MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO) BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) will be meeting on:

DATE: Wednesday, November 14, 2018

TIME: 3:00 PM

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

******************************************************************************

Mr. Bob Storke, Chairperson

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. NEW BPAC MEMBER INTRODUCTION (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, page 4)

III. PUBLIC COMMENT/PARTICIPATION (Length of time at the discretion of the Chairperson)

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
   (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, pages 5-14)

B. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TO CHANGE THE START TIME OF REGULARLY SCHEDULED BPAC MEETINGS FROM 3:00 P.M. TO 2:00 P.M. (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, pages 15-16)

C. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING THE FY 2018/19 – 2022/23 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) (Contact: Colleen Nicoulin) (Enclosure, pages 17-20)
IV. ACTION ITEMS (continued)

D. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (Contact: Lois Bollenback) (Enclosure, page 21)

E. CANCELLATION OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2018 BPAC MEETING (Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, page 22)

V. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE ST. JOHNS RIVER TO SEA LOOP TRAIL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY: LAKE BERESFORD PARK TO GRAND AVENUE (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 23-41)

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE R2CTPO POLICY RESOLUTIONS FOR THE ANNUAL CALL FOR PROJECTS (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 42-54)

C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE PRIORITY PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN AND B/P LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, pages 55-75)

D. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR CURRENT YEAR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) URBAN ATTRIBUTABLE (SU) SET ASIDE FUNDING (Contact: Stephan Harris) (Enclosure, page 76)

VI. STAFF COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 77)

→ River to Sea TPO Staff Update

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS (Enclosure, pages 77-87)

→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ BPAC Subcommittee Report
→ Light Up Midtown Health Fair
→ October 2018 TPO Outreach & Activities
→ St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail PD&E Study Public Meetings
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VIII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 77)
IX. ADJOURNMENT *(Enclosure, page 77)*

***The next meeting of the BPAC will be on Wednesday, January 9, 2019***

NOTE: Individuals covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in need of accommodations for this public meeting should contact the River to Sea TPO office, 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145; (386) 226-0422, extension 20416, at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

NOTE: If any person decides to appeal a decision made by the board 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.

NOTE: The River to Sea TPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability and family status. Those with questions or concerns about nondiscrimination, those requiring special assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, or those requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact Pamela Blankenship at 386.226.0422 or pblankenship@r2ctpo.org.
II. NEW BPAC MEMBER INTRODUCTION

Background Information:

Mr. Robert Bullard has been appointed to the BPAC as the Ponce Inlet representative by TPO Board Member Joe Perrone.

ACTION REQUESTED:

AS DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Minutes are prepared for each meeting and must be approved by the BPAC. The October 10, 2018 BPAC meeting minutes are provided with this agenda packet for your review.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 10, 2018 BPAC MEETING MINUTES
Members Present:
Holly Ryan
Scott Leisen
Michelle Grenham
Paul Eik, Vice Chairperson
Larry Coletti
Nic Mostert
Bob Storke, Chairperson
Gayle Belin
Chris Daun
Alice Haldeman
Roy Walters

Representing:
Daytona Beach
Deltona
Edgewater
Flagler Beach
Flagler County
New Smyrna Beach
Orange City
Ormond Beach
Volusia County, District 2 Alternate
Volusia County, District 3
Volusia County, At-Large

Non-Voting Technical Appointees Present:
Gwen Perney
Melissa Winsett
John Cotton
Mike Ziarnek

Representing:
Port Orange
Volusia County
Votran
FDOT

Members/Technical Appointees Absent:
Ted Wendler
Wendy Hickey (excused)
Heidi Petito/Bob Owens
Gilles Blais (excused)
Danielle Anderson
Christy Gillis (excused)
Patrick McCallister (excused)
Nancy Burgess-Hall (excused)
Rob Brinson

Representing:
DeLand
Flagler County
Flagler County Public Transportation
Holly Hill
Palm Coast
South Daytona
Volusia County, District 1
Volusia County, District 2
Volusia County School Board

Others Present:
Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
Stephan Harris
Pamela Blankenship
Lois Bollenback
Aarti Sharma
William Girard
Andrew Kennedy
Paul Haydt
Charles Morrow
Andrew Dodzik
Valerie Feinberg
Shawn Finley

Representing:
TPO Staff
Citizen, DeLeon Springs
Citizen, Ormond Beach
East Coast Greenways & Trails Alliance
Flagler Beach, Alternate
Flagler County, Alternate
Health Planning Council of Northeast Florida
Ormond Beach

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

The meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chairperson Bob Storke. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.
Chairperson Storke introduced Ms. Valerie Feinberg, new Safe Routes to School Coordinator for the Health Planning Council of Northeast Florida. She is replacing Ms. Karissa Moffet.

II. Public Comment/Participation

Mr. Paul Haydt, East Coast Greenway Alliance, stated he wanted to follow up on the FDOT presentation last month on the PD&E Study for the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail from SR 44 to SR 400. A lot of comments were made and he does not think the FDOT team was in attendance to hear them. He is concerned that they did not seem to incorporate any of the prior comments made at the presentation in the spring. He would like to send the minutes with the comments to FDOT as an official entry that the BPAC has serious concerns. The day after the BPAC meeting last month a stakeholder meeting was held in South Daytona where many of the same comments were made. The outcome of that meeting was to have a workshop in Port Orange. Port Orange heard the comments clearly and has new ideas on how to take the route closer to the river. He believes we need to make FDOT aware that there are serious complaints regarding their presentation that need to be addressed.

Mr. Mostert asked if Port Orange was receptive to taking the route from US 1 over to the river and were they willing to do so.

Mr. Haydt replied yes; there are challenges to going that way but there was discussion about making Halifax Drive a one-way road. There is right-of-way needed and businesses to work with to make it happen but Port Orange is looking at this trail as a major asset for the riverfront development project. South Daytona and New Smyrna Beach need to get involved to maximize what this trail can do for the community.

Mr. Andrew Kennedy, citizen of Ormond Beach, stated he sent an email to FDOT; he lives on John Anderson Drive and many people ride bikes in the area. He took photos showing that there are no bike paths in the area and stated there are bike paths as soon as you cross into Flagler County. He asked if Volusia County could at least get a northbound bike lane from Granada Boulevard to High Bridge and connect High Bridge to SR A1A. At SR A1A there is a southbound bike lane to Granada Boulevard and one west to the Casements. It would make a fantastic loop and would allow safe bicycling. Along this loop there are signs to share the road but there is no way to do that.

Mr. Daun commented he is aware of that plight; approximately six years ago there was a proposition to put a bike trail on John Anderson Drive but it was defeated because they planned to eliminate half of the historic trees which caused a huge backlash. He suggested Mr. Kennedy work with Ormond Beach planners and meet with his city councilman.

Mr. William Girard, citizen of DeLeon Springs, stated a recreational trail is supposed to be put in along with the widening of US 17 and asked why that location was chosen and if other routes were looked at. He is an avid cyclist and rides many trails; putting a trail along US 17 is questionable. Bicyclists do not ride US 17 now; he rides CR 3 instead where there is state land and power line right-of-way. The best trails weave around trees instead of being on a four-lane highway. He would like to know why this route was chosen instead of a better location.

Mr. Harris replied that years ago there was a trail proposal along CR 3 that Volusia County did a feasibility study for. The issues were limited right-of-way and expensive storm water improvements that would have to be made and some of the land was part of the state park. There were so many issues an agreement was reached with the county and FDOT to move the trail project from CR 3 to US 17. Another reason to do this is that US 17 was already slated to be widened and it was an opportunity to build the trail in conjunction with the widening project.

Mr. Girard commented it seems like they are buying a lot of land along US 17 to accommodate that trail, including some of his. He asked if it was easier to take his land rather than the state land for the trail. Although it is probably too late for this project, he would like other options to be considered rather than a straight run down US 17.
IV. Action Items

A. Review and Approval of September 12, 2018 BPAC Meeting Minutes

Mr. Eik referred to the member comments where he had asked for voting protocols to be placed on the agenda for today’s meeting; it is not on the agenda so he asked for it to be placed on the November agenda. He asked if staff had an opportunity to see if there is a procedure if a vote is split on how to determine the outcome. The raising of hands does not work.

Mr. Harris replied normally the voice vote determines whether a motion passes but there is always the option to take a roll call vote; that can be done for every motion if the committee chooses.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Leisen to approve the September 12, 2018 BPAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daun and carried unanimously.

B. Review and Recommend Approval of a Request from Ormond Beach to Increase Funding for the Tomoka Elementary Connector Sidewalk

Mr. Harris introduced Mr. Shawn Finley, City Engineer for Ormond Beach to discuss this project.

Mr. Finley stated there are two projects on the agenda today; the first is the Tomoka Elementary sidewalk and the other is the Williamson Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement project. Both of these projects were introduced in 2006 and are ways to improve pedestrian facilities in the city of Ormond Beach. This project is directly associated with Tomoka Elementary School; the school was built in the early 1980’s and habits have changed that have created a congestion problem. That congestion problem exacerbates the pedestrian issues. When the project was initially submitted the city was going to have the 10% match done as “in-kind” design services. After the city met with FDOT they were encouraged to bundle this project and the Williamson Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement project as one design project. The city has also experienced staff reductions over the last couple of years and in an effort to get this project completed it made sense to shift the design to a consultant that works on these types of projects on a daily basis. The city selected CPH out of Sanford based on qualifications received; they did an honest job of evaluating the project and what is required. However, CPH cannot provide their design services as cost effectively as the city can. There is a significant difference in cost so the city is asking for additional funds. They want to continue trying to create a safer environment for the school children on a street that has significant issues and give parents the peace of mind to allow the students to walk to school.

Mr. Daun asked for the map of the project to be shown.

Mr. Eik stated he wants the city representative to know that this committee did not raise objection to the project for why it was being done; the safety of the children was not the issue. Part of the reason this project was approved to be funded was that the city was going to do the design in-house. He asked if going forward from this point when the city has projects coming before the committee if it is wiser to bring someone in to do the design or if the city has the capacity to do the design themselves.

Mr. Finley replied they would evaluate on a case-by-case basis; the city is trying to learn from these LAP projects. He believes the consultant can do a better job and be more efficient on this project. The efficiency would make up for the extra cost for the design. He showed the map of the project limits and stated the project reconstructs the sidewalk to create a safer situation for students to cross on the east side of the street.

Ms. Haldeman stated there is not an issue with the value of the project but the TPO’s policy is any cost overrun is the responsibility of the project originator. The BPAC is not voting on the project but on whether to break the rules.

Chairperson Storke commented the members are not against the project being built but the problem is the additional funds that will have to be expended to use the consultant.
Mr. Finley replied he appreciates the BPAC being supportive of the project. He explained the city has zero tolerance for change orders on projects. By coming to the TPO before executing a contract with the consultant they are setting the groundwork of what they are going to do. At this point, the city can make the decision to do the project now or wait until an opportunity for staff to be able to do it or resubmit the estimate and have it reevaluated by the TPO. The city has not executed a contract with the consultant so there is not a cost overrun yet. The city is asking to see if there is money in the budget to continue the project at this time. They want to do this project whether it is now with additional funds or in the future when additional funds are available.

Mr. Daun asked if the city had pursued Safe Routes to School funding.

Mr. Finley replied no; the city has approached different schools about that and did not get the cooperation to create the required committees.

Ms. Valerie Feinberg, Safe Routes to School Coordinator, stated she could help him with that.

Mr. Finley stated that because of changes to policies, there are a lot of elementary schools that have students that are no longer able to ride the bus and must walk. The city has explored the Safe Routes to School before and can look into it again.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Daun stated because of the procedure and what the committee has agreed is policy and the fact that the city did not pursue Safe Routes to School funding, he cannot vote on this item.

Mr. Eik stated this is a project all members agreed is necessary and it is a safety issue that the city is trying to work on. The dilemma is should the committee vote to break the rules in order to allow this to occur. Because of the answers received today he is ready to go ahead with this. He asked if this committee votes to approve the additional funds, if it has to go before the TPO Board for final approval.

Mr. Harris replied yes.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Winsett commented the Safe Routes to School program is a different type of grant and it is more difficult than the TPO project application process. The Safe Routes to School grant requires a parent/teacher/school administration group to approve the project and there are limitations as to what the funds can be used for.

Ms. Feinberg replied that she understands it is an arduous process and that is why she is here to help the schools facilitate the process. It is a good way to leverage different funding.

Ms. Winsett replied that she previously was the Community Traffic Safety Team (CTST) Chair for the west side of the county and wanted to promote the Safe Routes to School program but could not get FDOT to do a presentation. She is glad the Ms. Feinberg is here and it would be helpful if she could walk the members through the program.

Ms. Feinberg replied she would be glad to do a presentation; education about the program is important. She asked if the funding for this project is for design or construction.

Mr. Finley replied design.

Ms. Feinberg stated there is a chance the city could leverage what they have done in design to get it built with infrastructure money.
MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Eik to recommend approval of the request from Ormond Beach to increase funding for the Tomoka Elementary Connector Sidewalk and the 10% match be increased dependent on the amount being requested. The motion was seconded by Ms. Belin. The motion passed with one “no” vote.

C. Review and Recommend Approval of a Request From Ormond Beach to Increase Funding for the Williamson Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements

Mr. Finley stated this is the second project Ormond Beach applied for in 2016 and it was born out of a phone call from a visually impaired citizen that needed to cross the street to get to Whole Foods from San Marco Apartments. This intersection was built in anticipation of things happening such as the eventual widening of Williamson Boulevard to LPGA Boulevard. Pedestrian improvements are significantly lacking at this intersection; there is no crosswalk, no push button and no way for a pedestrian to cross safely. There is a lot of opportunity at this location for people to be mobile. There is a gap in the sidewalk on the east side of Williamson Boulevard; this project would complete that gap and create a better situation at Williamson Boulevard and Hand Avenue and at the intersection by Publix. Signal design is very specialized and the city does not have the in-house capacity to it. The city did a similar project for three intersections, based their estimate on that cost and thought they had a good estimate with $24,000. The city bundled these two projects as one and the consultant identified issues the city did not see in their cursory look at the project. There are drainage issues to make the intersection American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant; the additional man hours are part of the additional cost. He does not see any improvements to Hand Avenue and Williamson Boulevard any time in the near future. He would like to do what the city can do now to help the situation and help people have a safe route.

Ms. Belin asked if Hand Avenue is a county or city road.

Mr. Finley replied both Hand Avenue and William Boulevard are county roads. He discussed this project with Ms. Winsett and at the time, the county did not have the resources to do it. This is a project to work together on; the city has a need on a county facility and the city took the lead to fix it.

Mr. Belin asked if this project was originally submitted in 2011.

Mr. Finley replied no; the other intersection improvements made were submitted in 2011. This project was submitted in 2016 and they felt that bundling the project may make it more attractive and they could get value pricing by bundling them.

Mr. Mostert asked if any other qualified bids were received.

Mr. Finley replied there were a total of seven qualified bids and all were equally qualified. The city could reject this bid and negotiate with another consultant. They have to use the most qualified consultant and their rates reflect that.

Mr. Mostert asked where this consultant ranked compared to the others; if it was the highest or lowest bid.

Mr. Finley replied the fees are not included in the ranking; it is based solely on the qualifications. The city qualification package includes experience, the team, approach to doing the project and their experience with similar projects. The city has to select the most qualified firm and not be swayed by cost.

Mr. Eik stated this project is very similar to the first one; this project has been before the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee and deemed to be worthwhile. It was ranked and funded for design. The issue is not the project but whether to go against the rules and approve additional funding.

Ms. Winsett commended the city for submitting project applications for two county roads. She agreed with Mr. Finley that there will not be improvements any time soon. The county is trying to widen Williamson Boulevard and has the funding to do so from LPGA Boulevard to Strickland Range but not to Hand Avenue;
that will be in a later phase. Cost estimates have drastically risen lately; for example, a mast arm signal has
gone from $230,000 to $300,000. When the county widens the road, they will install needed pedestrian
facilities. The Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) guidelines require looking at bicycle/pedestrian and transit
connections for developments.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ms. Belin to recommend approval of the request from Ormond Beach to
increase funding for the Williamson Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements. The motion was
seconded by Ms. Grenham and carried unanimously.

D. **Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Adopting the R2CTPO 2018 Congestion
Management Process (CMP) and Performance Measures Report**

Ms. Sharma stated this item was presented last month; no comments were received. The report is available
on the TPO website.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Leisen to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## adopting the
R2CTPO 2018 Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Performance Measures Report. The
motion was seconded by Mr. Walters and carried unanimously.

E. **Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2018-## Adopting the FY 2017/18 Public Involvement
Report**

Ms. Blankenship stated this item was presented last month and there have been no changes. She is asking for
a recommendation of approval.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Mr. Daun to recommend approval of Resolution 2018-## adopting the
FY 2017/18 Public Involvement Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mostert and carried
unanimously.

V. **Presentation and Discussion Items**

A. **Presentation and Discussion of Recommended Changes to the R2CTPO Policy Resolutions and Project
Applications for the Annual Call for Projects**

Mr. Harris stated every year, after the Project Priority Process closes, the TPO asks the committees to review
the process and recommend improvements for the next cycle. On October 1, 2018, the BPAC Project Review
Subcommittee and the TIP Subcommittee met jointly to discuss the process and changes to it. They discussed
the Local Agency Program (LAP) process, project costs that would be eligible and ineligible and cost overruns.
The BPAC Project Review Subcommittee will be meeting on October 24, 2018 to make specific
recommendations on the policy resolutions and the project applications. Those will be brought to the BPAC
next month as an action item.

Mr. Walters asked what time the meeting will be.

Mr. Harris replied 3:00 pm on October 24, 2018.

Mr. Eik asked if at the upcoming meeting, the committee will be able to see the definition of eligible versus
ineligible costs and overruns versus increases so that it can provide the guidance needed.

Mr. Harris replied he should be able to include that in the agenda for the meeting.

Ms. Perney asked if the committee would discuss going paperless and only submitting electronic files.
Mr. Harris replied it can be discussed; currently the TPO requires one hard copy and one electronic copy. It is something the BPAC can consider; it will be discussed at the subcommittee and brought back to the BPAC next month.

B. Presentation and Discussion of Modern Roundabouts

Mr. Harris showed a video of modern roundabouts that explained what a roundabout is and how a bicyclist or pedestrian can safely cross one.

Mr. Daun commented the video showed two examples of roundabouts; one in a residential neighborhood and the other in a busy area. He asked what type of roundabout would go in an urban setting.

Mr. Ziarnek replied if it is on a FDOT roadway, it would be a modern roundabout.

Mr. Daun referred to the brochure in the agenda and commented that it seems there needs to be a specific width allocation for pedestrians. He asked if that was an island. There are two roundabouts proposed for Mary McLeod Bethune Boulevard on the east and west side of Bethune Cookman University; one at Martin Luther King Boulevard and the other at Lincoln Street. In order for these roundabouts to be successful there has to be a specific width of the roads approaching the roundabout. He asked if the TPO would include in the design requirements that these widths will be as shown in the brochure for pedestrian and bicycle crossings.

Mr. Dodzik commented that has to happen otherwise it would not meet the design standards; it depends on if a city applies for state or federal funding. The city of Palm Coast designed their roundabouts the way they wanted because the city paid for them. To receive state or federal money there are certain guidelines that must be met.

Mr. Daun asked if the TPO could create a standard for local governments to meet these safety standards even if they are not receiving federal funds.

Mr. Harris replied the assumption is that projects that the TPO accepts are ones where federal funding is being requested. The TPO accepts applications for roundabout projects and they would be ranked as part of Traffic Operations/Safety projects. Once it goes through the TPO process and is on the priority list, it would have to be designed to meet federal and state guidelines. Roundabouts take a lot of space; much more than an intersection. Even if it is designed smaller, there is a good possibility land would be needed as the locations Mr. Daun mentioned are very tight. It would have to go through the public involvement process so residents and stakeholders could provide input.

Discussion continued.

C. Presentation and Discussion of BPAC Meeting Days and Times

Mr. Harris referred to page 50 of the agenda and the excerpt from the TPO Bylaws which state that BPAC meetings will be held on a regularly scheduled date, time and place approved by the BPAC. Currently, the BPAC meets on the second Wednesday of the month at 3:00 pm (except July and December) for as long as the committee deems; the committee can change it. Some meetings have run long and gone past 5:00 pm. If the committee would like to change the day and time, TPO staff has three suggestions; to consider meeting on the third Wednesday of the month, the third Thursday or third Tuesday. If the committee chooses the third Tuesday, it will have to be in the morning as the CAC and TCC meet in the afternoon. If the committee does this it will give staff an opportunity to get meeting agendas and materials to members earlier in the month. Right now, it goes up to the deadline; the agendas must go out a week in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Belin commented she did not think it was the day that is the issue but the time.

Mr. Coletti stated he and Ms. Haldeman discussed perhaps starting the meeting at 2:00 pm instead of 3:00 pm if there were not any conflicts so the meeting could adjourn by 4:00 pm.
Mr. Harris replied if the committee comes to a consensus for a different time it will be an action item next month and would take effect in January.

Ms. Haldeman stated she noticed after leaving the subcommittee meeting at 4:00 pm there is a big difference in traffic. Her only concern with changing the time is that some members may not be able to get here by 2:00 pm.

Mr. Kennedy suggested having public comment at the end of the meeting instead of the beginning.

Mr. Coletti stated when it gets close to 5:00 pm a number of members leave prematurely and changing the time gives the opportunity for all members to stay for the entire meeting.

Mr. Eik commented he has been a member long enough to notice the presentations are becoming more numerous and there does not seem to be a boundary on discussion. His concern is that there will be more discussion items and the meeting may not be as productive as it should. Most civic groups have specific guidelines as to the length of a presentation. There should be a reasonable time frame attached to a presentation.

Mr. Harris replied that the TPO allows 10 minutes for the advisory committees and 5 minutes for the board. The actual time the presenters receive is up to the chairperson.

Chairperson Storke stated that for the most part the presentations do not take long; it is the discussion that prolongs it. Once things are repeated it is time to close the discussion. He asked the members what their preference is for the time of the meeting; if members wanted to keep it the second Wednesday and change it to 2:00 pm.

The committee agreed on the second Wednesday of the month at 2:00 pm.

Mr. Harris replied it will be on the agenda next month as an action item.

VI. **Staff Comments**

Mr. Harris announced today is International Walk to School Day but Volusia County schools have postponed it until Friday due to Hurricane Michael. He will be at Campbell Middle School in Deltona and Ms. Blankenship will be at Indian River Elementary School in Edgewater.

VII. **Information Items**

- BPAC Attendance Record
- Letter from TPO Board Chair Lita Handy-Peters
- Mobility Week October 27 – November 3, 2018
- Pedestrian Safety/White Cane Awareness Event
- September 2018 TPO Outreach and Activities
- St. Johns River to Sea Loop Summit
- TPO Board Meeting Report

VIII. **BPAC Member Comments**

Mr. Walters stated he rode the new trail to Titusville and there are three roundabouts on the trail.

Mr. Mostert referred to the attendance record in the agenda and asked about the vacancy in Port Orange; there is a Port Orange representative here.
Chairperson Storke replied Ms. Perney is technical support.

Mr. Harris explained Port Orange has two representatives; a non-voting representative, Ms. Perney, and a voting member, which is currently vacant.

Mr. Daun stated it has been expressed by several members that there are policies the committee is to discuss or adhere to and his sentiment is if cities or staff are unable to look at other outlets or systems for funding, it should not be the TPO to give them a pass because they did not do their job effectively. He was not against the Ormond Beach sidewalk for the school but it was that they did not apply for the funding mechanisms that were available. Mr. Paul Haydt, East Coast Greenways and Trails, made the request to the committee to forward the minutes and comments from last month’s presentation on the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail to the FDOT representative; he would like to make a motion to do so.

Mr. Harris stated FDOT has a representative at all BPAC meetings; any action staff takes on the minutes needs direction from the BPAC.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Daun to forward the minutes and comments from last month’s BPAC meeting regarding the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail presentation to Ms. Heather Grubert, FDOT. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mostert.

Mr. Mostert commented he supports this motion because FDOT did not listen when taking the route from Rose Bay and the scenic tour versus the other route along Nova Road that would be more expensive it was discussed. As a cyclist, that route would not be used.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Eik stated he has discovered in Flagler Beach a good number of bicyclists riding at night without any lights. He was curious if the TPO had any ideas on how to get the people in the community aware that is not a good idea.

Mr. Harris suggested he would contact Mr. Chad Lingenfelter, at the FDOT Safety Office. He has held promotional events in the area and distributes lights and reflectors. He will have a report next month.

Discussion continued.

IX. Adjournment

The BPAC meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
IV. ACTION ITEMS

B. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TO CHANGE THE START TIME OF REGULARLY SCHEDULED BPAC MEETINGS FROM 3:00 P.M. TO 2:00 P.M.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

According to Section 7.3 of the River to Sea TPO Bylaws approved on June 25, 2014, monthly meetings of the BPAC shall be held on a regularly scheduled day, time and place approved by the BPAC membership. During a discussion of this topic at the October 10, 2018 BPAC meeting, a consensus was reached to change the start time of regularly scheduled BPAC meetings from 3:00 pm to 2:00 pm. The day and place of BPAC meetings remain the same. A draft 2019 Meeting Schedule of the River to Sea TPO Board and Committees is included with this agenda packet with the proposed start time.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO APPROVE CHANGING THE START TIME OF REGULARLY SCHEDULED BPAC MEETINGS FROM 3:00 P.M. TO 2:00 P.M.
# DRAFT 2019 Meeting Schedule of the River to Sea TPO Board and Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>River to Sea TPO Board</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
<th>Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)</th>
<th>Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)</th>
<th>Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)</th>
<th>Trans. Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td>4th Wed. @9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>1st Wed. @ 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>3rd Tues. @ 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3rd Tues. @ 1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>2nd Wed. @ 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2nd Wed. every other month @ 11:00 a.m. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>February 27, 2019</td>
<td>February 6, 2019</td>
<td>February 19, 2019</td>
<td>February 19, 2019</td>
<td>February 13, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>March 27, 2019</td>
<td>March 6, 2019</td>
<td>March 19, 2019</td>
<td>March 19, 2019</td>
<td>March 13, 2019</td>
<td>March 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>April 24, 2019</td>
<td>April 3, 2019</td>
<td>April 16, 2019</td>
<td>April 16, 2019</td>
<td>April 10, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>May 22, 2019</td>
<td>May 1, 2019</td>
<td>May 14, 2019</td>
<td>5/14/2019</td>
<td>May 8, 2019</td>
<td>May 8, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>June 26, 2019</td>
<td>June 5, 2019</td>
<td>June 18, 2019</td>
<td>June 18, 2019</td>
<td>June 12, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>August 7, 2019</td>
<td>August 20, 2019</td>
<td>August 20, 2019</td>
<td>August 14, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>September 25, 2019</td>
<td>September 4, 2019</td>
<td>September 17, 2019</td>
<td>September 17, 2019</td>
<td>September 11, 2019</td>
<td>September 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>October 23, 2019</td>
<td>October 2, 2019</td>
<td>October 15, 2019</td>
<td>October 15, 2019</td>
<td>October 6, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>November 27, 2019</td>
<td>November 6, 2019</td>
<td>November 19, 2019</td>
<td>November 19, 2019</td>
<td>November 13, 2019</td>
<td>November 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>December 25, 2019*</td>
<td>December 4, 2019*</td>
<td>December 17, 2019*</td>
<td>December 17, 2019*</td>
<td>December 11, 2019*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These meetings are typically cancelled  
** TDLCB Meetings are at Votran
IV. ACTION ITEMS

C. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING THE FY 2018/19 – 2022/23 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The proposed amendment to the FY 2018/19 - 2022/2023 TIP revises funding for one (1) existing project as follows:

- Derbyshire Park Sidewalks (FM #443236-1) along Vine Street from Brentwood Drive to 5th Street and along 3rd Street from Vine Street to Nova Road -- revises funding to add $477,000 to the Construction (CST) phase and $92,205 to the Construction Engineering & Inspection (CEI) phase in the current year; and re-allocates local and SU amounts corresponding to the 10% match requirement.

Resolution 2018-## is enclosed. Attachment “A” will be provided under separate cover.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2018-## AMENDING THE FY 2018/19 – 2022/23 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
WHEREAS, the River to Sea 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 portions of Flagler County inclusive of the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; 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 River to Sea 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 River to Sea 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 provided additional information to the River to Sea TPO regarding the FDOT adopted Five-Year Work Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the River to Sea TPO that the:

1. River to Sea TPO’s FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 TIP is hereby amended as shown in Attachment "A" attached hereto and made a part of this resolution; and the

2. Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit the FY 2018/19 to FY 2022/23 TIP as amended to the:
   a. Florida Department of Transportation;
   b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA);
   c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and the
   d. Department of Economic Opportunity.

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regularly convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 28th day of November 2018.
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 a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on November 28, 2018.

ATTEST:

________________________________________
DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
IV. ACTION ITEMS

D. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The River to Sea TPO adopted the year 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) report in January 2016. Among other items, the report identified major capital expenditures for projects designated on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). The SIS is Florida’s high priority network of transportation facilities that are deemed important to the state's economy and mobility. During the development of the LRTP, the TPO also identified projects that were needed improvements to the SIS, but were beyond the financial estimates provided at the time.

Since the adoption of the LRTP, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) updated their long range revenue estimates and approved an updated “cost feasible” SIS plan that extends out to the year 2045. In that updated plan, funding for the unfunded SIS needs identified in the River to Sea long range plan was identified. Two of the projects are currently in planning phases and have contracts that allow for the initiation of design activities upon completion of the planning phase. These are:

- **I-95 Interchange at Pioneer Trail** -- This project is a proposed interchange at I-95 and Pioneer Trail. A Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) study is currently underway and is expected to be completed in 2019.
- **I-95 Interchange at LPGA Boulevard** -- This project involves improvements needed to the interchange at I-95 and LPGA Boulevard. An Interchange Modification Report (IMR) study is currently underway and is expected to be completed in 2019.

The River to Sea TPO is seeking to amend the 2040 LRTP to reflect the funding of these two (2) projects consistent with the adopted FDOT Strategic Intermodal System Long Range Cost Feasible Plan.

Amendments to the R2CTPO plan require a 45 day public comments period. In addition, as a result of the implementation of Transportation Performance Management (TPM) the TPO will also be required to develop an amendment that incorporates the new performance measures into the decision-making.

River to Sea TPO staff are requesting support to develop the necessary materials and engage in the public outreach needed to amend the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan as described above.

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

*MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) FOR PUBLIC COMMENT*
IV. ACTION ITEMS

E. CANCELLATION OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2018 BPAC MEETING

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Traditionally, neither the TPO Board nor committees meet during the month of December if there is no outstanding business that needs to be conducted before the winter break.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO CANCEL THE DECEMBER 12, 2018 BPAC MEETING
V. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE ST. JOHNS RIVER TO SEA LOOP TRAIL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENT (PD&E) STUDY: LAKE BERESFORD PARK TO GRAND AVENUE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail (FM #439874-1) Lake Beresford to Grand Avenue Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study is being conducted to evaluate a multi-use trail in west Volusia County that will close the 3.6 mile gap between existing trails within Lake Beresford Park to the south and the junction of Grand Avenue and Minnesota Avenue to the north. The St. Johns River to Sea Loop is a 260-mile trail system that will link together several communities including St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, Titusville, DeLand, and Palatka.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail Gap
Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study
From Lake Beresford Park to Grand Avenue in DeLand, Volusia County
Financial Project Number: 439874-1-22-01
The purpose of the meeting is to present project related information on the multi-use trail alternatives that have been developed as part of the PD&E Study for the proposed trail from Lake Beresford Park to Grand Avenue, in DeLand.
Project Background

Sun Trail Program

• The Florida Shared-Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail Program was established for FDOT to develop a statewide network of paved trails which allows nonmotorized vehicles and pedestrians to access a variety of origins and destinations with limited exposure to motorized vehicles.

• The SUN Trail Network is created as a component of the Florida Greenways and Trails System (FGTS), which is planned by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

• In March 2016, the Florida Greenways and Trails Council (FGTC) selected the St. Johns River-to-Sea Loop (SJR2C) as their second regional trail system priority.

• For more information on this program please visit http://www.floridasuntrail.com
St. Johns River to Sea Loop (SJR2C)

- The St. Johns River-to-Sea Loop is a partially completed 260-mile trail system that will link together five counties and several communities including St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, Titusville, DeLand, and Palatka along Florida’s Atlantic Coast and the St. Johns River corridor.
This project is a segment of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop trail system and is planned to complete a gap section between existing trails terminating at the junction of Grand Avenue and Minnesota Avenue to the north, and those within Lake Beresford Park to the south.
Project Goals

• Develop, evaluate and select a multi-use trail option that meets the transportation need while minimizing impacts.

• Obtain stakeholder input and buy-in

• Advance the project to final design (currently programmed for fiscal year 2020).
• Project is state funded

• FDOT is required by Chapters 334, 338 and 339 of the Florida Statutes (F.S.) to consider and assess the impacts on the environment regardless of funding source.

• The level of assessment and documentation depends on the nature of the project, the potential for impacts, and the involvement of FDOT.

• A Non-Major State Action (NMSA) checklist is the documentation required for this project.
PD&E Process – Engineering Analysis

• The level of engineering detail required for a PD&E study is project-specific. The engineering analysis should be conducted to a level of detail that can be used to evaluate the impacts of a proposed project on the social, natural, cultural and physical environment, as well as to compare the impacts of various alternative improvement concepts.

• A state funded project does not require the detailed evaluation of a range of alternatives. The number of alternatives to be evaluated is determined based on preliminary engineering analysis and may include multiple Build Alternatives.

• A No-Build Alternative will always be carried through the public involvement portion of the PD&E study even though the No-Build Alternative usually will not meet the project’s purpose and need.

• After the preliminary engineering analysis and design criteria have been established, the typical section(s) can be developed to determine the total right of way width. Alignment alternatives are then developed and overlaid on aerial photography.
Example Typical Section

- **2′**
- **12′** MULTI-USE TRAIL
- **2′** VARIES (5′ MIN.) SEPARATION FROM ROADWAY
- **EXIST. ROADWAY**
Alternative 1 (West)
Alternative 2 (East)
Current Study Corridors
Trail Crossing at SR 44 and Grand Avenue Intersection
Right of way (ROW) Acquisition

- Goal is to utilize the existing ROW wherever possible
- Survey and ROW mapping was needed for identification of existing ROW throughout the project area
- Proposed alternatives were chosen based on availability of ROW as a priority factor
PD&E Process – Environmental Analysis

- The Environmental Analysis portion of the PD&E study involves gathering all available data needed to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the various improvement alternatives identified within the study corridor.
- The evaluation includes assessing potential impacts to the social, natural, cultural and physical environment.

**SOCIAL IMPACTS**
- Land Use Changes
- Community Cohesion
- Relocation Potential
- Community Services
- Title VI Considerations
- Controversy Potential
- Bicycles and Pedestrians

**NATURAL IMPACTS**
- Wetlands
- Water Quality
- Floodplains
- Wildlife and Habitat

**CULTURAL IMPACTS**
- Historic and Archeologic Sites
- Recreation Areas

**PHYSICAL IMPACTS**
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Construction
- Contamination
# Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>No-Build Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 1 (West)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (East)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centerline Length of Alternative (miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individual parcels impacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of business relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of residential relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological/Historical sites - potential for impact (low/medium/high)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public parks, recreation areas, or wildlife refuges (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened and endangered species - potential for impact (low/medium/high)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination sites (ratio - high/medium)</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides existing trail connectivity (yes/no)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of way acquisition for trail (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Estimate of Total Project Cost*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12.9 M</td>
<td>$12.1 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Project cost does not include potential right of way acquisition
PD&E Process – Public Involvement

Public involvement activities are most extensive during the PD&E phase of a project. These activities allow the public to provide input in transportation decisions that result in the development of a transportation system that truly meets community needs and desires.

Public involvement, in conjunction with other sources of data, plays an essential role in the assessment of the social, economic, land use, mobility, aesthetic, and relocation effects of transportation projects.

Public Involvement Milestones

- **Informational public meeting** (November 2017)
- **Small group public and agency meetings** (December 2017 – November 2018)
- **Alternatives public meeting** (December 2018)
## Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Win</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- ◻ Begin or End Study
- 📝 Newsletter Mailed
- 🗓️ SIR2C Public Meeting
Project Funding

After this study is complete, the resulting recommendations will be advanced into the design phase, which is tentatively funded for fiscal year 2020. Following the design phase, if needed, will be a right of way acquisition phase, followed by construction. The entire process can take several years, depending on many factors, including the availability of funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of way Acquisition</td>
<td>Not Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For additional project information, updates on study progress and project documents (as completed) please visit:

http://www.cflroads.com/

(Search number 439874-1)

For additional information regarding this project, contact:

**Mary McGehee**, Project Manager
Florida Department of Transportation
District Five
719 South Woodland Blvd.
DeLand, FL 32720
386-943-5063
Mary.McGehee@dot.state.fl.us

**Bob Finck**, Consultant Project Manager
AIM Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
3802 Corporex Park Drive, Suite 225
Tampa, FL 33619
813-574-0221
bfinck@aimengr.com
V. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE R2CTPO POLICY RESOLUTIONS FOR THE ANNUAL CALL FOR PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Each year, after completion of the project prioritization process, the TPO staff asks the committees to evaluate the process and recommend improvements for the next cycle. The aim is to achieve the best possible outcomes in terms of identifying and promoting transportation-related priorities consistent with the community’s goals and objectives as prescribed in the adopted long-range transportation plan. The Project Review Subcommittee met on October 24, 2018 and recommended improvements to the R2CTPO Policy Resolutions for the Annual Call for Projects. Draft resolutions are included in this agenda packet for your review. Additions are underlined and deletions are stricken.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
### 2019 Priority Project Process Schedule

#### January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issue Call for Projects/“Notice of Funding Availability” (9-1/2 weeks long)*

#### February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TCC Meeting/Priority Project Process Workshop*

#### March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application Deadline (12:00 noon)

TIP Subcommittee and BPAC Subcommittee meet separately to score/rank applications

Project sponsors submit updated cost estimates for projects currently on List of Prioritized Projects

BPAC reviews preliminary rankings

CAC/TCC review preliminary rankings; 30-day legal notice for adoption hearing

TPO Board reviews recommended preliminary rankings

30-day public notice/invitation to comment (post in area newspapers and on TPO website);

BPAC reviews/recommends rankings

CAC/TCC review/recommend rankings

TPO Board reviews/approves final rankings
WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that every urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more, as a condition to the receipt of federal capital or operating assistance, shall 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 River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for the designated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) comprised of Volusia County and the urbanized areas of Flagler County including the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

WHEREAS, 23 C.F.R. 450.104 provides that the River to Sea TPO shall annually endorse, and amend as appropriate, the plans and programs required, among which is the Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects list of the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) submission; and

WHEREAS, each year the appropriate River to Sea TPO committees made up of a cross-section of interested citizens and technical staff are charged with the responsibility of drafting a list of prioritized projects; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the River to Sea TPO to establish project priorities for all areas of the TPO's MPA; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO reaffirms its commitment to the priority process and related policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the River to Sea TPO that the following policies are established to prioritize transportation projects throughout the TPO's MPA:

1. The project application and evaluation criteria approved by the River to Sea TPO Board shall be used to solicit and evaluate projects for priority ranking in the transportation program categories listed below:
   a. Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects;
   b. Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects and Major Bridge Projects;
c. Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects;
d. Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives Projects;
e. Public Transit Projects; and
f. Transportation Planning Studies.

2. River to Sea TPO projects that were previously ranked and have a Financial Management (FM) number and are in the Florida Department of Transportation Work Program will automatically be prioritized above projects that are not currently in the FDOT Five-Year Work Program;

3. Projects which are ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects are deemed to be protected, and will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;

4. Projects which are ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects and Major Bridge Projects are deemed to be protected, and will remain in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;

5. Projects which are ranked one through eight on Tier “B” of the Prioritized List of Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects are deemed to be protected, and will be ranked in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;

6. Projects which are ranked one through three on Tier “B” of the Prioritized List of Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives Projects are deemed to be protected, and will be ranked in their current spot or move to the next available higher spot until they are completed and drop out of the Work Program;

7. If, at any time, two or more lists of prioritized projects are merged into a new list, every project that was protected prior to the merger shall retain its protected status, and no new or previously unprotected project shall be deemed to be protected unless and until it advances to the protected rank prescribed for the new, merged list.

8. The River to Sea TPO will only re-prioritize or add projects when the TPO Board determines: a) unusual circumstances support such action, b) the circumstances are not of a recurring nature, c) the circumstances do not result from the actions of the project sponsor, and d) the proposed reprioritization or addition will not be contrary to the public interest;

9. Requests to change the priority or to add a project must include a statement of hardship by the requestor along with supporting documentation that includes
detailed justification of need and an assessment of the impacts to the programming of prioritized projects;

10. It is the responsibility of the River to Sea TPO and FDOT staffs to provide the River to Sea TPO members with current information and data on project status and to assist the members in their efforts to make informed decisions regarding the prioritized projects lists;

11. The River to Sea TPO shall, in its discretion, make all decisions regarding the final prioritized project lists that are annually submitted to FDOT;

12. Once a project has attained protected status, it should be programmed within 3 years. If it has not been programmed during that time due to inactivity on the part of the project sponsor, then the project will be removed from the list of priority projects. The project sponsor may resubmit the project for open ranking on any subsequent call for projects.

13. Per the approved the Annual Call for Projects schedule, the project sponsor shall annually submit a letter to the River to Sea TPO affirming their continued support to retain each project on the priority list and provide updated cost estimates.

14. The River to Sea TPO shall use this project prioritization process to support the development of Regional Priority Lists in the areas of Trails, Transit, Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O), and Planning Studies.

14-15. The policies set forth in this resolution shall remain in effect unless and until they are repealed by the TPO; and

15.16. The Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO, (or their designee) is hereby authorized and directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the:

   a. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);

   b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and

   c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation)
DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 6th day of December 2017.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Volusia County Council Vice Chair Deb Denys
Commissioner Robert Gilliland
Vice-Chairperson, River to Sea TPO

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 a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on December 6, 2017.

ATTEST:

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
RESOLUTION OF THE RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
ESTABLISHING THE POLICY FOR THE ANNUAL ALLOCATION OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
PROGRAM (STP) URBAN ATTRIBUTABLE (SU) FUNDING AND OTHER STATE AND FEDERAL
FUNDS IDENTIFIED IN THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR LOCAL
INITIATIVES

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that every
urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more, as a condition to the receipt of federal capital
or operating assistance, shall 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 River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the duly
designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning
and programming process for the designated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) comprised of
Volusia County and the urbanized areas of Flagler County including the cities of Flagler Beach,
Beverly Beach, and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

WHEREAS, 23 C.F.R. 450.104 provides that the River to Sea TPO shall annually endorse, and
amend as appropriate, the plans and programs required, among which is the Surface
Transportation Program (STP) projects list of the annual Transportation Improvement Program
(TIP) submission; and

WHEREAS, each year the appropriate River to Sea TPO committees, made up of a cross-
section of interested citizens and staff, are charged with the responsibility of drafting a list of
prioritized projects; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the River to Sea TPO to establish project priorities that
are equitable for all areas within the River to Sea TPO’s planning boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO reaffirms its commitment to the priority process and
related policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the River to Sea TPO that:

1. Annual set-asides of the River to Sea TPO’s total Surface Transportation Program
   (STP) Urban Attributable (SU) funding will be made in the following manner: 40% 30% of the
total SU funds will be used for Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local
Initiatives (traffic operations focused) Project Priorities, 30% of the total SU funds will be used for Transit Project Priorities, and 30% to 40% of the total SU funds will be used for Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives (bicycle/pedestrian focused) Project Priorities;

2. Annual set-asides of other state and federal funds identified in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Local Initiatives will be made available in the following manner: 50% of the funds will be used for Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives (traffic operations focused) Project Priorities and 50% will be used for Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives (bicycle/pedestrian focused) Project Priorities;

3. Mixed projects (defined as a project that is not a stand-alone bicycle or pedestrian project) will only be accepted and ranked if the predominant cost component is consistent with the category of funding to which it is submitted. All other cost components are subject to eligibility of available funding. Mixed projects submitted by a member local government will be presented to the TPO Board for final determination prior to being ranked in the TPO’s list of Priority Projects for Bicycle/Pedestrian facilities;

4. For projects funded in whole or in part with Urban Attributable (SU) funding and/or other state and federal funds obtained through the TPO’s Priority Project Process, if the recipient of the funds chooses to display any signs or markers at the project site, said signs or markers shall include language acknowledging the River to Sea TPO, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and/or other funding partners, as may be applicable, for providing funding for the project. In addition to the language, the sign or marker shall include these agencies’ official logos.

Additionally, any public pronouncements made by or on behalf of the recipient regarding the project, including press releases, publications, annual reports, video credits, and dedications, shall acknowledge the funding support provided by the TPO, FDOT, FHWA, and FTA.

5. Resolution 2016-03 2017-03 is hereby repealed and replaced by this resolution;

6. The policies set forth in this resolution shall remain in effect unless and until they are repealed by the TPO; and

7. The Chairmanperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the:

   a. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);
   b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and
   c. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation).
DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 25th 23rd day of January 20172019.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

________________________________________
CITY OF FLAGLER BEACH
COMMISSIONER MARSHALL SHUPE
COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
CHAIRMAN Vice-CHAIRPERSON, RIVER TO SEA TPO

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 a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on January 25, 201723, 2019.

ATTEST:

_____________________________________
PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
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 River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for the designated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) comprised of Volusia County and the urbanized areas of Flagler County including the cities of Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, and portions of Palm Coast and Bunnell; and

WHEREAS, the FDOT funds projects in the Work Program based on the plans and priorities set by the TPO; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO desires to provide, whenever possible, financial assistance to governmental entities to allow them to pursue transportation projects and programs which are consistent with the TPO's plans and priorities and benefit residents of and visitors to our planning area; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO wants to leverage the state and federal transportation funds programmed on transportation projects in TPO's MPA and ensure a measure of local financial commitment to transportation projects and programs utilizing these funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the River to Sea TPO that:

1. Every governmental entity receiving state and/or federal transportation funds for a project on any of the following Priority Project Lists shall provide a local match at the ratio of 10% local funds to 90% state and/or federal funds:
   a. Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects;
   b. Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Alternatives, Regional Trails, and Local Initiatives Projects.
      This match requirement shall not apply to projects on the State Highway System; and

2. Every governmental entity receiving state and/or federal transportation funds for a project on the TPO's Priority List of Transportation Planning Studies shall provide a local match at the ratio of 10% local funds to 90% state and/or federal funds; and
3. A local match shall not be required for any project on the TPO’s Priority Lists of Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects, Regionally-Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects, or Transit Projects, subject to the any other funding program requirements that may apply (e.g., Transportation Regional Incentive Program); and

4. the River to Sea TPO determines that “local match” shall be defined as non-state/non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services of eligible costs that advance the project in question; and

5. notwithstanding the terms prescribed in subparagraph 2, above, the required local match shall not exceed the ratio required in the current policy of the TPO Board at the time the governmental entity requesting the funds commits to its amount of local match for the project; and

6. the River to Sea TPO reserves the right to waive or adjust the local match requirements if the TPO Board deems there exists sufficient reason or circumstance; and

7. the River to Sea TPO defines a cost overrun as an increase in the amount of the cost of any programmed project phase due to a change in scope, project limits or project approach that could have reasonably been foreseen or is the result of an incomplete, insufficient or out of date cost estimate; and

8. the River to Sea TPO also reaffirms its policy that any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with state and/or federal transportation funds will be the responsibility of the governmental entity identified as the project originator with the following exception: if the project is on the state highway system and the State DOT is the project manager of record then the state shall be responsible for any cost overruns utilizing state dollars; and

9. the River to Sea TPO defines a cost increase as an increase in the cost of any programmed project phase due to unforeseen market changes or a change in requirements and/or standards for projects that have current and complete cost estimates; and

10. Requests for additional state and/or federal transportation funds must be submitted to the TPO and include a statement of hardship or justification by the governmental entity identified as the project sponsor along with supporting documentation that includes detailed justification of the change in cost; and

11. the River to Sea TPO Executive Director may authorize the use of state or federal funds to cover some or all of a cost overrun cost increase on any project phase up to and including 10% of the project cost estimate for that phase; and

12. the use of state and/or federal funds to cover cost overrun increases exceeding 10% of the project cost estimate for any phase may be authorized only by the River to Sea TPO Board; and

13. the Chairman/Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to submit this resolution to the:
a. Florida Department of Transportation;
b. Federal Transit Administration (through the Florida Department of Transportation);
c. Federal Highway Administration (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and
d. Councils, Commissions, and Managers of the TPO Member Local Governments.

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regularly convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on the 27th day of January 2016.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

________________________________________
VOLUSIA COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER, PAT PATTEN
COMMISSIONER ROBERT GILLILAND
CHAIRMAN, RIVER TO SEA TPO

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 a resolution, adopted at a legally convened meeting of the River to Sea TPO held on January 27, 2019.

ATTEST:

___________________________________
PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP
DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
V. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

C. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE PRIORITY PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN AND B/P LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Each year, after completion of the project prioritization process, the TPO staff asks the committees to evaluate the process and recommend improvements for the next cycle. The aim is to achieve the best possible outcomes in terms of identifying and promoting transportation-related priorities consistent with the community’s goals and objectives as prescribed in the adopted long-range transportation plan. The Project Review Subcommittee met on October 24, 2018 and recommended improvements to the Priority Project Applications (Feasibility Study and Project Implementation) for Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects. Draft Priority Project Applications and General Instructions are included in this agenda packet for your review. Additions are underlined and deletions are stricken.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
January 2018 2019

General Instructions:

For the 2018 2019 Call for Projects, the R2CTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

Feasibility studies assess the engineering and planning characteristics of bicycle/pedestrian projects. Feasibility studies must include, but not be limited to, the determination of available right-of-way, documentation and identification of the solutions of obstacles that may impede the project’s constructability, permitting and socioeconomic constraints, landscaping, drainage and an engineer’s estimate of related planning, design, right-of-way and construction costs.

The R2CTPO has two different application forms for Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Projects. One is to be used when applying for a Feasibility Study; the other is to be used when applying for Project Implementation. For a given project, applications for Feasibility Study and Project Implementation must be submitted in separate application cycles.

When applying for Project Implementation, the applying agency will also be required to submit a completed copy of FDOT’s Project Information Application Form. No project will advance beyond a Feasibility Study unless the R2CTPO 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.

Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application. The TPO is not obliged to consider information pertaining to the project request that is not included in the project application. However, applying agencies are encouraged to be present for the evaluation of their applications to provide clarification, if needed. Updated cost estimates for projects on the bicycle/pedestrian list of prioritized projects are to be submitted with a letter of continuing support by April 30, 2018 March 29, 2019.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

Eligible Project Sponsors for Transportation Alternatives Funds

Transportation Alternatives funds can only be obligated for projects submitted by “eligible entities” defined in 23 U.S.C. 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 oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible.

The following are the only activities related to surface transportation that can be funded with Transportation Alternatives funds:

   a) Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized 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 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).
   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 non-motorized transportation users.

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) Non-infrastructure-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.

All construction and pre-construction work phases will be administered by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) or other Local Agency Program (LAP) certified local government. Reimbursements are distributed only to a LAP certified agency responsible for completing the tasks. FDOT assigns a LAP Design and LAP Construction Liaison for each project. Federal law requires that each project be administered under the

---

It is the River to Sea TPO’s intent to extend eligibility to all of the activities included within the meaning of the term “Transportation Alternatives” pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) except the following:

1. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas;
2. Community improvement activities, including –
   a. inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
   b. historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
   c. vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and
   d. archaeological activities related to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23;
3. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to –
   a. 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
   b. reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats
4. Safe Routes to School coordinator
5. Planning, designing, or construction boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
rules and procedures governing federally funded transportation projects. Certified Local Agencies comply with all applicable Federal statutes, rules and regulations.

**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 River to Sea TPO’s Regional Trails Corridor Plan or an adopted 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.

Is this an activity that can be funded with Transportation Alternatives Funds?
- If Yes – the project is eligible.
- If No – the project application is not acceptable.

**Local Match Requirement:**
R2CTPO Resolution 2016-01 provides that the governmental entity requesting state and/or federal transportation funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratio of 10% local funds to 90% state and/or federal funds. The match shall be by project phase for each programmed phase including feasibility study. A non-federal cash match is required for a feasibility study. For all other phases, the local match is defined as non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services that advance the project. This resolution also reaffirms the R2CTPO’s policy that the applying agency (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with state and/or federal transportation funds unless the project is on the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns.

**Other Funding Requirements:**
All project applications are subject to approval by the R2CTPO Board. Other funds (in addition to SU funds) may be used to fund project phases or overall costs.

**Electronic and “Hard Copy” 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 **must** be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive. [https://www3.mydocsonline.com/cupload.aspx?id=R2CTPO](https://www3.mydocsonline.com/cupload.aspx?id=R2CTPO)
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 Transportation Alternatives Activities 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.

Projects that contribute directly to the completion or enhancement of the following trail systems may be eligible for inclusion as Regional Trail Projects:

1. SunTrail Network
2. Priority and Opportunity Land Trails of the Florida Greenways and Trails System (FGTS) Plan

Will this proposed project contribute directly to the completion or enhancement of any of the aforementioned regional trail systems?  Yes ☐ No ☐

R2CTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an application at the request of any member local government.
Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

Applying Agency (project sponsor): ____________________________ Date: ________________

Contact Person: ____________________________ Job Title: ____________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________________

Phone: ____________________________ FAX: ____________________________

E-mail: ______________________________________________________________________

Does the Applying Agency expect to be certified by FDOT to perform work under the Local Agency Program (LAP) process?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO

If not, what local government agency will perform the work on behalf of the Applying Agency? ____________________________

[Attach a letter of intent from the agency that will perform the work.]

Governmental entity with maintenance responsibility for roadway facility on which proposed project is located:

[If not the same as Applying Agency, attach letter of support for the proposed project from the responsible entity. This letter of support must include a statement describing the responsible entity’s expectations for maintenance of the proposed improvements, i.e., what the applying agency’s responsibility will be.]

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applying Agency: _______________

Project Description: ______________________________________________________________________

Project Location (include project length and termini, if appropriate, and attach location map): _______________

Project Eligibility for Federal Funds (check the appropriate box):

☐ the proposed improvement is located on the Federal-aid system. (Reference the Federal Aid Road Report at http://www.fdot.gov/planning/statistics/fedaid/);

☐ the proposed improvement is not located on the Federal-aid system, but qualifies as a type of improvement identified in 23 U.S.C. §133 that is not restricted to the Federal-aid system.

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.

The Purpose and Need Statement should address all of the following Priority Criteria:

1. **Proximity to Community Assets**: 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 20 points will be assessed.

2. **Connectivity and Accessibility**: 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. A maximum of 20 points will be assessed.

3. **Safety/Security**: 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 numbers of safety concerns. A maximum of 25 points will be assessed.

4. **Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community**: this measure considers factors that have an impact on “livability” and sustainability in the community. A maximum of 10 points will be assessed.

5. **Enhancements to the Transportation System**: this measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation. A maximum of 10 points will be assessed.

6. **Public Support/Special Considerations**: 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. A maximum of 5 points will be assessed.

7. **Local Matching Funds > 10%**: if local matching funds greater than 10% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail. A maximum of 20 points will be awarded.

**Commentary (required):**
Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

Applying Agency (project sponsor): ____________________________ Date: ________________

[Attach a copy of the completed Feasibility Study, or explain in the space provided below for commentary why a Feasibility Study is not attached.]

Commentary: ________________________________________________________________

Attach a completed copy of FDOT’s Project Information Application Form.

Criteria Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Proximity to Community Assets</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Connectivity and Accessibility</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Safety/Security</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Enhancements to the Transportation System</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Project Readiness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Public Support/Special Considerations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Local Matching Funds &gt; 10%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary)</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion #1 – Proximity to Community Assets (20 points maximum)

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 and Transportation Alternatives Activities or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 20 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 and describe in the space provided.
Proximity to Community Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential developments, apartments, community housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping plaza, malls, retail centers, trade/vocational schools, colleges, universities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, trail facilities, recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/health facilities, nursing homes, assisted living, rehabilitation center</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus stop (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment: 20

Criterion #1 Description (if needed required):

Criterion #2 – Connectivity and Accessibility (20 points maximum)

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. Does the project enhance mobility or accessibility for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled?

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 space provided.

Network Connectivity and Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity Feature</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project provides access to a transit facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g., comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Point Assessment: 20

Criterion #2 Description (if needed required):

Criterion #3 – Safety/Security (20 points maximum)

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 numbers of safety concerns.

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

For more information, contact Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and refer to Florida Statute 1006.23.

2018 2019 Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local Initiatives Project Application - Project Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety/Security</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. The project eliminates or abates a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study. The project helps the River to Sea TPO meet or exceed adopted Transportation Safety Targets for Non-Motorized Serious Injuries and Fatalities. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Point Assessment**

| 20 |

**Criterion #3 Description (if needed required):**

**Criterion #4 Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers how the project positively impacts the “Livability” and Sustainability in the community that is being served by that facility. Depict assets on a project area map and describe in the space provided.

**Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (Maximum 10 Points)**

- Project includes traffic calming measures
- Project is located in a “gateway” or entrance corridor as identified in a local government applicant’s master plan, or other approved planning document
- Project removes barriers and/or bottlenecks for bicycle and/or pedestrian movements
- Project includes features which improve the comfort, safety, security, enjoyment or well-being for bicyclists, pedestrians, and/or transit users
- Project improves transfer between transportation modes
- Project supports infill and redevelopment consistent with transit-oriented design principals and strategies are in place making it reasonably certain that such infill and redevelopment will occur
- Project supports a comprehensive travel demand management strategy that will likely significantly advance one or more of the following objectives: 1) reduce average trip length, 2) reduce single occupancy motor vehicle trips, 3) increase transit and non-motorized trips, 4) reduce motorized vehicle parking, reduce personal injury and property damage resulting from vehicle crashes
- Project significantly enhances the travel experience via walking and biking

**Criterion (4) Describe how this project contributes to the “Livability” and Sustainability of the Community:**

---
**Criterion #5 Enhancements to the Transportation System (10 points maximum)**

This measure considers the demonstrated and defensible relationship to surface transportation.

Describe how this project fits into the local and regional transportation system. Depict this on the map where applicable and describe in the space provided.

*Enhancements to the Transportation System (Maximum 10 Points)*

- Is the project included in an adopted plan?
- Does local government have Land Development Code requirements to construct sidewalks?
- Does the project relate to surface transportation?
- Does the project improve mobility between two or more different land use types located within 1/2 mile of each other, including residential and employment, retail or recreational areas?
- Does the project benefit transit riders by improving connectivity to existing or programmed pathways or transit facilities?
- Does the project conform to Transit Oriented Development principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in the corridor/area?

**Criterion #5 Describe how this project enhances the Transportation System:**

**Criterion #6 Project “Readiness” (5 Points maximum)**

This measure considers the state of project readiness. Describe project readiness in the space provided.

*Project Readiness (Maximum 5 Points)*

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?
- Is the project completed through the design phase?
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

**Criterion #6 Describe the state of Project “Readiness”:**

**Criterion #7 – Public Support/Special Considerations (5 points maximum)**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Considerations</th>
<th>Check All that Apply</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is documented public support provided for the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any special issues or concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Point Assessment**

5

**Criterion #7 Description (if needed required):**
Criterion #8 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (20 points maximum)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost?</th>
<th>Check One</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0% &lt; Local Matching Funds &lt; 12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 15.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 27.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds &lt; 32.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Point Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion #8 Description (if needed required):

Criterion #9 – Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary) (variable points)

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the eight 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.
2018 2019 Priority Process for Bicycle/Pedestrian and B/P Local initiatives Projects

Feasibility Studies

1. Local government submits project(s)
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for feasibility studies
3. The TPO Board will approve a final ranking of all projects
4. TPO requests a Fee Proposal from consultant to perform a feasibility study
5. TPO schedules a scoping meeting with the consultant, FDOT and local government(s)
6. Consultant provides Fee Proposal to TPO
7. 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.)
8. TPO gives the consultant a Notice to Proceed on the feasibility study
9. Draft feasibility study is reviewed and approved by the TPO, FDOT and local government(s)
10. Final feasibility study is completed

Project Implementation

1. Local government submits project(s) and an official letter agreeing to pay 10% of the programmed project implementation cost, and agreeing to pay for any cost overruns
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for project implementation
3. The TPO Board will approve a final ranking of all projects
4. TPO coordinates with FDOT to program the project in the next available fiscal year of the FDOT Work Program
5. Construction of top ranked project: 2-4 years
DATE:

1. **Project Information:**
   - Project ID (SR, CR, Etc…):
   - From/At (South or West Termini):
   - To (North or East Termini):
   - County: -
   - Project Length (Miles):
   - Project Type: Other If other, please specify: -

2. **Title of Project Priority List and Project Ranking:**
   - Central Florida MPO Alliance List and Project Ranking (if applicable):

3. **Managing Agency Contact Information:**
   - Applicant:
   - Contact Person:
   - Title:
   - Address:
   - Phone Number:
   - E-mail Address:

4. **Phase(s) Being Requested** (click to select all appropriate boxes):
   - [ ] Study
   - [ ] PD&E
   - [ ] Design
   - [ ] Right-of-way
   - [ ] Construction
   - [ ] Other:

5. **Project Description:**
   a. Project Scope/Description (please be as detailed as possible):
   b. What fiscal year will this project be ready for production/construction:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>Requested Fiscal Year (July 1-June 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development and Environment Study (PD&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/CEI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Please state the purpose and need for this project.

d. What data from the statement above was obtained and/or used to support this analysis?

**Note:** If a study was done, then please provide a copy of the study. If no study was done, please provide documentation to support the need of the project and that the proposed improvements will address the issue.

e. Is this project within 5 miles of a Public Airport? If yes, which one(s)?

f. Is this facility a designated SIS corridor, connector, or hub or adjacent to a SIS facility?

g. Is this project on a transit route? If yes, which one(s)?

h. Is this project within the Federal Aid system?
   (If yes, FDOT staff needs to verify and check here □)

6. **Consistency with Local and MPO Plans**
   a. Is this project consistent with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan?

      If no, please state when an amendment will be processed to include the project in the Plan.

   b. Is the project in an MPO Cost Feasible component of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)?

      If yes, please attach a copy of the page in the LRTP.
If no, please state when an amendment will be done to include the project in the LRTP (if applicable). It is not necessary to specifically identify traffic planning studies in the LRTP.

7. **Other Information:**
   a. Has the Applying Agency been certified by FDOT to perform the work under the Local Agency Program (LAP) process?

   b. What year was the agency last certified?

8. If this is a non-state road project, to be located outside of State Right-of-Way, is there sufficient right-of-way for the project is currently owned by the local government entity?

   If yes, please provide proof of right-of-way ownership (right-of-way certification, right-of-way maps or maintenance maps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>Phase Complete? Yes/No/NA</th>
<th>Responsible Agency (Who performed or who will perform the work?)</th>
<th>Procurement Method? In-house/Advertise</th>
<th>Project Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development and Environment Study (PD&amp;E)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost Estimate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Include a map showing location of the area of interest. Label important features, roadways, or additional description to help FDOT identify the location and understand the nature of the project.
- When requesting the Construction phase please include the following documents, if available:
  - Signed and sealed plans
  - Engineer’s estimate
- Bid Documents and Specifications Package
- Signed LAP Construction Checklist
- Right of Way Certification
- Environmental Certification
- All necessary permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>Federal/State $</th>
<th>Local $</th>
<th>Project Cost Estimate $ *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development and Environment Study (PD&amp;E)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost Estimate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project Cost Estimate for each Work Type must match the Project Cost Estimate provided in the preceding table.*
### EXHIBIT “A”

**Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 18 (Planning)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPN (If Known):</th>
<th>FAN: TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name of Project:**

**Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):**

**Phone:**

**Email Address:**

**Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:**

**Procurement Method:**

- Advertisement

**Fee Estimate:** $0 (include backup documentation)

**Tentative Schedule** (MMDDYY):

- FDOT issues NTP for Study:
- Advertise/Award/NTP for Study Services:
- Begin Study:
- Final Submittal:
- Final Invoice:
- Date Agreement needed:
- Board Date:
**EXHIBIT “A”**  
**Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 28 (PD&E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPN (If Known):</th>
<th>FAN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>Email Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement Method:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Advertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fee Estimate:** $0 (include backup documentation)

**Tentative Schedule (MMDDYY):**

**FDOT issues NTP for Study:**

**Advertise/Award/NTP for Study Services:**

**Begin Study:**

**Final Submittal:**

**Final Invoice:**

**Date Agreement needed:**

**Board Date:**
EXHIBIT “A”

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 38 (Design)

FPN (If Known):  
Name of Project:  
Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):  
Phone:  
Email Address:  
Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:  

Design Procurement Method:  
☐ In-House  ☐ Advertisement  
Design Fee Estimate:  $0  (include backup documentation)

Tentative Design Schedule (MMDDYY):

FDOT issues NTP for Design:  
Advertise/Award/NTP for Design Services:  
Begin Design:  
60% Plans Submittal (including Reviews):  
90% Plans Submittal (including Reviews):  
Final Plans Submittal:  
Final Invoice:  
Date Agreement needed:  
Board Date:  
Construction Funded:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  
Fiscal Year:  
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# EXHIBIT “A”

## Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 58 (Construction)

- **FPN (If Known):**
- **FAN:**
- **Name of Project:**
- **Project Manager:**
- **Phone:**
- **Email Address:**

## Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEI Procurement Method:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ In-House</td>
<td>□ Advertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CEI Procurement Method:

- **CEI Estimate (LAP Projects Only):** $0 (Attach supporting man-hours and rates)
- **Const Estimate (LAP Projects Only):** $0 (Attach engineer's estimate)

### Tentative Construction Schedule (MMDDYY):

- **Ad Date:**
- **Bid Opening Date:**
- **Award Date:**
- **Executed Contract Date:**
- **Pre Construction Date:**
- **NTP to Contractor Date:**
- **Construction Duration:**
- **Completion Date:**
- **Final Acceptance Date:**
- **Date Agreement Needed:**
- **Board Date:**

---
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V. PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR CURRENT YEAR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) URBAN ATTRIBUTABLE (SU) SET ASIDE FUNDING

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

As a designated Transportation Management Area (TMA), the River to Sea TPO receives federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding each year. These funds, totaling approximately $5 million per year, are allocated at the discretion of the TPO based on program eligibility. The current policy of the River to Sea TPO allocates funding as follows:

- 30% for capital expenditures by Transit providers
- 30% for Bicycle and Pedestrian related projects; and
- 40% for Traffic Operations and Safety improvements.

Applications are received each year for project funding requests in two (2) of the categories: 1) the Bicycle and Pedestrian related projects; and 2) the Traffic Operations and Safety improvements. Project funding requires that a sponsor be certified under the Local Area Program (LAP). LAP certification is challenging and limits the opportunities for local governments to access these funds.

In addition, the funding must be obligated in the year they are allocated to the TPO. If the TPO does not fully obligate the funds, restrictions may be applied that reduce spending authority in following years.

The R2CTPO currently has roughly $1.8 million for Traffic Operations projects and $330,000 for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects. We have also been notified that approximately $300,000 in unspent funds remain after completion of the I-95 to SR 417 Connector Study and these may be available to program within the planning area. The TPO has identified two (2) projects that may advance to utilize a portion of these funds. If these projects are funded, however, there will still be just over $750,000 available.

In partnership with the FDOT, the R2CTPO is seeking input from the TPO to program unused funds in the current fiscal year to supplement state funds available to support the design phase of the Pioneer Trail Interchange. The PD&E for this project will be completed in 2019 and the design phase is currently not funded.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION IS REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE BPAC
VI. STAFF COMMENTS

→ River to Sea TPO Staff Update

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

→ BPAC Attendance Record
→ BPAC Subcommittee Report
→ Light Up Midtown Health Fair
→ October 2018 TPO Outreach & Activities
→ St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail PD&E Study Public Meetings
→ TPO Board Meeting Report

VIII. BPAC MEMBER COMMENTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
# BPAC Attendance Record 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Ryan/Doug Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daytona Beach (appt. 3/12) (alt. appt. 02/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wendler</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeLand (appt. 05/11) (appt. 6/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Leisen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deltona (appt. 12/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Grenham</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edgewater (appt. 01/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Eik (17/18 Vice Chairman)/Charles Morr</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler Beach (appt. 7/14) (alt appt 9/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Coletti/Andrew Dodzik</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt 2/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Blais</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Hill (appt 3/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic Mostert/Andrew Dodzik</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Smyrna Beach (appt. 03/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Storke (17/18 Chairman)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange City (appt. 12/07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Belin</td>
<td></td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ormond Beach (appt. 01/15 - 07/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Coast (Appt. 02/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bulard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ponce Inlet (Appt 10/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Gillis/Andrew Dodzik</td>
<td></td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Daytona (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McCallister</td>
<td></td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County District 1 (appt. 10/16)(Patterson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Walters/Jason Aufdenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County At-Large (appt. 03/05) (alt. appt 07/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Burgess-Hall/Chris Daun</td>
<td></td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (app 2/14) D-2 (Wheeler)(alt. appt 3/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Haldeman</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (appt. 04/13) D-3 (Denys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-VOTING MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Hickey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County (appt. 12/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Petito/Bob Owens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler County Transit (appt 9/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Perney</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large City - Port Orange (appt. 10/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cotton/Edie Biro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Votran (appt. 07/13)(alt. appt. 02/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Winsett/Terri Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County (02/14) (alt. Appt. 09/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Brinson/Eric Kozieksi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia County School Board (appt. 01/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Zianek</td>
<td></td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT (appt 8/17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **QUORUM**                          |     |    |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |    |                                                                        |

| Vacancies                           |     |    |     |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |    |                                                                        |

- Beverly Beach
- Bunnell
- Daytona Beach Shores
- DeBary
- Flagler County School Board
- Flagler County Traffic Engineering
- Lake Helen
- Oak Hill
- Pierson
- Port Orange
- Volusia County D-2
- Volusia County Chair

---

January - December 2018
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BPAC Project Review Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
October 24, 2018

• Approved a motion recommending the following improvements to the Project Prioritization Process:
  o Revise current definition for cost overruns on Resolution 2016-01 and include a definition for cost increases
  o Exclude costs that are ineligible for federal funds from the 10% local match requirement
  o Include language on Project Implementation Application to award points for projects that help meet or exceed R2CTPO Transportation Safety Targets
  o Change Surface Transportation Program (STP) Urban Attributable (SU) funding set-aside to: 40% Bicycle & Pedestrian, 30% Traffic Operations & Safety, 30% Transit Projects
  o Require descriptions for criteria on Project Implementation Application (currently listed as “if needed”)
  o Revise Project Implementation Application Criterion #3 for hazardous walk/bike zones
  o 2019 Priority Project Process Schedule with all project applications and updated cost estimates being accepted January 24 - March 29, 2019
"Light Up Midtown" Health Fair
December 8
10 a.m. - 2 p.m.
Daisy Stocking Park
550 Third Avenue
Daytona Beach

This event is hosted by the City of Daytona Beach in partnership with the Midtown Health Equity Action Team

FREE
• Health screenings
• Giveaways
• Health information
• Children’s activities
• Demonstrations

For more information about the health fair please contact Charles Bryant at 386-671-8185 or email: bryantc@co.db.us
October 2018 TPO Outreach & Activities

1 **Port Orange Family Days Helmet Fitting**
   Date: Saturday, October 6, 2018
   Location: Port Orange
   Description: TPO staff provided a booth and gave away safety promo items in addition to fitting and donating 265 bicycle helmets.

2 **International Walk to School Day Events**
   Date: Friday, October 12, 2018
   Location: Indian River Elementary and Campbell Middle Schools
   Description: TPO staff participated in Walk to School Day events in Edgewater and Daytona Beach.

3 **Mobility Week Events:**
   **White Cane Awareness Day**
   Date: Saturday, October 27, 2018
   Location: Intersection of White St and ISB
   Description: TPO staff participated in this event which guides blindfolded individuals through four legs of an intersection.

   **New Smyrna Beach Farmer’s Market Event**
   Date: Saturday, October 27, 2018
   Location: Corner of Sams and Julia St
   Description: TPO staff provided a booth and handed out promo items and safety literature in coordination with Votran.

   **Palm Coast Nature Walk/Presentation**
   Date: Thursday, November 1, 2018
   Location: Palm Coast Community Center
   Description: TPO staff gave a presentation on trails and fit and donated 30 bicycle helmets.

   **Halifax Art Festival Helmet Fitting**
   Date: Saturday, November 3, 2018
   Location: Downtown Daytona Beach
   Description: TPO staff provided a display booth and fit and donated 128 bicycle helmets, in coordination with Votran.

   **Port Orange Family Days Helmet Fitting**
   Date: Saturday, October 6, 2018
   Location: Port Orange
   Description: TPO staff provided a booth and gave away safety promo items in addition to fitting and donating 265 bicycle helmets.

   **International Walk to School Day Events**
   Date: Friday, October 12, 2018
   Location: Indian River Elementary and Campbell Middle Schools
   Description: TPO staff participated in Walk to School Day events in Edgewater and Daytona Beach.

   **Mobility Week Events:**
   **White Cane Awareness Day**
   Date: Saturday, October 27, 2018
   Location: Intersection of White St and ISB
   Description: TPO staff participated in this event which guides blindfolded individuals through four legs of an intersection.

   **New Smyrna Beach Farmer’s Market Event**
   Date: Saturday, October 27, 2018
   Location: Corner of Sams and Julia St
   Description: TPO staff provided a booth and handed out promo items and safety literature in coordination with Votran.

   **Palm Coast Nature Walk/Presentation**
   Date: Thursday, November 1, 2018
   Location: Palm Coast Community Center
   Description: TPO staff gave a presentation on trails and fit and donated 30 bicycle helmets.

   **Halifax Art Festival Helmet Fitting**
   Date: Saturday, November 3, 2018
   Location: Downtown Daytona Beach
   Description: TPO staff provided a display booth and fit and donated 128 bicycle helmets, in coordination with Votran.

**NOVEMBER EVENTS:**

1: MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC) Meeting, Orlando
13: GIS Day, Volusia County Courthouse
14: R2CTPO Holiday Open House, TPO Office
14: SJR2C Loop PD&E Study Public Alternatives Meeting, Piggotte Community Center, S.D.
15: SJR2C Loop PD&E Study Public Alternatives Meeting, Brannon Center, N.S.B.
16: Central Florida Visitors Study PAG, R2CTPO
19: Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials, D.B. International Airport
28: I-95 @ LPGA Blvd. Interchange Improvements Public Info Meeting, Daytona State Advanced Technical College
29: Central Florida Commuter Rail Commission Meeting, MetroPlan Orlando

**WHITE CANE AWARENESS DAY**

**ONGOING PROJECTS & STUDIES:**

- Annual Call for Projects Review of Process
- Development of 2017/18 TPO Annual Report
- Development of an Amendment to the 2040 LRTP
- Development of Bicycle Suitability Map
- Central Florida Visitors Study
- Regional Truck Parking Study
- Golfview Blvd. Shared-Use Path Feasibility Study
- Central Florida Regional Planning Model Update
- US 17/92 @ Dirksen Drive Feasibility Study
- Madeline Ave. Trail Feasibility Study, Phase 1 & 2
- Willow Run Boulevard Sidewalk Feasibility Study

**OTHER UPCOMING EVENTS:**

Dec. 4: SJR2C Trail PD&E Open House, Edgewater City Hall
Dec. 11: FDOT Public Meeting on SR-5/US-1 Resurfacing, O.B. Performing Arts Center
TBD: FDOT Tentative Work Program Public Hearing
UPCOMING OPEN HOUSE
The open house will be held on Tuesday, Dec. 4, 2018, at the City of Edgewater Council Chambers, located at 104 N. Riverside Drive, Edgewater, FL 32132 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The purpose of this open house is to present shared-use path options being evaluated. Project displays and information will be available for review. Members of the project team will be available to discuss the project and answer questions. A formal presentation will not be given. The back of this newsletter includes more information regarding public involvement.
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Written comments can be submitted at this open house, by mail to Lorena Cucek, FDOT Project Manager, 719 South Woodland Boulevard, MS 542, DeLand, FL 32720 or by email to lorena.cucek@dot.state.fl.us no later than Friday, Dec. 14, 2018. All comments, written and oral, will become part of the project’s public record.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns relative to FDOT compliance with Title VI may do so by contacting Jennifer Smith, FDOT District Five Title VI Coordinator at jennifer.smith2@dot.state.fl.us.

Persons with disabilities who require accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact the FDOT Project Manager, Lorena Cucek, by phone at 386-943-5392 or via email at lorena.cucek@dot.state.fl.us at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact us by using the Florida Relay Service, 1-800-955-8771 (TDD) or 1-800-955-8770 (Voice).

If you would like more information about the project, please contact Lorena Cucek, or visit the project website at www.cflroads.com. Simply type 439862-1 in the search box, click on “go” and then click on the project name.
How will we select a recommended alternative?
Both ‘no-build’ and ‘build’ alternatives are being considered. The ‘build’ alternatives presented, serve to improve bicycle and pedestrian accommodations throughout various corridors within New Smyrna Beach, Port Orange and South Daytona in Volusia County. The alternatives will be evaluated and compared to each other using criteria that give consideration to engineering, physical, environmental, and social impacts, right of way needs, cost, and public opinion. A recommended alternative will become clear based on this evaluation and comparison.

Local Government Partners
In addition to receiving public input, we are coordinating with various local government agencies throughout the study including:

Who will approve the final PD&E Document?
This project has been classified as a Non-Major State Action (NMSA); this means the FDOT, or designee will sign and date the NMSA checklist prepared for the Study. If the proposed improvements are recommended and accepted by the department, the proposed project will proceed into future project phases as funding becomes available. Those project phases include: design, right of way acquisition (if applicable) and construction. The design phase is currently partially funded. Right of way acquisition and construction phases are currently unfunded.

What happens after the public alternatives meetings?
We will continue to evaluate the alternative routes, then select a recommended ‘build’ alternative or the ‘no-build’ alternative. A final newsletter will be sent to property owners along the recommended route if the ‘build’ alternative is selected. The final newsletter is expected to be mailed to property owners before March 2020 followed by finalizing engineering and environmental documents and final Non-Major State Action (NMSA) approval.

How can you provide input?
Public comments and questions are welcomed at any time throughout the study. If you would like to learn more about the study, or would like to schedule a small group meeting, please contact one of the following individuals:

FDOT Project Manager
Ms. Heather Grubert, P.E.
Florida Department of Transportation
719 S. Woodland Boulevard, MS 501
DeLand, Florida 32720
Phone: 386-945-5540
Email: heather.grubert@dot.state.fl.us

Additional Contact
Mr. John Scarlatos
4152 W. Blue Heron Boulevard, Suite 119
Riviera Beach, Florida 33404
Phone: 561-429-5065
Email: jscarlatos@scalarinc.net

For regular updates about the SJR2C Loop PD&E Study, please visit www.cflroads.com (search by number 439865-1). This website will be updated on a regular basis to provide the latest study information. You can also make comments or ask questions through the website, and you can request to be added to the mailing list.
Newsletter No. 2  SJR2C Loop PD&E Study  October 2018

Project Description
The SJR2C Loop is the longest multi-use loop trail underway through the Southeastern United States that follows the East Coast Greenway along Florida’s Atlantic Coast and St. Johns River corridor. The segment being evaluated for this PD&E Study is U.S. 1, or an alternate route from S.R. 44 (Lytle Avenue) to Beville Road, crossing the cities of New Smyrna Beach, Port Orange and South Daytona in Volusia County. The trail involves utilizing four bridges along U.S. 1 in Port Orange and one along Sauls Street in South Daytona. The PD&E Study involves preliminary engineering to determine multi-use trail concepts, environmental evaluations to assess impacts associated with a new multi-use trail, and extensive public involvement and agency coordination.

Purpose and Need
The SJR2C Loop PD&E Study is being conducted to develop and evaluate options for a multi-use trail along U.S. 1, or alternate route from S.R. 44 (Lytle Avenue) to Beville Road in Volusia County, a distance of approximately 18 miles. The purpose of this study is to close the existing trail gap in accordance with Shared-Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail standards. The need for this project is system linkage. Once complete, the trail would connect the cities of Edgewater, New Smyrna Beach, Port Orange, South Daytona, Daytona Beach, and parts of unincorporated Volusia County.

Florida Sun Trail Program
This project is part of the statewide goal of supporting the transportation, and recreational needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. As such, the state of Florida is dedicating $25 million annually to the development of a statewide network of multi-use trails. Currently, the SJR2C Loop is a top priority. More information about the SUN Trail program can be found by visiting http://floridasuntrail.com.

The proposed trail width for this project is 12 feet and a minimum of 8 feet in constrained areas such as along bridges or areas of environmental concern.

Trail Benefits
The proposed trail does have the potential to increase surrounding property values. In turn, it could also attract more residents and generate additional jobs, serving as an economic driver. Research shows that trails can be associated with higher property value, especially when designed to provide neighborhood access and maintain residents’ privacy. Trails also promote healthy living by providing a facility for walking, bicycling, and other forms of physical exercise. Recent studies suggest that by accelerating the expansion of trails and accessibility to them, the health of residents in nearby communities may greatly benefit.

Alternative Trail Routes
The alternative trail route is shown in green on the maps below. There are areas where only sharrows (shared lane markings of bike symbol with two chevrons over it) are proposed, such as along Julia St. from U.S. 1 to Orange St., Sams Ave. to N. Riverside Dr., and along Sauls St. from just south of George Hecker Dr. to Reed Canal Rd. Along N. Riverside Drive from Mary Ave. to Wayne Ave. and Faulkner St. from Wayne Ave. to Turnbull Bay Rd., only “Share the Road” signage is proposed. The proposed route incorporates the existing 8-foot wide sidewalk on the south side of Nova Rd., the 10-foot wide trail along Ridge Blvd., and other existing trail connections such as along N. Riverside Dr. from Julia St. to Washington Ave., the existing trail system within the Riverside Pavilion Park of Port Orange, and McDonald Rd. from Charles St. to Sauls St. As part of the proposed alternative, Riverside Dr./Halifax Dr. is proposed to be converted to a one-way street from Commonwealth Blvd. to just north of Herbert St. Extending the one-way conversion south of Commonwealth Blvd. to Seminole Ave. is currently not part of the alternative. However, if implemented, the alternative could then connect at Seminole Ave. and U.S. 1, and then south on U.S. 1 to Nova Rd. This would be instead of utilizing Nova Rd., Spruce Creek Rd., and Commonwealth Blvd. In South Daytona, two options are considered; 1) Construct a trail along the south side of Reed Canal Rd. from Sauls St. to Anastasia Dr., and then cross over to the north side and connect to Carmen Dr. The trail would then extend from Reed Canal Rd. to Ridge Blvd. along the west side of Carmen Dr.; or 2) Construct a trail from Reed Canal Rd. to Ridge Blvd. along the east side of Pope Avenue.
River to Sea TPO Board  
Meeting Summary  
October 24, 2018

- Announced Volusia County impact fee meetings tonight in New Smyrna Beach at the Brannon Center, Thursday, October 25, 2018 at Deltona City Hall, and Tuesday, October 30, 2018 at Daytona Beach City Commission Chambers; all meetings are 6:30 pm to 8:00 pm

- Received public comment on behalf of the president of the Volusia County League of Women Voters regarding the importance to the county government of Amendment 10, Florida’s Home Rule Amendment, on the upcoming November 6, 2018 ballot

- Received public comment thanking FDOT for completing repairs in Ormond Beach and Daytona Beach and in support of raising the Volusia County impact fee

- Recognized outgoing TPO Board members, Volusia County Council Member Joyce Cusack, Flagler County Commissioner Nate McLaughlin, South Daytona Council Woman Nancy Long

- Recognized retiring TPO CFO, Mr. Herb Seely, for his 41 years of service and presented him with a plaque and retirement gift

- Approved consent agenda including approval of the September 26, 2018 TPO Board meeting minutes

- Approved Resolution 2018-24 adopting the FY 2017/18 Public Involvement Report

- Approved Resolution 2018-25 adopting the Transportation Performance Management Targets

- Recognized retiring DeLand Vice Mayor Leigh Matusick for her 11 years of service to the TPO Board, as Chair in 2011/12 and various subcommittees and her commitment to bicycle and pedestrian safety

- Approved Resolution 2018-26 amending the FY 2018/19 to 2022/23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Approved Resolution 2018-27 adopting the R2CTPO 2018 Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Performance Measures Report

- Approved the River to Sea TPO’s FY 2017/18 Independent Audit Report

- Approved request from the city of Ormond Beach for additional design funding for the Tomoka Elementary Sidewalk with one opposing vote
• Approved request from the city of Ormond Beach for additional design funding for the Williamson Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements project with one opposing vote

• Received a staff presentation of the proposed 2019 Legislative Positions

• Received a staff presentation of changes under consideration to the R2CTPO policy resolutions and project applications for the annual Call for Projects

• Received a PowerPoint presentation of the St. Johns River to Sea Loop Trail PD&E Study (SR 44/Lytle Avenue to SR 400/Beville Road)

• The FDOT report was provided in the agenda and a handout update was provided


Items Requiring Follow-Up

• TPO staff to send via email the Executive Director’s Report update on SU Funding/Work Program and Roundtable of Volusia County Elected Officials; and copy of the Volusia County Transportation Impact Fee presentation

The next River to Sea TPO Board meeting will be on Wednesday, November 28, 2018