney	x			Volusia County Traffic Engineering
Amanda Vandermaelen				x	exc	x		exc	x	abs			V.C. Parks, Recreation & Culture (appt. 03/12)
Bill McCord				x	x	x		abs	exc	x			Large City - Port Orange (appt. 4/12)
Wendy Hickey	x	x	x	x	x	exc		x	x	x			Small City - Orange City
Helen LaValley								x	x	x			Volusia County Schools (appt. 06/12)
Heather Blanck	x	exc	x	exc	Davenport	x		x	Davenport	x			Votran
Joan Carter	x	x	x	x	exc	exc		x	x	x			FDOT
<u>Vacancies</u>													
Beverly Beach													
Deltona													
Lake Helen													
New Smyrna Beach													
Oak Hill													
Pierson													
South Daytona													
Volusia County D-3 (Alexander)													
Volusia County D-1 (Kelly)													
QUORUM	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y			

January - December 2012

MAP-21 - Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES INTERIM GUIDANCE

PROGRAM PURPOSE

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) authorized under Section 1122 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 213(b), 101(a)(29)) provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; safe routes to school projects; and projects for the planning, design or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

GOVERNING AUTHORITIES

Section 1122 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) established TAP in 23 U.S.C. 213. Section 1105 of MAP-21 provides for the apportionment of funds in 23 U.S.C. 104(b), from which TAP funding is set aside.

The following sections of title 23 are applicable to TAP:

- a. 23 U.S.C. 104 Apportionment
- b. 23 U.S.C. 106 Project approval and oversight
- c. 23 U.S.C. 109 Standards
- d. 23 U.S.C. 112 through 116 Letting of contracts; Prevailing rate of wage; Construction; Advance Construction; Maintenance
- e. 23 U.S.C. 120 Federal share payable
- f. 23 U.S.C. 123 Relocation of utilities
- g. 23 U.S.C. 126 Transferability of Federal-aid highway funds
- h. 23 U.S.C. 133 Surface Transportation Program
- i. 23 U.S.C. 134 Metropolitan transportation planning
- j. 23 U.S.C. 135 Statewide transportation planning
- k. 23 U.S.C. 149 Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program
- l. 23 U.S.C. 206 Recreational trails program
- m. 23 U.S.C. 213 Transportation alternatives
- n. 23 U.S.C. 217 Bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways
- o. 23 U.S.C. 319 Landscaping and scenic enhancement
- p. 23 U.S.C. 323 Donations and credits
- q. 23 U.S.C. 328 Eligibility for environmental restoration and pollution abatement
- r. 23 U.S.C. 329 Eligibility for control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species

Activities eligible under the following section of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59) are eligible under TAP:

- a. Section 1404 (SAFETEA-LU) Safe Routes to School Program (23 U.S.C. 402 note)

The following section of MAP-21 is also applicable to TAP:

- a. Section 1524 Use of Youth Service and Conservation Corps

A. FUNDING

Funding Levels under MAP 21: Section 1122 of MAP-21 provides for the reservation of funds apportioned to a State under section 104(b) of title 23 to carry out TAP. The national total reserved for TAP is equal to 2 percent of the total amount authorized from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund for Federal-aid highways each fiscal year. (23 U.S.C. 213(a))

The following table shows the national total for TAP under MAP-21:

FY 2013	\$808,760,000
FY 2014	\$819,900,000
TOTAL	\$1,628,660,000

Each State's TAP funding is determined by dividing the national total among the States based on each State's proportionate share of FY 2009 Transportation Enhancements funding. Within each State, the amount for TAP is set aside proportionately from the State's National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), and Metropolitan Planning apportionments. (23 U.S.C. 213(a))

The Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS) program codes will be provided in a memorandum to the FHWA Division Offices and States when the program codes are finalized.

Period of Availability: TAP is funded by contract authority from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. TAP funds are available for obligation for a period of 3 years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized (23 U.S.C. 118).

Obligation Limitation: TAP funds are subject to the annual obligation limitation imposed on the Federal-aid highway program.

Federal share: The Federal share for TAP projects is governed by 23 U.S.C. 120. The Federal share generally is 80 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment. Recreational Trails Program (RTP) projects funded under the RTP set-aside shall use the RTP Federal share provisions under 23 U.S.C. 206(f), which allows some additional flexibility, especially for the non-Federal share.

Transfer of funds: A State may transfer up to 50% of TAP funds to NHPP, STP, HSIP, CMAQ, and/or Metro Planning. The amount transferred must come from the portion of TAP funds available for use anywhere in the State (no transfers of suballocated TAP funds or funds set aside for the RTP, which are discussed below). [§1509; 23 U.S.C. 126]

If a transit project eligible under TAP is selected, funds for such project may be transferred to FTA to administer the project in accordance with chapter 53 of title 49. (23 U.S.C. 104(f)).

Flexibility of Excess Reserved Funding: Additional guidance on this provision will be provided.

B. ELIGIBILITY

Funds apportioned to a State to carry out the TAP may be obligated only for the activities described below.

There is no requirement for TAP projects to be located along Federal-aid highways. SRTS projects must be within approximately two miles of a school for kindergarten through eighth grade as specified in SAFETEA-LU Section 1404. (23 U.S.C. 402 note)

Eligible Activities: Under 23 U.S.C. 213(b) eligible activities under the TAP program consist of:

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 nonmotorized 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.
 - 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 nonmotorized transportation users.
 - D. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
 - E. Community improvement activities, including-
 - i. inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
 - ii. historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
 - iii. vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
 - iv. archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23.
 - F. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to-
 - i. 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
 - ii. reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.
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. Noninfrastructure-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.
- C. Safe Routes to School coordinator.
- 4. Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

Ineligible Activities: Section 1103 of MAP-21 eliminated the definition of transportation enhancement activities in section 104 of title 23 and inserted in its place a definition of transportation alternatives, which does not include eligibility for certain activities that were previously eligible as transportation enhancements:

- A. Safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycles.
Exception: Activities targeting children in Kindergarten through 8th grade are eligible under SRTS (an eligible activity under the TAP funding).
Note: Some of these activities may be eligible under HSIP. Nonconstruction projects for bicycle safety remain broadly eligible for STP funds.
- B. Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites.
- C. Scenic or historic highway programs (including visitor and welcome centers).
 - i. Note: A few specific activities under this category (construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas) remain eligible under section 101(a)(29)(D) of title 23.
- D. Historic preservation as an independent activity unrelated to historic transportation facilities. Note: Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities are permitted as one type of community improvement activity; see section 101(a)(29)(E).
- E. Operation of historic transportation facilities.
- F. Archaeological planning and research undertaken for proactive planning. This category now must be used only as mitigation for highway projects.
- G. Transportation museums.

C. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Suballocation: Fifty percent of a State's TAP apportionment (after deducting the set-aside for the Recreational Trails Program, if applicable) is suballocated to areas based on their relative share of the total State population with the remaining 50 percent available for use in any area of the State. The suballocation is made in the same manner as for STP funds. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)). [See the Q&As regarding [Suballocation of Apportioned Funds](#) for additional detail.]

Distribution among Urbanized Areas: States are required to obligate funds in urbanized areas with populations over 200,000 based on their relative share of population, unless the Secretary approves a joint request from the State and relevant MPO(s) to use other factors in determining obligation. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)).

Selection of Projects: Consistent with other Federal-aid highway programs, TAP funds are administered by the State Department of Transportation (State DOT). The statute requires the following with respect to the selection of projects:

- TAP funds must be obligated to eligible projects submitted by eligible entities through a competitive process. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(A)).

- For urbanized areas with populations over 200,000, the MPO, through a competitive process, selects the TAP projects in consultation with the State from proposed projects submitted by eligible entities (listed below in D). (23 U.S.C. 213(c)(3)).
- Funds suballocated to small urban areas and rural areas will be administered by the State. Using a competitive process, the State will select the projects from proposed projects submitted by eligible entities.
- For the RTP set-aside, if applicable, States administer the program through a designated State agency. This can remain the same agency it has been (for most States, the State resource agency or grant agency), or may be the State DOT. (23 U.S.C. 206(c) and 213(f)).

FHWA encourages State DOTs to develop creative approaches to program structure and project implementation procedures.

States should include public involvement as part of the project selection process, due to the unique nature of TAP and the need for multiple perspectives in decisionmaking. States must ensure compliance with civil rights laws and regulations, and should address environmental justice principles throughout planning and decisionmaking processes. It is FHWA's continuing policy to identify and prevent discriminatory effects by actively administering its programs, policies, and activities to ensure that social impacts to communities and people are recognized early and continually throughout the transportation decisionmaking process from early planning through implementation.

D. TREATMENT OF PROJECTS

The "treatment of projects" requirement (23 U.S.C. 213(e)) means that all projects carried out using TAP funds (except for recreational trails projects carried out under the RTP set-aside) must comply with applicable provisions in title 23, such as project agreements, authorization to proceed prior to incurring costs, prevailing wage rates (Davis-Bacon), competitive bidding, and other contracting requirements, regardless of whether the projects are located within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway.

There may be some exceptions for projects that use youth service and conservation corps. (MAP-21 1524).

E. ELIGIBLE PROJECT SPONSORS

Under 23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(B), the eligible entities to receive TAP funds are:

- 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, consistent with the goals of subsection (c) of section 213 of title 23.

Under TAP, nonprofits are not eligible as direct grant recipients of the funds. Nonprofits are eligible to partner with any eligible entity on an eligible TAP project, if State or local requirements permit.

F. RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM

MAP-21 section 1122 amends the RTP to make the funding a set-aside from the TAP. Unless the Governor opts out in advance, an amount equal to the State's FY 2009 RTP apportionment is to be set aside from the State's TAP funds for recreational trails projects. (23 U.S.C. 213(f)-(g)). All RTP provisions and requirements continue under section 206 of title 23. (23 U.S.C. 213(f)(3)).

Under 23 U.S.C. 213(f), if continuing the RTP:

- Each State shall obligate an amount of funds reserved under section 213 of title equal to the amount of the funds apportioned to the State for fiscal year 2009 under section 104(h)(2) for projects relating to recreational trails under section 206.
- Each State shall return 1 percent of those funds to the Secretary for the administration of RTP.
- Each State shall comply with the provisions of the administration of the recreational trails program under section 206, including the use of apportioned funds. Therefore, all RTP provisions and requirements remain unchanged, including the requirement for 40 percent diverse use, 30 percent motorized use, and 30 percent nonmotorized use.

If opting out of the RTP:

- The Governor of the State must notify the Secretary not later than 30 days prior to apportionments being made for any fiscal year. (23 U.S.C. 213(g)). Any State that desires to opt out of the RTP set-aside should notify FHWA via email, with a letter signed by the Governor or the Governor's designee accompanying the opt-out notification, to the HCFB-1 official mailbox (BudDiv@dot.gov) no later than the September 1st prior to the fiscal year in which the State wishes to opt out.
- The funds remain as TAP funds.
- The State cannot use a portion of its TAP funds for the fiscal year in which it opts out for RTP administrative costs.

Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) Questions & Answers

TAP: General Information

Funding and Financial Management

1. How are Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds allocated and administered?

Fifty percent of a State's TAP apportionment (after deducting the set-aside for the Recreational Trails Program, if applicable) is suballocated to areas based on their relative share of the total State population with the remaining 50 percent available for use in any area of the State. The suballocation is made in the same manner as for STP funds. (23 U.S.C. 213(c), MAP-21 1122) [See the Q&As regarding [Suballocation of Apportioned Funds](#) for additional detail.]

2. Can you transfer funds from other programs into Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)?

Yes. Funds from the NHPP, STP, CMAQ, and HSIP may be transferred to the TAP. (MAP-21 1509). Note that projects eligible under TAP are broadly eligible for STP funds and STP funds could be used for TAP projects without making a transfer. (23 U.S.C. 133(b)(11)).

3. What is the Federal share for Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) projects, in general, and for the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) and Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) in particular?

The Federal share for TAP projects is as follows:

- For most TAP projects, including the SRTS, the Federal share is the same as for the general Federal-aid highway program: 80 percent Federal/20 percent State or local match with a sliding scale. (23 U.S.C. 120).
- Projects funded under the RTP set-aside retain the Federal share and flexible match provisions under current law (23 U.S.C. 206(f)). Recreational trails projects funded from other TAP funds use the general match described above.

4. Are States required to distribute funds among Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) with urbanized area populations less than 200,000?

No. MAP-21 does not require suballocation to MPOs with populations less than 200,000. TAP funds suballocated to areas with a population between 5,001 to 200,000 may be used anywhere in those areas, including within the metropolitan planning area boundaries of an MPO serving an urbanized area with a population less than or equal to 200,000.

5. Can funds be transferred to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)-eligible projects?

Yes. Funds may be transferred in the same manner as other Federal-aid highway program procedures. (23 USC 104(f)).

Eligible Projects

1. What activities are eligible under Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)?

Eligible activities (23 U.S.C. 213(b) (MAP-21 1122); 23 USC 101(a)(29) (MAP-21 1103) under the TAP program include:

- A. Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized 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.
- 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 nonmotorized transportation users.
- D. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
- E. Community improvement activities, including-

- inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
 - historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
 - vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
 - archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under this title.
- F. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to-
- address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(11), 328(a), and 329; or
 - reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.
- G. The recreational trails program (RT) under 23 U.S.C. 206.
- H. The safe routes to school program (SRTS) under section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU, including-
- 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.
 - Noninfrastructure-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.
 - Safe Routes to School coordinator.
- I. Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
- 2. Can Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds be used for landscaping and scenic enhancement as an independent project?**
- No. TAP funds cannot be used for landscaping and scenic enhancement as independent projects. However, landscaping and scenic enhancement are eligible as part of the construction of any Federal -aid highway project under 23 U.S.C. 319, including TAP-funded projects.
- 3. Does "vegetation management" under the definition of transportation alternative include routine maintenance?**
- No. Routine maintenance is not eligible as a TAP activity except under the RTP.
- 4. Can administrative costs be paid to an Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds?**
- No. There are no provisions under TAP permitting the payment of MPO administrative costs.
- 5. What types of scenic byway projects are eligible under MAP-21?**

Eligible projects under the STP and TAP that may have previously been eligible as part of the National Scenic Byways Program include the construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas; historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities related to a byway; and bicycle and pedestrian facilities along a byway. (23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29), 23 USC 213(b), MAP-21 1101, 1122).

Eligible Project Sponsors

1. Are State DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) eligible entities to access Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds?

No. State DOTs and MPOs are not eligible entities as defined under 213(c)(4)(B) and therefore are not eligible for TAP funds. However, State DOTs and MPOs may partner with an eligible entity project sponsor to carry out a project.

2. What entities can submit projects for Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding?

TAP funds can only be obligated for projects submitted by "eligible entities" defined in 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 or oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible, consistent with the goals of this subsection.

3. Are nonprofits eligible to receive Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds?

No, nonprofits are not eligible as direct grant recipients of the funds. Nonprofits are eligible to partner with any eligible entity on an eligible TAP project, if State or local requirements allow.

4. Are other State agencies eligible to access Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds?

Yes. State natural resource and public land agencies are eligible. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(B)).

5. Are Federal agencies eligible to access Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds?

Yes. Federal natural resource and public land agencies are eligible. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(B)).

6. Does the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) retain its own eligible project sponsor provisions?

For RTP set-aside funds, the eligible project sponsor provisions under 23 U.S.C. 206 are retained. (23 U.S.C. 213(f)(3)).

Competitive Process for Project Selection

1. Are there Federal requirements or minimum standards on how to set up competitive processes described under 23 U.S.C. 213(c)?

No. TAP does not establish specific standards or procedures for the competitive process. The USDOT plans to develop best practices for consideration. DOT will publish a model Request for Proposal or Notice of Funds Available that States and MPOs may use at their discretion.

2. Does a competitive process have to consider all eligible activities equally?

No. There is no specific requirement to consider all eligible activities equally.

3. Can Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) return their money to the State to have the State run a competitive process on their behalf?

Yes. A TMA may allow the State to run the TMA's competitive process. However, the State cannot require the TMA to turn over the TMA's selection process.

4. How are the projects chosen under Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)?

All TAP funds must be obligated to eligible projects submitted by eligible entities through a competitive process. For the suballocated funds in the urban areas with populations 5,001 to 200,000, and the areas with populations 5,000 and below, the State DOT selects the projects. For suballocated funds in urbanized areas over 200,000 population, the MPO serving the TMA selects the projects in consultation with the State. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)).

TAP: Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

1. How does the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) change under MAP-21?

MAP-21 makes RTP funding a set-aside from the TAP. Unless the Governor opts out in advance, an amount equal to the State's FY 2009 RTP apportionment is to be set aside from the State's TAP funds for recreational trails projects. RTP requirements under 23 U.S.C. 206 continue to apply to RTP set-aside funds. (23 U.S.C. 213(f)-(g)).

2. Are there new Recreational Trails Program (RTP) requirements that apply to the RTP set-aside funds?

Yes. Under 23 U.S.C. 213(f)(2), each State shall "return 1 percent of those funds to the Secretary for the administration of that program." This is comparable to the requirement under SAFETEA-LU for the FHWA to take funds off the top of the RTP funding for this purpose before apportioning the funds to the States.

Each State shall "comply with the provisions of the administration of the recreational trails program, including the use of apportioned funds." (23 U.S.C. 213(f)(3)). Therefore, RTP requirements under 23 U.S.C. continue to apply to RTP set-aside funds. (23 U.S.C. 206).

"A State may opt out of the recreational trails program [set-aside] if the Governor of the State notifies the Secretary not later than 30 days prior to apportionments being made for any fiscal year." (23 U.S.C. 213(g)).

3. Did MAP-21 change what agency manages the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) set-aside?

No. The statute requires the State Governor to designate the State agency or agencies to administer the RTP. (23 U.S.C. 206(c)).

4. Do the provisions in 23 USC 206, which governed Recreational Trails Program (RTP) before MAP-21, still apply?

Yes. While RTP funds will be a set-aside of TAP funds, MAP-21 provides that States must comply with the provisions of section 206 when using the MAP-21 set-aside funds. (23 U.S.C. 213(f)(3)). This includes following the provisions in section 206(d) relating to the use of funds. It also allows use of the Federal share provisions in section 206(f) and project administration provisions in section 206(h).

5. Is the State Recreational Trail Advisory Committee still required?

Yes. For a State to be eligible to use funds set aside for the RTP under 23 U.S.C.213(f), the State must comply with the requirements of section 206 of title 23 U.S.C., including the requirement under 23 U.S.C. 206(c)(2) that "...the State shall establish a State recreational trail advisory committee that represents both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail users, which shall meet not less often than once per fiscal year." If a State does not meet this requirement, it is not eligible to use RTP set-aside funds.

6. What is the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Opt-Out Provision?

The MAP-21 allows the Governor of the State to opt out of the set-aside for the RTP on an annual basis. (23 U.S.C. 213(g)). Instructions on how to opt out of the program for FY 2013 were included in a Notice to the States. See the following webpage:

www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/directives/notices/n4510755.htm for additional information.

7. If a State opts out of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), can it still fund recreational trail projects with TAP funds?

Yes. Recreational trail projects are eligible for TAP funds, but the RTP provisions and requirements under 23 U.S.C. 206 would not apply. (23 U.S.C. 213(c)(4)(b)). Recreational trails projects funded with TAP funds other than the RTP set-aside are subject to the requirements in 23 U.S.C. 213. The "treatment of projects" provision under 23 U.S.C. 213(e) would apply. This means that projects would have to be treated as projects on Federal-aid highways.

8. What happens to the funding if a State opts out of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP)?

The funds remain part of the TAP.

9. If a State opts out of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), will it still have access for administrative funds to administer projects from previous years?

No. The ability to use RTP funds for State administrative costs is limited to a percentage "of the apportionment made to the State for the fiscal year" (which would include the RTP set-aside funds). (23 U.S.C. 206(d)(2)(H)). If there is no program to administer, then the administrative funds cannot be permitted.

10. Are recreational trails projects eligible under other Federal-aid programs?

Yes. Recreational trail projects that would be eligible under the RTP will be broadly eligible under STP and TAP. (23 U.S.C. 213(b)(2), 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(20)). TAP provisions and requirements under section 213 would apply to recreational trail projects using TAP funds (other than RTP set-aside funds). STP provisions and requirements apply to STP funds used for recreational trails projects.

11. Does the transferability provision apply to the Recreational Trails Program (RTP)? Can a State continue its RTP to retain the RTP structure, but then transfer funds from the RTP to TAP?

No. MAP-21 does not have a transferability provision for the RTP set-aside. Some projects may be eligible both under the RTP and TAP, and a State can choose whether to obligate RTP or TAP funds for such projects. Also, States have broad discretion to use STP funds for projects eligible under TAP or RTP. Note that if a State opts out of the RTP, such funds remain TAP funds, and the transferability provisions pertaining to TAP would apply.

TAP: Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

1. Are Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) coordinators required as under SAFETEA-LU Section 1404(f)(3)?

No. SRTS coordinators are not required under MAP-21 but are eligible for funding under TAP.

2. Does the requirement from SAFETEA-LU Section 1404(f)(1)(B) that States allocate "not less than 10 percent and not more than 30 percent..." of Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) funds for non-infrastructure activities still apply?

No. This split between infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects does not exist in MAP-21. It does apply to remaining SRTS funds from SAFETEA-LU.

3. What happens to the Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) funds provided by SAFETEA-LU?

Funds provided under SAFETEA-LU for the SRTS program, will continue to be available for their specified period of availability under the same terms and conditions in effect prior to the effective date of MAP-21. See [FHWA's Safe Routes to School Guidance dated March 2006](#).

4. Is Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Education eligible under the Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) component of MAP-21?

Yes. Bicycle and pedestrian safety education for Kindergarten through 8th grade continues to be an eligible SRTS activity.

5. Is travel for Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) project-specific site visits or to conferences an eligible activity?

Yes. Travel directly related to a specific project is eligible under SAFETEA-LU Section 1404(f)(2) (A). Travel related to "training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs" is eligible as a non-infrastructure-related activity.

6. Is a local Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) coordinator position an eligible expense?

Yes, this eligibility is maintained in MAP-21. SAFETEA-LU Section 1404(f)(2)(A) lists "managers of safe routes to school programs" as eligible under the non-infrastructure projects.

TAP: Transportation Enhancement (TE)

1. What Transportation Enhancement (TE) activities formerly eligible under SAFETEA-LU are not eligible for TAP under MAP-21?

MAP-21 eliminated eligibility for TE for the following activities:

- Safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicycles, however, activities targeting children are eligible as SRTS projects under the TAP funding.
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites.
- Scenic or historic highway programs (including visitor and welcome centers).
- Historic preservation as an independent activity unrelated to historic transportation facilities. Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities are permitted as one type of community improvement activity; see Section 101(a)(29)(E).
- Operation of historic transportation facilities.
- Archaeological planning and research undertaken for proactive planning. This category now must be used only as mitigation for highway projects.
- Transportation museums.

2. Do the MAP-21 eligibility changes apply to unobligated Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds or to TE projects that already have been obligated?

No. TE funds apportioned in prior years will continue to be available for their specified period of availability under the same terms and conditions in effect prior to the effective date of MAP-21.

TAP: Youth Service and Conservation Corps, MAP-21 Section 1524

1. What is the purpose of the Youth Service and Conservation Corps provision?

The concept for using youth corps in Federal-aid highway program projects originated from:

- " TEA-21 §1108(g) relating to Transportation Enhancement (TE) projects.
- " TEA-21 §1112(e) and SAFETEA-LU §1109(f) relating to RTP projects.

Youth corps organizations have benefited under the RTP, which is usually administered through a State resource agency that may have ongoing relationships with youth corps organizations. Most RTP projects are not within highway rights-of-way and follow "Common Rule" procedures rather than highway program procedures.

However, few youth corps organizations have been able to participate under TE because of Federal highway program requirements.

2. What are *Qualified* Youth Service and Conservation Corps?

Section 1524 of MAP-21 defines "qualified youth service or conservation corps" as those that are defined at 42 USC 12572(a)(2) and 42 USC 12656(c)(3). 42 USC 12572(a)(2) refers to the "healthy futures corp," which is designed to identify and meet unmet health needs in communities. 42 USC

12656(c)(3) refers to the "urban youth corps," which means any program established by a State or local government or by a nonprofit organization that--

- A. is capable of offering meaningful, full-time, productive work for individuals between the ages of 16 and 25, inclusive, in an urban or public works or transportation setting;
- B. gives participants a mix of work experience, basic and life skills, education, training, and support services; and
- C. provides participants with the opportunity to develop citizenship values and skills through service to their communities and the United States.

3. How do we find qualified youth service and conservation corps?

Youth service and conservation corps exist in 44 States and the District of Columbia. There are also national organizations that qualify as youth service and conservation corps.

4. What kinds of projects are eligible under the provisions of Section 1524?

MAP-21 Section 1524 requires the USDOT/FHWA to "...encourage the States and regional transportation planning agencies to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with qualified youth service or conservation corps ... to perform appropriate projects eligible under sections 162, 206, 213, and 217 of title 23, United States Code, and under section 1404 of the SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1228)." These programs are the National Scenic Byways Program (23 U.S.C. 162), Recreational Trails Program (23 U.S.C. 206), Transportation Alternatives Program (23 U.S.C. 213), Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways (23 U.S.C. 217), and the Safe Routes to School Program (Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU).

5. What do the Section 1524 Requirements mean?

Section 1524(b)(1) requires the Secretary to set the pay rate and refers to a method used to establish a living allowance or rate of pay for youth service and conservation corps. This language avoids conflicts with prevailing wage rate requirements. The USDOT/FHWA may use a rate already established by another Federal agency.

Section 1524(b)(2) exempts contracts and cooperative agreements with youth service and conservation corps from Federal-aid highway program contracting requirements under 23 U.S.C. 112. In effect, a State or regional transportation planning agency may sole-source contracts and cooperative agreements to qualified youth service and conservation corps for working undertaken for byway, recreational trail, transportation alternative, bicycle and pedestrian, or SRTS projects.

6. Does Section 1524 supersede the requirement of 23 U.S.C. 213(e) relating to Treatment of Projects?

Yes. There are differences between MAP-21 Section 1524 and the newly established 23 U.S.C. 213 (e) under TAP regarding compliance with Federal-aid highway requirements. MAP-21 Section 1524 provides exceptions to certain requirements regarding pay rates and contracting requirements for projects using contracts and cooperative agreements with qualified youth service or conservation corps for certain projects.



Many school systems are reviewing their school transportation options as a result of budget constraints. Encouraging more children to walk to school is one option to cost-effectively change school transportation. Walking school buses can result in more activity and fewer cars on the roadways around schools.

Save money, improve health, cut down on congestion, provide a friendly trip to and from school

WALKING SCHOOL BUS WORKSHOP

**Volusia County School Transportation Office and
District 5, Florida Dept. of Transportation**

Invite you to attend an all day Walking School Bus workshop on **Tuesday, December 4, 2012** at the Volusia County School Transportation Office, 1648 Hancock Blvd., Daytona Beach, Florida.

The workshop will be led by Robert Johnson, of PedNet, a Pedestrian and Pedaling Network. Mr. Johnson is a nationally recognized consultant who advises schools and communities on improving walking and bicycling conditions.

The **9 A.M.-4 P.M. workshop** will cover a range of topics from generating community support to planning and managing individual walking school buses. Mr. Johnson will bring information and sample handouts developed from his own experiences with the program.

Visit: PedNet

<http://www.pednet.org/programs/walking-school-bus.html>

For more information contact: Joan Carter, 386-943-5335, joan.carter@dot.state.fl.us

Or Greg Akin, Volusia County School Transportation Director, 386-258-4677 ext 50546

Please share this invitation with educators, public health professionals, interested parents and transportation advocates.