

**Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)  
Meeting Minutes  
November 15, 2022**

**CAC Members Physically Present:**

Shawn Collins  
Janet Deyette  
Bliss Jamison  
Gilles Blais  
Bob Storke  
Fred Heyne  
Alan Peterson  
Paul Martel  
Elizabeth Alicia Lendian  
Edie Biro  
Sean Castello (non-voting)  
Anna Taylor (non-voting)

**CAC Members Virtually Present:**

Emily Nice  
Ed Fendley  
Bobby Ball

**CAC Members Absent:**

Kerry Karl, Chairperson (excused)  
Erika Benfield (excused)  
Greg Feldman (excused)  
Faith Alkhatib (non-voting)  
Tisha Peterson  
Rick Basso  
Sue Elliott (excused)  
Joe Villanella (excused)  
Jack Delaney (excused)  
Dave Castagnacci, Vice Chairperson (excused)  
Patricia Lipovsky

**Others Physically Present:**

Colleen Nicoulin  
Stephan Harris  
Steven Buck

**Others Virtually Present:**

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary  
Pamela Blankenship

**Representing:**

Daytona Beach  
Deltona  
Edgewater  
Holly Hill  
Orange City  
Ormond Beach  
Palm Coast  
Pierson Alternate  
Volusia County At Large  
Votran (CTC)  
Volusia County Traffic Engineering  
FDOT

**Representing:**

Daytona Beach Alternate  
Flagler Beach  
Port Orange

**Representing:**

DeLand  
DeBary  
Flagler County  
Flagler County Traffic Engineering  
Flagler County Public Transportation  
Lake Helen  
Pierson  
Ponce Inlet  
South Daytona  
Volusia County Chair  
Volusia County D-2

**Representing:**

TPO Staff  
TPO Staff  
FDOT

**Representing:**

TPO Staff  
TPO Staff

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

Past Chairperson Bob Storke called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 1:15 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was physically present. Due to the COVID-19 virus, the meeting was held in a hybrid format with ten voting and two non-voting members physically present; and two voting and one non-voting member virtually present.

Ms. Nicoulin announced that the CAC Chairperson and Vice Chairperson were both unable to attend today's meeting; as the past CAC Chairperson, Mr. Storke volunteered to chair the meeting so a motion is needed to appoint him as chair for this meeting.

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Ms. Biro to appoint Mr. Bob Storke as CAC Chairperson for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais and carried unanimously.*

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Martel to allow members attending virtually to participate and vote. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lendian and carried unanimously.*

The Pledge of Allegiance was given.

## **II. Public Comment/Participation**

There were no public comments.

## **III. Action Items**

### **A. Review and Approval of the October 18, 2022 CAC Minutes**

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Peterson to approve the October 18, 2022 CAC minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais and carried unanimously.*

### **B. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2022-## Restating the Policy for the Allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program Urban Attributable (SU) Funding and Other State and Federal Funding Identified in the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**

Ms. Nicoulin stated each year the TPO staff, the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee and the TIP Subcommittee review the prior year's priority project process to identify any changes that need to be made to the policy resolutions and/or project applications. Three policy resolutions guide the annual Call for Projects process; this resolution allocates the set aside (SU) funding the TPO receives; defines mixed-use projects and the funding of them; and allows the re-allocation of SU funds left over in a category in a current year to be programmed on another project on the priority list if there is not another project in the same like category. There were no recommended changes to this resolution; this is a restatement of the policy for the current year's annual Call for Projects cycle.

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Martel to recommend approval of Resolution 2022-## restating the policy for the allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program Urban Attributable (SU) funding and other state and federal funding identified in the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The motion was seconded by Ms. Deyette and carried unanimously.*

### **C. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2022-## Restating the Local Match Requirements Placed on Member Local Governments for Projects Prioritized for Funding by the TPO**

Ms. Nicoulin stated this resolution defines the local match requirements for member local governments; defines cost overruns versus cost increases; requires requests for additional funds be submitted on an application form, includes a statement of hardship and supporting documentation including a detailed justification of the change in cost and provides the Executive Director with authorization to approve additional funds of up to 50% of a project phase; any amount over 50% requires TPO Board authorization. There were no recommended changes; this is a restatement of the policy for this year's Call for Projects application package.

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Ms. Biro to recommend approval of Resolution 2022-## restating the local match requirements placed on member local governments for projects prioritized for funding by the TPO. The motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson and carried unanimously.*

### **D. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2022-## Restating the Policy for Establishing and Maintaining Transportation Priority Projects**

Ms. Nicoulin stated this resolution establishes the project categories and ranking; defines and sets protected projects on the priority list; defines criteria for reprioritizing or adding projects outside the annual cycle; requires annual project cost updates; requires a commitment from project sponsors for Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) eligible projects; and confirms the project prioritization process will support the development of regional priority lists.

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Martel to recommend approval of Resolution 2022-## restating the policy for establishing and maintaining transportation priority projects. The motion was seconded by Ms. Deyette and carried unanimously.*

**E. Review and Recommend Approval of the Priority Project Applications for Traffic Operations/Safety and Local Initiatives Projects and Transportation Planning Studies**

(Handout)

Ms. Nicoulin stated there are no changes to the planning studies application other than updating the current year and replacement of the word “commentary” with a purpose and need statement. She reviewed the changes to the feasibility study application; Criteria 3, Safety Benefits, was updated to include pedestrian crashes and Criteria 4 was updated to reference transportation equity and economic vitality. She reviewed the changes to the project implementation application including adding more project detail on the first page which will help staff when programming projects. More emphasis was placed on the safety criteria. Equity and resiliency criteria were added as they were not addressed in the previous applications and new funding is becoming available specific to sustainability and resiliency projects. Because the overall project scores were not increased, adjustments were made to other criteria in terms of the maximum number of points awarded.

Mr. Peterson asked how tight the scores are for existing projects on the priority list; if we should allow past projects requests to be rescored.

Ms. Nicoulin replied that a project sponsor of any project in any given year can submit a new application to be scored.

Mr. Peterson asked if the political entities are aware of this.

Ms. Nicoulin explained that a workshop is held in January as part of the priority process for TCC members as they are the ones who submit the applications; she will make sure that information is conveyed to them then. She continued to review the changes to the project implementation application.

Mr. Ball asked if once a project is on the priority list and ranked if it stays on the list until funded unless it can score better with a new application.

Ms. Nicoulin explained the priority lists have protected projects; on the traffic operations list, the top eight projects are protected and a new project ranking higher will not move the project down but if it is not in the top eight, the project can be affected.

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Peterson to recommend approval of the priority project applications for traffic operations/safety and local initiatives projects and transportation planning studies. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais and carried unanimously.*

**F. Cancellation of December CAC Meeting**

**MOTION:** *A motion was made by Mr. Collins to cancel the December CAC meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martel and carried unanimously by a roll call vote.*

**IV. Presentation Items**

**A. Presentation and Discussion of Transportation Funding**

Ms. Nicoulin stated that the TPO's funding has been discussed over the last year and additional funding opportunities are becoming available through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL). She explained the funding the TPO uses on a day-to-day basis for operations are the planning funds identified in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP); they are also used for consultants. Most of the TPO's funding is federal and some grants have matching requirement. Local member governments are assessed annually at \$.10 per capita which amounts to approximately \$62,000; these funds support activities that are not eligible for federal reimbursement such as community outreach and helmet fittings. The TPO Board asked staff to review the assessment to see if there is justification for increasing it. The member assessment has been done for over 20 years and it helps the TPO's programs as well as helping to build up the reserves. She explained new funding is becoming available specific to resiliency, carbon reduction, and equity as well as a number of competitive grants such as the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grant that is specific to safety; the TPO submitted for this grant. By incorporating criteria for equity and resiliency into the annual Call for Projects, we are able to identify projects that can utilize some of the new funding. There is also formula funding such as for carbon reduction programming. The idea is to create a pipeline of projects for when funding becomes available so that we can take advantage of it.

**B. Presentation and Discussion of the I-95 Corridor Overview**

Mr. Steven Buck, FDOT, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the I-95 Corridor Overview; I-95 is one of the oldest highways on the interstate highway system running from Miami to the US/Canadian border. He explained the significance of the corridor to connectivity, the economy and the movement of goods, and its importance as an evacuation route. He reviewed the traffic counts on the corridor within Volusia and Flagler Counties; I-95 has five segments within District 5 including 45.7 miles and eight interchanges in Volusia County and 18.7 miles and four interchanges in Flagler County. He reviewed some of FDOT's past projects along the I-95 corridor. Current projects in Volusia County include the US 1 and LPGA Boulevard interchanges and new interchanges at Pioneer Trail and Maytown Road; he provided details on each project. Public hearings for both the US 1 and LPGA Boulevard interchanges will occur in early 2023.

Ms. Jamison asked when they estimate breaking ground on the I-95 at Pioneer Trail interchange since it is funded for construction in the current year.

Mr. Buck replied in 2023. He continued to review the details of the Pioneer Trail and Maytown Road interchanges. He explained that the Maytown Road interchange is being done in coordination with Volusia County through planned developer funding. He reviewed the future plans which include a strategic plan for all of I-95 within District 5 to address mobility, safety, resiliency, technology and community engagement. He reviewed some of the technology components that are already being installed. They have been installing a number of fish-eye cameras to look at traffic volumes and safety issues.

Members discussed the presentation and what triggered the need for the new interchanges at Pioneer Trail and Maytown Road. It was explained that both interchanges were driven by Volusia County; the Maytown Road interchange is being coordinated by the county and a planned developer. Currently, FDOT is looking to program the PD&E phase for Maytown Road which is to be funded by the developer. There is a multitude of reasons for the justification of these two new interchanges, alleviating traffic at the north and south interchanges and safety improvements among them.

**C. Presentation and Discussion of an Amendment to the Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**

Ms. Nicoulin stated that funding for the I-95 at Pioneer Trail interchange was received through the federal stimulus for fiscal year 2023 for construction; therefore, the TPO must amend the Connect 205 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) to advance that funding to the current year. When the LRTP is amended, the amendment must be presented and opened for public review and comment which will occur after it is presented to the TPO Board on November 30, 2022. It will be back for action in January.

Ms. Jamison asked where the public meeting will be and when.

Ms. Nicoulin replied the public meetings are the TPO's advisory committee and TPO Board meetings; it will open for public comment for 30 days following the November 30, 2022 TPO Board meeting.

Mr. Collins asked what the design will be for the I-95 at Pioneer Trail interchange considering there is a substantial area of wetlands in that vicinity.

Mr. Buck replied it will be a modified diamond interchange with the northeast and southwest quadrants being a fishhook design and the other two quadrants a traditional diamond interchange.

#### **D. FDOT Report**

Ms. Taylor announced that as of Saturday, all sections of SR A1A have reopened following emergency repairs from Hurricane Nicole; 600 loads of sand were trucked in to assist with the recovery efforts. She announced this week is Crash Responder Safety Week; this is an opportunity to recognize those that play a critical role in traffic incident responses by saving lives and keeping traffic moving along the highways. FDOT is asking people to not drive distracted and to move over when they see emergency vehicles. She announced a public hearing regarding the Tentative Five-Year Work Program will be held the week of December 5 - 9, 2022 with an in-person meeting on December 6, 2022 beginning at 5:00 pm at the District 5 office in DeLand. People can call the TPO liaison unit to set up one-on-one meetings to discuss any questions or concerns they may have regarding the proposed Work Program.

Mr. Peterson stated that this is the second time in recent years that SR A1A has washed out and required repairs. He asked if there are any plans for design changes rather than just repairing it.

Ms. Taylor replied she does not think so; it is a vulnerable roadway. FDOT is working with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) with trying to assess the dune situation.

Mr. Peterson commented he is impressed with what was done the first time but disappointed it washed out again; changes need to be made and he would be interested to know what other possibilities are viable options.

Mr. Collins asked if there are any plans to widen SR 44 in Lake County.

Ms. Buck answered no for SR 44 but yes for SR 40.

#### **E. Volusia and Flagler County Construction Reports**

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

#### **V. Staff Comments**

Ms. Nicoulin announced the River to Sea TPO's annual Holiday Open House and Toy Drive will be on Wednesday, December 7, 2022 from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm; toys will be collected for the Department of Children and Families (DCF) to distribute.

Ms. Lendian asked for a range of ages for toys.

Ms. Nicoulin replied infants to teenagers; gift cards are also acceptable.

#### **VI. CAC Member Comments**

Mr. Peterson announced he is resigning from the CAC effective at the end of this month.

Ms. Biro announced a handout is available on the sign-in table announcing public hearings occurring this month and next month regarding Votran service changes. The changes were put in place almost a year ago and due to staffing shortages, they are being made permanent.

**VII. Information Items**

- CAC & TCC Attendance Records
- October/November TPO Outreach and Events
- Upcoming River to Sea TPO events
- TPO Board Report
- 2023 TPO Meeting Schedule
- Annual TPO Holiday Open House & Toy Drive Flyer

**VIII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the CAC meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

**RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**



**MR. DAVE CASTAGNACCI, VICE CHAIRPERSON  
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**

**CERTIFICATE:**

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the November 15, 2022 regular meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC), approved and duly signed this 17<sup>th</sup> day of January 2023.



**DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY  
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**\*\* A recording of the November 15, 2022 CAC meeting is available upon request.**



2023 Application for Project Prioritization – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

# Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects

\*All applications must be uploaded to the TPO file transfer site by 24:00 p.m. (EST) on February 25, 2023\*

<https://www3.mydocsonline.com/customerupload/b4bbf6f197bbf605f029f13c7936>

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applying Agencies (project sponsor): \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**Phase(s) requesting to be funded:**

☐ PD&E ☐ Design ☐ Right-of-Way ☐ Construction ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Support:**

Does the project have support by the submitting agency's council/commission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(Provide documentation that the project is part of an approved Capital Improvement Program or other plan that has been approved by the agency's council/commission OR a specific resolution or motion supporting the project)

Is the project consistent with the local government Comprehensive Plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Is the project supported by the River to Sea TPO Connect 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Project Administration:**

Will the project be implemented via the FDOT LAP program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Per LAP program requirements, is the project estimate for each phase greater than \$250,000? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Is the submitting applicant LAP certified or seeking project specific LAP certification? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If the applicant is not seeking LAP certification or does not intend to administer the project through LAP, which local agency is LAP certified and willing to administer the project?

(Applicant must provide written documentation of an agreement with administering agency or a memorandum of understanding (MOU)).

☐ This project is being submitted as a mixed-use project as defined by Resolution 2023-23XX. Mixed-use projects must provide the cost breakdown between the traffic operations component of the project and the bicycle/pedestrian component of the project in the cost estimate.

☐ Attach a copy (or provide a link) of the completed Feasibility Study, or explain in the space provided below for commentary why a Feasibility Study is not necessary.

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

### Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.) – Based on federal functional classification map

This criterion looks at the classification of the roads that will benefit from a proposed project. This criterion gives more points to projects that provide a benefit on roads that are classified at a higher level. If a project benefits more than one road, the road that has the highest classification will be used to allocate points.

Indicate the federal functional classification of the roadway on which the proposed improvement is located. (Reference the Federal Aid Road Report at <http://www.fdot.gov/statistics/fedaid/>). R2CTPO staff will review the application to verify the classification of the roads benefitting from the proposed project.

**Select only ONE**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Federally Functionally Classified Road (1 point) <sup>1</sup> | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Rural Major Collector (3 points)    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Rural Local Road (1 point) <sup>1</sup>                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Rural Minor Arterial (4 points)     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rural Minor Collector (1 points) <sup>1</sup>                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Rural Principal Arterial (5 points) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Minor Collector (2 points)                                  |  |

Commentary (if needed): \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup>Project must be safety related

### Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)<sup>2</sup>

This criterion looks at the amount of work required to develop the project and get it ready for construction. The closer a project is to the construction phase, the more points it is eligible for.

Check the appropriate boxes to indicate which phases of work have already been completed or will not be required. For each phase that will not be required, explain why in the space provided for commentary. Include with this application a copy of any relevant studies, warrants, designs, and/or permits. **If this is an application for Project Implementation, you must attach a copy of the project scope and cost estimate.**

~~Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate/SEMP<sup>3</sup>~~

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ ~~Completed (3 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Not Required (3 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Required but Not Completed (0 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Unknown or TBD (0 points)~~

PE (Design)

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Completed (3 points)
- ☐ Not Required (3 points)
- ☐ Required but Not Completed (0 points)
- ☐ Unknown or TBD (0 points)

Environmental

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Completed (3 points)
- ☐ Not Required (3 points)
- ☐ Required but Not Completed (0 points)

- ☐ Unknown or TBD (0 points)

Right-of-Way Acquisition

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Completed (3 points)
- ☐ Not Required (3 points)
- ☐ Required but Not Completed (0 points)
- ☐ Unknown or TBD (0 points)

Permitting

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Completed (3 points)
- ☐ Not Required (3 points)
- ☐ Required but Not Completed (0 points)
- ☐ Unknown or TBD (0 points)

Utility Relocation<sup>3</sup>

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Completed (3 points)



☐ Not Required (3 points)

☐ Unknown or TBD (0 points)

☐ Required but Not Completed (0 points)

<sup>2</sup> When Federal funding will be used to fund a project, all activities or work, including that which is done in advance of applying for Federal funds, must comply with all applicable Federal statutes, rules and regulations.

<sup>3</sup> ~~A Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) is generally required for ITS projects.~~ Includes all underground and overhead utilities, including, but not limited to private gas utility, fiber optic communication cable, public/private water or sewer utility, telephone, power or cable tv utility.

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

### Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30-25 points max.)

This criterion looks at the extent of traffic operational benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. The number of points allocated will reflect the degree of benefit that is expected.

In the space provided below for commentary, describe the operational benefits of the proposed project, and specify and explain if this project is considered regional in nature. When putting your application together please include a copy of any approved signal warrant or street lighting studies.

Describe the mobility and operational benefits of the proposed project, and specify and explain if this project is considered regional in nature. Enough detail must be provided so that the reviewer can assess the following criteria:

Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]

Select only ONE

☐ less than 0.75 (0 points)

☐ 0.75 to 0.99 (3 points)

☐ 1.00 to 1.25 (4 points)

☐ greater than 1.25 and/or identified as congested in TPO's CMP/Performance Measures Report (5 points)

Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility and/or travel time reliability that a project will provide)

Select ALL that Apply

☐ None (0 points)

☐ Bicycle, Pedestrian, ADA, or Transit (1-5 points)

☐ Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improvement, or Traffic Signal Retiming<sup>4</sup> (1-10 points)

Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant, widening justification<sup>5</sup>, an FDOT approved roundabout geometric and operational analysis<sup>6</sup>, or access management or ITS improvements<sup>7</sup>

Select only ONE

☐ No (0 points)

☐ Yes (1-5 points)

~~Hurricane evacuation route (based on appropriate agency's Comprehensive Plan) upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements.<sup>8</sup>~~

Select only ONE

☐ No (0 points)

☐ ~~Yes (0-5 points)~~

<sup>4</sup> Attach Traffic Signal Timing Study.

<sup>5</sup> Attach Warrant Study to application; otherwise R2CTPO staff will assume that a Warrant Study justifying the improvement has not been completed.

<sup>6</sup> Attach FDOT Step 3 Roundabout Summary Report.

<sup>7</sup> Access management and ITS improvements include, but are not limited to, addition of non-traversable median greater than 50% project length, addition of curb/gutter at intersection or greater than 50% project length, closure of minor intersections or crossovers, reduction of the number of access points (driveways or driveway widths), elimination of existing at-grade RR crossing, elimination of existing on-street parking, provision of traffic signal preemption for emergency vehicles, connection of three or more traffic signals, and new connection of traffic signal system to computerized signal control.

<sup>8</sup> ~~The term "other operational improvements" includes any improvement that will likely result in a significant: a) increase in evacuating traffic capacity or b) reduction in the probable occurrence or severity of evacuating traffic delay and/or disruption from signal failure, lane blockage, etc.~~

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Criteria #4 – Safety Benefits (20-25 points max.)

This criterion looks at the degree of safety benefits that will be derived from a proposed project. ~~The distinction between the categories of benefits will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTST).~~ The number of points allocated will reflect whether the proposed project will mitigate for an identified safety issue/concern and the degree of benefit that is expected.

In the space provided below for commentary, describe the safety benefits expected from the proposed project, and explain how the proposed project will mitigate for the safety issue and help the River to Sea TPO meet or exceed adopted Transportation Safety Targets for Serious Injuries and Fatalities. ~~R2CTPO~~ TPO staff will work with the appropriate agencies to determine the intersection and corridor crash rates, if needed.

Describe the safety issue being addressed and provide specific detail on how the proposed safety strategy or countermeasure would mitigate for the documented safety issue/concern. Enough detail must be provided so that the reviewer can assess the following criteria:

##### Select ALL that Apply

- ☐ The specific project location is on FDOT's High Crash List; The River to Sea TPO's Congestion Management Process Report top 25 crash frequency and severity list for vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles, or pedestrians; or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles<sup>9</sup>, corridor crashes per million vehicle miles<sup>10</sup>, Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.) (0-5 points)
- ☐ The ~~"problem" described on page 1 of this application~~ proposed project addresses ~~is~~ a safety issue that falls within one or more of the ~~eight~~ twelve Emphasis Areas identified in the latest adopted Florida Strategic Highway Safety Plan (i.e., ~~distracted driving, vulnerable road users, intersection crashes, lane departure crashes, aging road users and teen drivers, impaired driving, and traffic records~~ lane departures, intersections, pedestrians and bicyclists, aging road users, motorcyclists and motor scooter riders, teen drivers, impaired driving, occupant protection, speeding and aggressive driving, distracted driving) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident. (0-~~5~~ 10 points)
- ☐ The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized in the AASHTO Highway Safety Manual or identified by FHWA as a Proven Safety Countermeasure (<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures>) as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents. (0-10 points)



<sup>9</sup> If an application scores very high in this criterion, the R2CTPO may submit application to either the East or West Volusia Community Traffic Safety Team (CTST) for Safety Fund consideration.

<sup>108</sup> Applying Agency must use the following crash rate calculation formulas: Corridor Crash Rate = (Number of Crashes x 1,000,000) / (AADT x 365 days/year x Number Years x Segment Length); Intersection Crash Rate = (Number of Crashes x 1,000,000) / (AADT x 365 x Number of Years).

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

### Criteria #5 – ~~Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals~~ Transportation Equity and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)

This criterion looks at whether the proposed project advances or provides opportunities in traditionally underserved communities (transportation disadvantaged census tracts - <https://www.transportation.gov/grants/dot-navigator/federal-tools-determine-disadvantaged-community-status>) and/or the degree to which the project supports economic vitality. ~~the degree to which the proposed project will actually contribute to the achievement of one or more of the local government's adopted comprehensive plan goals or objectives, and the degree to which it supports economic vitality. The Applying Agency must identify specific goals and/or objectives from the relevant comprehensive plan and provide a rational explanation of how the proposed project will advance those goals and/or objectives. Points will not be awarded for being merely consistent with the comprehensive plan. Points should be awarded in proportion to how well the project will show direct, significant and continuing positive influence. Temporary effects related to project construction, such as the employment of construction workers, will not be considered.~~

Describe how the proposed project advances or provides opportunities in traditionally underserved communities and/or the degree to which the project supports economic vitality. Enough detail must be provided so that the reviewer can assess the following criteria:

Select ALL that Apply

- ☐ ~~Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan~~ The proposed project directly advances or provides opportunities in traditionally underserved communities (improving access to employment, education, community services, or health care services) (0-5 points)
- ☐ ~~The proposed project~~ Directly supports economic vitality (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, supports freight movement, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities) (0-5 points)

Commentary: \_\_\_\_\_

### Criteria #6 – ~~Infrastructure Impacts~~ Resiliency and Sustainability (20 points max.)

This criterion looks at ~~impacts to adjoining public or private infrastructure, which may be in the way of the project. The less existing infrastructure is impacted the more points a project will score~~ the resiliency and sustainability aspects of the proposed project.

~~In the space provided below for commentary, describe the infrastructure impacts that will occur as a result of constructing the proposed project. When completing your application, please consider the drainage issues that may be involved (see notes below for a more detailed explanation).~~

Describe the resiliency and sustainability aspects of the proposed project. Enough detail must be provided so that the reviewer can assess the following criteria:

- ☐ Sea Level Rise/Storm Water Management (0-4 points)  
The proposed project improves facilities that have been identified as vulnerable to sea level rise or provides an improvement to address storm water management and/or drainage.
- ☐ Carbon Footprint/Emissions (0-4 points)  
The proposed project includes carbon reduction strategies that may include reducing single occupant trips,



facilitating the use of vehicles or modes of travel that result in lower emissions, providing for alternate modes of transportation, reducing congestion and idling through congestion management strategies, etc.

☐ **Environmental (0-4 points)**

The proposed project includes strategies that minimize impacts to the environment, including preserving specimen and historic trees, wetlands, and protected species habitats.

☐ **Hurricane Evacuation (0-8 points)**

The proposed project improves a designated evacuation route including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements<sup>9</sup>

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ ~~Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined<sup>10</sup> (0 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required (0-2 points)~~
- ☐ ~~No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required (0-4 points)~~

**Select ALL that Apply**

- ☐ ~~Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required<sup>11</sup> (0-4 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required<sup>11</sup> (0-4 points)~~
- ☐ ~~Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required<sup>12</sup> (0-4 points)~~
- ☐ ~~No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18" diameter will be removed or destroyed (0-4 points)~~

<sup>9</sup> The term "other operational improvements" includes any improvement that will likely result in a significant: a) increase in evacuating traffic capacity or b) reduction in the probable occurrence or severity of evacuating traffic delay and/or disruption from signal failure, lane blockage, etc.

<sup>10</sup> ADA pedestrian crossings at intersections may impact drainage significantly. Attached Traffic Study should address drainage impacts.

<sup>11</sup> Typically, these are underground utilities that can only be determined by a complete set of plans. Attach plans showing no impacts; otherwise, assumption is in urban area utilities will be affected.

<sup>12</sup> Typically, above ground utilities are not affected except for widening and turn lane projects.

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion #7 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.) – Bonus Points**

Please specify the committed local match percentage \_\_\_\_\_ ***(Match must be in whole or half percent increments)***

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

**Select only ONE**

- ☐ Local Matching Funds are equal to 10.0% (0 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 10.5% but less than 12.5% (1 point)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 12.5% but less than 15.0% (2 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 15.0% but less than 17.5% (3 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 17.5% but less than 20.0% (4 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 20.0% but less than 22.5% (5 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 22.5% but less than 25.0% (6 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 25.0% but less than 27.5% (7 points)



- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 27.5% but less than 30.0% (8 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 30.0% but less than 32.5% (9 points)
- ☐ Local Matching Funds are greater than or equal to 32.5% (10 points)

**Commentary (if needed):** \_\_\_\_\_





2022~~23~~ Application for Project Prioritization – **FEASIBILITY STUDY**  
**Traffic Operations, Safety, and Local Initiatives Projects**

All applications must be uploaded to the TPO file transfer site by **24:00 p.m. (EST) on February 25~~8~~, 2022~~3~~**  
<https://www3.mydocsonline.com/customerupload/b4bbf6f197bbf605f029f13c7936>

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 the 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 a 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/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 your Purpose and Need statement is clear and complete. It will be the principal consideration in ranking your 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

project Purpose and Need will also help to define the scope for the Feasibility Study, the consideration of alternatives (if appropriate), and ultimate 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 such as livability and the environment 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 reduce intersection delays or to reduce rear end collisions. It should avoid stating a solution as a purpose such as: “the purpose of the project is to add an exclusive left turn lane”. It should be stated broadly enough so that no valid solutions will be dismissed prematurely.

The Need should establish the evidence that the problem exists, or will exist if anticipated conditions are realized. It should support the assertion made in the Purpose statement. For example, if the Purpose statement is based on safety improvements, the Need statement should support the assertion that there is or will be a safety problem to be corrected. When applying for a Feasibility Study, you should support your Need statement with the best available evidence. However, you will not be expected to undertake new studies.

**Commentary** Project Purpose and Need Statement: \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria #1 through #4, below, will be used to evaluate and rank each application for Feasibility Study. For Criteria #1, the Applying Agency must indicate the functional classification of the roadway on which the proposed improvement will be located. For Criteria # 2 through #4, the Applying Agency must provide commentary explaining how and to what degree the proposed improvement will address the criteria.**

**Criteria #1 - Location** – Indicate the federal functional classification of the roadway on which the proposed improvement is located. (Reference the Federal Aid Road Report at <http://www.fdot.gov/statistics/fedaids/>). R2CTPO staff will review the application to verify the classification of the roads benefitting from the proposed project. (4 points total)

- ☐ Urban/Rural Principal Arterial
- ☐ Urban/Rural Minor Arterial
- ☐ Urban/Rural Major Collector
- ☐ Urban Minor Collector
- ☐ Rural Minor Collector or Urban/Rural Local Road
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Criteria #2 - Mobility and Operational Benefits** – The proposed project will significantly reduce traffic congestion and/or delays identified in the TPO’s Congestion Management Process/Performance Measures Report or otherwise identified and documented. (4 points total)

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria #3 - Safety Benefits** – The project will significantly reduce the number and/or severity of crashes, including pedestrian crashes; it will significantly reduce the number of fatalities and/or serious injuries. (4 points total)

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Criteria #4 - ~~Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals~~ Transportation Equity and Economic Vitality** – The proposed project will directly ~~contribute to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the applying local agency’s adopted comprehensive plan~~ advance or provide opportunities in traditionally underserved communities; it directly supports economic vitality (e.g., supports community development in major development areas, supports business functionality, and/or supports creation or retention of employment opportunities). (4 points total)

**Commentary:** \_\_\_\_\_





## 202~~2~~3 Application for Project Prioritization Transportation Planning Studies

\*All applications must be uploaded to the TPO file transfer site by **24:00 p.m. (EST) on February 25~~8~~, 202~~2~~3\***  
<https://www3.mydoconline.com/customerupload/b4bbf6f197bbf605f029f13c7936>

Study Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Requesting Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_ Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Study Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Study Area (include study area length and termini, if appropriate, and attach location map): \_\_\_\_\_

Estimated Study Cost: \_\_\_\_\_

### Purpose and Need for the Transportation Planning Study:

In the space provided below, describe the Purpose and Need for this proposed study and explain how the study is expected to address each ranking criterion that may apply. It is very important that your Purpose and Need statement is clear and complete and specifies whether the study is local or regional in nature. It will be the principal consideration in ranking your study proposal. It must convince the public and decision-makers that the expenditure of funds is necessary and worthwhile and that the priority the study is being given relative to other needed transportation planning studies is warranted. The Purpose and Need will also help to define the study scope, the consideration of alternatives (if appropriate), and ultimate study findings and recommendations.

~~Commentary~~ Purpose and Need Statement: \_\_\_\_\_



**Media Contact: Heather Belden  
Volusia County Community Information**

**Oct. 26, 2022  
386-822-5062 ext. 12246  
For immediate release**

### **Votran hosting public meetings to discuss service changes**

Votran will be holding several public meetings to hear feedback from the public about proposed changes to bus schedules. Most of the changes were implemented on a temporary basis in early 2022 due to staffing levels. Because the staffing levels have not returned to pre-pandemic levels and per federal requirements, all temporary changes must be considered permanent if they last for more than one year.

The changes being proposed to become permanent are as follows:

- Weekdays: Routes 3, 4, 11 and 60 to run hourly during the midday period, from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.
- Weekdays: Routes 7, 10 and 20 to run hourly at all times
- Saturdays: Routes 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 20 and 60 to run hourly at all times.

In addition to these changes, Votran is proposing schedule adjustments to two westside routes to improve service efficiency, Routes 31 and 32. Additionally, service to the Volusia Mall will be adjusted due to construction, affecting Routes 10, 11 and 19.

All public meetings will be held in an open house format, and attendees can arrive at any time during the window. The meeting will feature a short presentation, and Votran staff will be on-site to answer questions. The public meeting schedule is as follows:

- 3 to 5 p.m. Tuesday, Nov. 1: Daytona Beach Regional Library, 105 Jackie Robinson Parkway. Attendees can use Routes 1 or 7.