



MEETING AGENDA

Please be advised that the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) **CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) & TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)** will be meeting on:

DATE: Tuesday, November 18, 2014
TIME: 1:30 P.M. (CAC) & 3:00 P.M. (TCC)
PLACE: River to Sea TPO Conference Room
2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Suite 100
Daytona Beach, Florida 32114

Mr. Gilles Blais, CAC Chairman

Ms. Heather Blanck, TCC Chairperson

AGENDA

- I. **CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**
- II. **PUBLIC COMMENT/PARTICIPATION** *(Public comments may be limited to three (3) minutes at the discretion of the Chairperson)*
- III. **CONSENT AGENDA**
 - A. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 21, 2014 CAC AND TCC MEETING MINUTES** *(Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, CAC pages 3-12; TCC pages 13-24)*
 - B. **CANCELLATION OF DECEMBER CAC AND TCC MEETINGS** *(Contact: Debbie Stewart) (Enclosure, page 3)*
- IV. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - A. **REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## REAFFIRMING THE POLICY FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY PROJECTS** *(Contact: Robert Keeth) (Enclosure, pages 25-30)*
 - B. **REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PRIORITY PROCESS PROJECT APPLICATIONS** *(Contact: Robert Keeth) (Enclosure, pages 31-63)*
 - C. **REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## AMENDING THE FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)** *(Contact: Robert Keeth) (Enclosure, pages 64-70)*

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEMS (SIS) PROJECTS** (Contact: Lois Bollenback) (Enclosure, page 71)
- B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON FHWA ORDER 5020.2 AND FHWA/FDOT COORDINATED PROCESS FOR LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAM (LAP) CONTRACT AWARD ADJUSTMENT (TCC ONLY)** (Contact: Robert Keeth) (Enclosure, pages 72-74)
- C. PRESENTATION ON THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) FINANCIAL RESOURCES PLAN** (Contact: Jean Parlow) (Enclosure, page 75)
- D. FDOT REPORT** (Contact: Gene Ferguson, FDOT District 5) (Enclosure, page 76)
- E. VOLUSIA AND FLAGLER COUNTY CONSTRUCTION REPORTS** (Contact: Volusia & Flagler County Traffic Engineering) (Enclosure, pages 77-80)

VI. STAFF COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 81)

→ Discussion of VCOG Closure/Office Space

VII. CAC/TCC MEMBER COMMENTS (Enclosure, page 81)

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS (Enclosure, pages 81-93)

- SunRail Feeder Route Changes
- River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Project Application

IX. ADJOURNMENT (Enclosure, page 81)

*****The next meetings of the CAC and TCC will be on Tuesday, January 20, 2015*****

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.

If any person decides to appeal a decision made by this 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 in any of its programs or services. To learn more about our commitment to nondiscrimination and diversity, visit our Title VI page at www.r.org or contact our Title VI/Nondiscrimination Coordinator, Pamela Blankenship, at 386-226-0422, extension 20416, or pblankenship@r2ctpo.org.

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 21, 2014 CAC AND TCC MEETING MINUTES

Background Information:

Minutes are prepared for each CAC and TCC meeting and said minutes must be approved by their respective committees.

B. CANCELLATION OF DECEMBER CAC AND TCC MEETINGS

Traditionally, if there is no outstanding business that must be conducted prior to the end of the calendar year, all TPO Committee meetings are suspended the month of December.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2014**

CAC Members Present:

Charles Gardner
Donald Smart, Vice Chairman
Richard Gailey
Janet Deyette
Bliss Jamison
Richard Belhumeur
Gilles Blais, Chairman
Bob Storke
Susan Elliott
Joy Krom
Elizabeth Alicia Lendian
Gene Ferguson (non-voting advisor)
Bob Owens
Melissa Winsett (non-voting)
Rickey Mack

CAC Members Absent:

Faith Alkhatib (non-voting)
Jake Sachs (excused)
Bobby Ball (excused)
Judy Craig
Dan D'Antonio

Others Present:

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
Pam Blankenship
Carole Hinkley
Robert Keeth
Stephan Harris
Jean Parlow
Lois Bollenback
Martha Moore
Eliza Harris

Representing:

Bunnell
Daytona Beach
DeBary
Deltona
Edgewater
Flagler Beach
Holly Hill
Orange City
Pierson
South Daytona
Volusia County
FDOT District 5
Flagler County Transit
Volusia County Traffic Engineering
Votran

Representing:

Flagler County Traffic Engineering
New Smyrna Beach
Port Orange
Volusia County
Volusia County

Representing:

TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
Ghyabi & Associates
Canin Associates

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

Chairman Gilles Blais called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 1:30 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press or citizen comments.

III. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of September 16, 2014 CAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Smart to approve the September 16, 2014 CAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lendian and carried unanimously.*

IV. Action Items

A. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2014-## amending the FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Keeth stated this item is to make up for an oversight on the last TIP amendment. The project being considered for the amendment is a railroad crossing project in Holly Hill at Calle Grande Street. It was in the previous TIP for construction during FY 2013/14 and should have been in the roll forward TIP but did not. The TPO would like to add it back in to the TIP for construction in FY 2014/15 at the same amount. It will be constructed by Florida East Coast Railway (FEC); FEC does not allow others to work on their system and it will be constructed on their time table and until it is the TPO will continue recommending to move it in the appropriate funding year.

Chairman Blais stated there is 100 feet of right-of-way in that particular area and asked if there were any problems with the railroad.

Mr. Keeth replied FEC has provided the cost estimate included in the TIP and they are going to build the project within their right-of-way. The connecting sidewalk on the east and west side of the railroad track will be constructed by Volusia County as a separate project.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Belhumeur to recommend approval of Resolution 2014-## amending the FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Storke and carried unanimously.*

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Planning Studies Request

Ms. Bollenback stated last month she talked about transferring some of the TPO's SU dollars from construction to planning to fund a few studies as directed by the board. The TPO has had discussions with FDOT about the amount of money the TPO has and the amount of money that is allowed to be spent each year; there is \$287,000 left to be obligated for planning. FDOT reserved the money and the TPO has worked through a more detailed scope of services and submitted applications to FDOT for the SR A1A pedestrian and mobility safety study and the Belle Terre Parkway intersection study; a series of intersections along the Belle Terre Parkway corridor on which the city wants to create some predictability and standardization. There is roughly \$160,000 for the pedestrian safety study that will be moved from the bicycle/pedestrian box and \$75,000 for the Belle Terre Parkway intersection study that will be moved from the ITS/Traffic Ops box. This was approved in general last month but now that there is more detail, the TPO wants to make sure everyone supports these studies.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Belhumeur to recommend approval to direct FDOT to allocate \$160,330 from the Bicycle/Pedestrian box to a pedestrian safety and mobility study on SR A1A and \$75,031 from the Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety box to an intersection study on Belle Terre Parkway. The motion was seconded by Ms. Elliott and carried unanimously.*

V. Presentations, Status Reports, and Discussion Items

A. Presentation on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Ms. Parlow introduced Ms. Eliza Harris, Canin Associates, to give the presentation.

Ms. Harris gave a PowerPoint presentation on the alternative land use forecast for the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and stated the trend forecast is complete; that is a typical activity done as a part of every MPO as a way to predict future traffic. To predict future traffic you need to know how many people and how many jobs will be there. As an addition to that, this TPO is doing an alternative land use forecast and it is a theoretical exercise; if the growth changes from what it is trended to do, it can change the transportation outcomes. She stated where land use grows in the future impacts future transportation funding and needs. There have been some regional exercises that read into this; including a focus on compact walkable development, supporting multiple modes of transportation and the overall purpose is to reduce reliance on the regional highway system. Similar studies have been done in other places; one large study done in Atlanta found land use mix, density and connectivity were major factors that influenced how much people drove, how often they walked and biked, and overall lowered the emissions output from driving because of that shift. One quote from that study was that this pattern holds true regardless other factors; age, income, education and whether or not someone had a driver's license had less impact on the likelihood of walking, biking or transit than land use patterns. As a result, they are going through a process with the land use working group to identify areas within the Volusia and Flagler planning area that might accommodate compact walkable developments. This process is called characterization; the categories used are transit focused areas, special districts, which are heavy employment areas that do not accommodate mixed use such as airports, and development focused corridors that may be more transit oriented. The transit oriented areas are looked at in two different sheds; primary transit which is a ten minute walk from the transit station and secondary transit which is larger tracks that might accommodate a larger mixed use development that would be a short trip to the transit station. Corridor development is where there might be higher usage of existing bus routes. The land use working group has also been working to identify example densities; examples of places with a higher density in an aesthetically pleasing way. She showed examples of mixed use buildings as a way to show how densities might be applied. One important factor to take in consideration is if buildings have surface parking or structure parking; a building with structure parking will have a higher density than a building with surface parking. Some examples of results in other jurisdictions where similar projects were done are improved air quality, reduced congestion, reduced energy dependence and vehicle dependency and increased safety and improvement in the system efficiency.

Ms. Krom asked Ms. Harris to clarify what a trend TAZ is.

Ms. Harris replied TAZ's are traffic analysis zone; it is the language the transportation model reads.

Chairman Blais asked if the cities shown as examples had codes or ordinances with regard to construction to establish these density areas.

Ms. Harris replied it depends; some examples are historical buildings not built with current codes and some are newer buildings built under newer codes.

Chairman Blais stated in looking to the future of downtown Daytona Beach, which has been dead for years but used to be the hub of activity, he asked what the city of Daytona and other like cities were planning to do, and what will it be ten or twenty years from now.

Ms. Harris replied one of the things they were looking at was Community Reinvestment Areas (CRAs) and downtown Daytona Beach has one, which is able to direct funds toward improvements to encourage development. There are a lot of factors that go into where and why developers choose to build and this is at a fairly high level and they cannot get into every jurisdiction's exact regulations. There are so many factors that go into how densities are calculated it is hard to get an apples to apples comparison. What densities are allowed is one factor and then another is if someone will actually build under that.

Ms. Winsett stated that the city Daytona Beach is in the process updating their code.

B. Presentation on Priority Process Program Changes

Mr. Keeth stated one of the most important things the TPO does is establish priorities for the expenditure of state and federal transportation funds and the TPO identifies those priorities on the priority project list. Each year the TPO reviews the list and adds to it with projects that have been brought through the annual call for projects. When that process is complete and the new list has been adopted, the TPO evaluates the process and the criteria used to assign priorities. This review has been underway for the last couple of months through the efforts of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee and they have addressed a number of different issues and reached a conclusion and recommendation for half of those issues. They are continuing to work on this trying to reach a conclusion on some of the issues and he expects this to come back in November for review and approval. The overriding interest this year is to reduce the number of lists; there are now seven separate lists relating to different types of projects or funding sources. One reason to reduce the number of lists is when these lists are given to FDOT they are left with the task of deciding which among the different lists are the TPO's highest priorities and that should be done at the TPO level. Another reason to address the number of lists and the types of projects on the lists is this year the TPO received some applications for projects that do not fit into the current priority lists; specifically some roundabout projects received from the city of Daytona Beach. These would generally not be considered capacity projects, they are more Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety improvements and typically the TPO would address those under the XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety lists. The problem with that is there are funding limitations; the TPO receives an annual allocation of \$4.5 million and that is divided 40% for Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety, 30% for transit and 30% for Bicycle Pedestrian projects which leaves only \$1.5 for Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety projects. The roundabout projects the city of Daytona Beach submitted cost considerably more than that and there is no way the TPO can fund those from the SU pot of money. They need to be on a different list for consideration for funding with other types of funds. One way to do that would be to look at the list normally reserved for capacity projects that come out of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and open it up to expensive non-capacity projects like the roundabouts and look at alternative sources of funding. The issue then is the expensive projects that are not capacity projects would compete against the more expensive capacity projects that are identified and prioritized through the LRTP. To address that, the TIP Subcommittee suggested the TPO require for those expensive types of projects, traffic operations, safety, non-capacity projects, if they exceed \$3 million in cost they should be identified in the LRTP and be evaluated against other projects in the LRTP. The other recommendations so far are to continue the annual submittal process as is; uncouple the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety and the Bicycle/Pedestrian projects lists from the SU funds recognizing that projects on these lists may be funded through other sources; maintaining the current policy allocating 40% of SU funds to Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety projects, 30% to Bicycle/Pedestrian projects and 30% to transit projects; that projects should lose their "protected" status if they cannot be programmed due to fault of the applicant. If a project has not advanced after five years, the applicant should provide the TPO with an update and include a statement indicating why the project has not advanced and the project will be re-evaluated. If the applicant fails to provide that documentation then the project should be removed from the list.

Mr. Smart stated on page 47 it states the applicant has to resubmit and it speaks to the issue of the possibility that the reason a project has not moved is for something the applicant did not do or failed to do and it does not address what happens if it is through no fault of the applicant because of lack of funding and asked how those were dealt with.

Mr. Keeth replied that is grounds for saying the project deserves the ranking it has and should remain there; if it did not advance through no fault of the applicant they should not be penalized. Projects sometimes will stay on the list for long periods of time because it may no longer be a priority for the applicant, additional studies may be required, such as ITS projects. In those cases, it generally is the fault of the applicant for not providing the required documentation.

Mr. Smart asked what happens if the money is not available.

Mr. Keeth replied the money may not be available because the project is expensive; if it is not the fault of the applicant, under normal circumstances, the project should retain its ranking. There needs to be a specific time the TPO would look to see what the reason is to why projects are not advancing. When a project sits on a list and retains its protected ranking, if the applicant is at fault, it penalizes projects beneath it that cannot move up and get funded. The TIP Subcommittee also recommended requiring annual confirmation of project cost estimates. This is being done now; fairly recently FDOT has begun asking the TPO for annual updates of their project application forms. There are a number of issues the TIP Subcommittee has not reached a conclusion on. One of these is whether or not FDOT should be able to submit a project application. A few years ago FDOT had an interest in promoting certain projects and approached the county with a request to include these projects in their applications. It creates problems in knowing who to go to for project updates, or current status, and it creates issues regarding who is responsible for the local match. One response to consider is whether the TPO should use SU funding on projects on the state highway system which would be eligible for state funding, particularly if it is a project the state wants done. The SU funds are allocated to the TPO by the federal government and the TPO is directly responsible for determining where those funds should go and what priorities should be advanced by those funds. This is a limited amount of funds and it makes sense to reserve those funds for projects that could not otherwise be funded with state or federal funds. Related to that is whether projects on the state highway system should be exempt from local match requirements. The TPO requires a 10% match when SU funds are used and 20% for TALU funds. This issue could be addressed if the TPO decides SU funds should not be spent on the state system. Another issue being considered is cost overruns; what they are specifically and under what circumstances the project applicant should be responsible. The TPO views a cost overrun as a cost over and above the cost programmed in the TIP and FDOT's Work Program. By the time a project is programmed there has been considerable review of it and the cost should not vary much unless the project changes in terms of scope or unless unforeseen circumstances arise. The current policy is that it is the responsibility of the project applicant; there is an option for the board to waive that policy and provide the cost overrun to be covered by state or federal funds. Once issue that has come up since the last TIP Subcommittee meeting is a suggestion by FDOT that the TPO provide them with a priority list of planning studies so that they can use some of their planning funds to fund some of the TPO's high priority planning projects. It has not been worked out how this would work yet, possibly through the call for projects; the TPO would have an application, require a clear statement of purpose and need for the study and supporting documentation.

Ms. Lendian asked if a five year limit would be implemented on the planning study priority list.

Mr. Keeth replied he did not know at this point but studies generally have a short shelf life. Regulations change and the study may contain recommendations that would only be appropriate given a certain set of regulations. Cost estimates change over time and would have to be updated. He stated he did not know if the TPO would have to refresh studies on a predictable time frame.

Ms. Lendian stated it was a lot of money spent on studies and if it is not going to be used, it is just lost.

Chairman Blais asked if it was the responsibility of the agency that submitted the application to notify the TPO if they change their mind; and in the event that they change their mind, what happens to the study.

Mr. Keeth replied the TPO asks for an annual statement of support for the project from the agency. In most cases studies are used to identify projects which a local government would then bring forward with a new application.

Mr. Belhumeur asked if the TIP Subcommittee was planning to meet again soon.

Mr. Keeth replied yes, he would be sending out a notice perhaps by the end of this week.

C. Presentation and Discussion on Roundabouts

Ms. Martha Moore, Ghyabi & Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation and a brief overview on roundabouts. She stated FDOT changed their policy regarding roundabouts on January 1, 2013 and now looks at roundabouts

as one of the first options when they are doing screenings for traffic intersection control. She stated the features of roundabouts are they have a raised center island that can be landscaped or have fountains or statuary to add to the visual effect, traffic flows counter-clockwise, the entrances are deflected, drivers must yield on entry, they are low speed, there may be a truck apron and there is no parking in a roundabout. She showed three types of roundabouts; rotary, traffic circle and a small neighborhood traffic circle. Rotaries are large, high speed and typically connect major roads, large, high volume roads where you change lanes within the traffic circle. But she is talking about modern roundabouts; where you do have to yield on entry and which may you actually have stop control at the entrance. Traffic flows counter clockwise and are much slower than a traffic circle, pedestrian movement is not allowed through the roundabout. The first modern roundabout was in Nevada in the 1990's. Roundabouts can handle a large daily traffic volume; a single lane roundabout can handle up to 34,000 vehicles per day, and a multilane 45,000 to 70,000. MythBusters did a comparison between roundabouts and a four-way intersection and found did improve traffic flow by 20%. Roundabouts can be used not just at neighborhood intersections but at interchanges, rural roads, high volume areas, near schools, and awkward geometry. Florida has close to 300 roundabouts throughout the state, most of those are single lane roundabouts and located mainly on county and local roads but FDOT is increasing their roundabouts. She showed examples of urban roundabouts in Clearwater and Jacksonville. The biggest advantage to roundabouts is safety, safety for pedestrians and other drivers. Advantages are also limited delay which results in reduced emissions, fuel savings and not the maintenance required for traffic signals. There is a 90% reduction in fatalities and a 35% reduction in total crashes. Part of why is because a regular four way intersection has thirty-two conflict points and a roundabout has only eight conflict points. There are some issues for pedestrians; vehicles are not stopping so there is no gap and there are issues for visually impaired pedestrians and a lot of research is going on to see how that can be accommodated. The new FDOT policy is before a traffic signal is installed a roundabout has to be considered in the screening. Roundabouts are appropriate at intersections with less than 8,000 vehicles per hour, it is better if the entry volumes are balanced and where pedestrian volumes are appropriate. Not every intersection is a good fit for a roundabout; a lot of driveways could back traffic up, railroad tracks nearby, or corridors with a well operating coordinated signal system are examples. Public attitude before construction of a roundabout is two-thirds negative but after construction changes to the positive. Regarding the visually impaired, there are some issues being researched about the fact a roundabout is not stop controlled and there is no way for the visually impaired to tell where the gaps in traffic are. It is an American Disabilities Act (ADA) requirement that roundabouts are accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. She showed examples of roundabouts in other places, one in Asia with a pedestrian overhead.

Chairman Blais asked where in Asia the roundabout with the elevated pedestrians over the roundabout was.

Ms. Moore replied she is not exactly sure but will find out.

Ms. Lendian asked how roundabouts affected bicycle riders.

Ms. Moore replied roundabouts can accommodate bicycles; sometimes cyclists will walk their bikes through the roundabout but there can be bike lanes.

D. FDOT Report

Mr. Gene Ferguson introduced himself as the new FDOT liaison to the River to Sea TPO and stated there are no changes from last month; he will have a full report next month.

Mr. Keeth stated the TPO has been working with Mr. Ferguson the last few weeks and that he will serve the TPO well.

E. Volusia County Construction Report

Ms. Winsett stated she was happy to report they have completed three projects; the Tymber Creek Road project, the Saxon Boulevard project and the Calle Grande sidewalk project. Construction is soon to start on the Howland Boulevard project between Courtland Boulevard and SR 415, and on the Dunn Avenue paved

shoulders project. They are currently under construction on two segments of the Regional Rail Trail, the one between SR 415 and Guise Road and the segment between Cow Creek and Dale Street.

Mr. Storke asked about the right turn lane out of the Racetrak and Perkins Restaurant Ms. Deyette had asked about at the previous CAC meeting.

Ms. Winsett replied they did look at that; the situation is the one exit from Perkins and the Racetrak is a little too close to the interchange off ramp. Locals know not to use it but to use the driveway further away to have enough room to merge. In this case they will have to work with the property owner to put signage on his property. The county has the correct overhead signage in place on Saxon Boulevard that says it is a turn lane.

VI. Staff Comments

➤ Discussion on Coast to Coast Summit

Mr. Keeth stated that the TPO's rail trail project is an important component of the Coast to Coast Multi Use Trail System and a very important summit was recently held; Mr. Harris will give a brief update on the summit.

Mr. Harris stated the summit was held October 1, 2014 at the Winter Garden City Hall and the purpose was two-fold; the first was to inform the stakeholders of the status of the Coast to Coast Trail and the second was to establish a framework to organize and implement a regional system of local trails. Ms. Lois Bollenback also attended along with board members Ms. Patricia Northey and Ms. Leigh Matusik. Funding for the trails was discussed and there is a constitutional amendment on the ballot next month, Amendment 1, and if it passes will allow funds to be spent on trails from the Land Acquisition Trust Fund. Also, earlier this year, Governor Scott signed into law a bill that appropriates \$15.5 million to closing gaps in the Coast to Coast Connect and FDOT has programmed \$18.8 million toward that project on top of \$26 million that is already on projects along the trail that are currently in different stages. Representatives from all the MPO's and TPO's that had segments in their planning area and each representative gave a status report on their gaps. He made a presentation that focused on the gap at the Volusia/Seminole County line at US 17/92; \$682,000 is currently programmed for design in the current year. The gap runs from where the Spring to Spring Trail ends at Lake Monroe Park to where the sidewalk ends at Wayside Park at the Seminole County line. He spoke about the status of the Rail Trail and the Spring to Spring Trail. Ms. Bollenback spoke on the Regional Trails Corridor Assessment and the idea for an extension for the Coast to Coast Trail from where the Rail Trail ends in Edgewater near Rotary Park northward to New Smyrna Beach over the north causeway to the Atlantic Ocean. Senator Gardner attended and Bike Walk Central Florida presented with an award for being Florida Legislator of the Year for promoting trails. All the presentations, the agenda and maps have been uploaded to the Office of Greenways and Trails website.

➤ Budget Impact of VCOG Closing

Mr. Keeth stated VCOG has shared office space, utilities and the copier for many years. Late last month the VCOG Board decided to shut down VCOG and they are vacating the offices now. The TPO will be looking for another entity to fill the space and provide the TPO with some income to make up for what is being lost with VCOG's departure; about \$30,000 per year. The TPO's lease on the building is for another three years. It would be best if another government entity or non-profit could occupy the space. The TPO is looking for ways to fill the hole in the budget and reduce cost and asked the committee to forward any interested parties.

Mr. Storke asked where the Volusia League of Cities lived.

Mr. Keeth replied VCOG was staffing the Volusia League of Cities and would no longer be providing those services and Volusia League of Cities would not be a candidate.

➤ **Comments on Statewide and Metropolitan Transportation Planning**

Mr. Keeth stated the Federal Highway Administration issued a proposed notice of rule-making; the purpose of these rules is to implement the new provisions to MAP-21, the federal transportation planning act. In the agenda packet is a letter from Ms. Bollenback regarding those changes and addresses some concerns raised by the draft regulations in two issue areas. One issue is related to the makeup of the TPO Board and representation; particularly relating to transit. The TPO is very much in support of providing good representation relating to transit but wants to make sure they have flexibility to address the particular needs here and not create any problems by allowing a non-elected official to stand in as a representative of the transit agency when members of the board who are elected officials and stand over the transit agency from a policy standpoint. The other area of concern relating to the proposed rules with respect to the performance based planning as is now required; the TPO is now required to identify performance targets and measures to determine whether or not those targets are met; the TPO wants to make sure they have the flexibility there that is necessary to do that in the TPO's best interest.

➤ **SunRail**

Mr. Keeth stated ridership overall has declined from the high in June to a low in September of about 3,000 riders per day. This is somewhat predictable; there are natural cycles in transit ridership. The average from the beginning stands at about 4,200 riders per day; just under the target of 4,300 per day. Ridership should pick up again when construction begins on I-4. DeBary is the number one station in terms of ridership; just over 8,000 in September. The next high volume station is Sand Lake Road; others are Winter Park and Church Street. The number of boardings with bicycles is around 200 per day. Parking lot counts, the DeBary station averages at 58% occupied per month. There are plans to expand the parking lot in 2015. In terms of performance, the system has generally been on time.

VII. CAC Member Comments

Mr. Belhumeur asked if Mr. Keeth was able to follow up on traffic calming.

Mr. Keeth replied he spoke with Mr. Chris Cairns, FDOT, and was told the study was completed and was being quality checked in-house and he expects a report soon.

Ms. Lendian announced Autumn in the Oaks Festival at DeLeon Springs this Saturday from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm with a parade at 11:00 am followed by the Ponce DeLeon lookalike contest and there will be Halloween activities at DeLeon Springs State Park starting at 5:00 pm.

VIII. Information Items

- **Long Range Transportation Plan Workshop**
- **River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary**
- **Resolutions Regarding the Need for Widening West Park Avenue in Edgewater and Request for Funding**

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, the CAC meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

GILLES BLAIS, CHAIRMAN
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 October 21, 2014 regular meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC), approved and duly signed this 18th day of November 2014.

DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)

Meeting Minutes

October 21, 2014

TCC Members Present:

Fernand Tiblier
Chris Walsh
Pedro Leon
Rebecca Hammock
Ron Paradise
Mike Holmes
Darren Lear
Faith Alkhatib
Bob Owens
Gail Henrikson
Alison Stettner
Ric Goss
Jose Papa
Jim Smith
Clay Ervin
Tim Burman
John Dillard
Richard Moore
Marian Ridgeway
Melissa Winsett
Heather Blanck, Chairperson
Gene Ferguson (non-voting advisor)
Robert Keeth (non-voting)

TCC Members Absent

Stewart Cruz, Vice Chairman
Tom Harowski (excused)
Kent (K.C.) Cichon

Others Present:

Debbie Stewart, Recording Secretary
Pam Blankenship
Lois Bollenback
Carole Hinkley
Jean Parlow
Stephan Harris
Martha Moore
Pat White
Eliza Harris

Representing:

Bunnell
Daytona Beach
Daytona Beach Int'l Airport
DeBary
Deltona
DeLand
Edgewater
Flagler County Traffic Engineering
Flagler County Transit
New Smyrna Beach
Orange City
Ormond Beach
Palm Coast
Pierson
Ponce Inlet
Port Orange
South Daytona
V.C. Emergency Management
V.C. School District
V.C. Traffic Engineering
Votran
FDOT District 5
TPO Staff

Representing:

Daytona Beach Shores
Holly Hill
Lake Helen

Representing:

TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
TPO Staff
Ghyabi & Associates
Volusia County E.M.
Canin & Associates

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

Chairperson Heather Blanck called the meeting of the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) to order at 3:00 p.m. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Press/Citizen Comments

Chairperson Blanck welcomed and introduced new TCC members Mr. Gene Ferguson, FDOT Liaison, and Mr. Bob Owens, Flagler County Transit.

III. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of September 16, 2014 TCC Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Blanck stated she made one change on page 6; the motion was moved up further in the discussion.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Cheney to approve the September 16, 2014 TCC meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lear and carried unanimously.*

IV. Action Items

A. Review and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2014-## Amending the FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Cheney to recommend approval of Resolution 2014-## amending the FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded by Mr. Lear and carried unanimously.*

B. Review and Recommend Approval of Planning Studies Request

Ms. Bollenback stated last month she talked about transferring some of the TPO's SU dollars from construction to planning to fund three studies as directed by the board. The recommendation from the TCC was to follow through with two of those studies; SR A1A and Belle Terre Parkway. The TPO has had discussions with FDOT about the amount of money the TPO has and the amount of money that is allowed to be spent each year; there is \$287,000 left to be obligated for planning. FDOT reserved the money and the TPO has worked through a more detailed scope of services and submitted applications to FDOT for the SR A1A pedestrian and mobility safety study and the Belle Terre Parkway intersection study; a series of intersections along the Belle Terre Parkway corridor on which the city wants to create some predictability and standardization. There is roughly \$160,000 for the pedestrian safety study that will be moved from the Bicycle/Pedestrian box and \$75,000 for the Belle Terre Parkway intersection study that will be moved from the ITS/Traffic Operations/Safety box. This was approved in general last month but now that there is more detail, the TPO wants to make sure everyone supports these studies.

Mr. Cheney asked Ms. Alkhatib if there were safety issues on the SR 100 corridor.

Ms. Alkhatib replied she would have to get in touch with traffic operations; she added that there were some safety issues at some of the intersections.

MOTION: *A motion was made by Mr. Cheney to recommend approval to direct FDOT to allocate \$160,330 from the Bicycle/Pedestrian box to a pedestrian safety and mobility study on SR A1A and \$75,031 from the Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety box to an intersection study on Belle Terre Parkway. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lear and carried unanimously.*

V. Presentations, Status Reports, and Discussion Items

A. Presentation on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Ms. Eliza Harris, Canin & Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the alternative land use forecast for the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and stated the trend forecast is complete; that is a typical activity done as a part of every MPO as a way to predict future traffic. To predict future traffic you need to

know how many people and how many jobs will be there. As an addition to that, this TPO is doing an alternative land use forecast and it is a theoretical exercise; if the growth changes from what it is trended to do, it can change the transportation outcomes. She stated where land use grows in the future impacts future transportation funding and needs. There have been some regional exercises that read into this, including a focus on compact walkable development, as well as supporting multiple modes of transportation and the overall purpose is to reduce reliance on the regional highway system. Similar studies have been done in other places. As a result, they are going through a process with the Land Use Working Group to identify areas within the Volusia and Flagler planning area that might accommodate compact walkable developments. This process is called characterization; the categories used are transit focused areas, special districts, which are heavy employment areas that do not accommodate mixed use such as airports, and development focused corridors that may be more transit oriented. The transit oriented areas are looked at in two different sheds; primary transit which is a ten minute walk from the transit station and secondary transit which is larger tracks that might accommodate a larger mixed use development that would be a short trip to the transit station. Corridor development is where there might be higher usage of existing bus routes. The Land Use Working Group has also been working to identify example densities; examples of places with a higher density in an aesthetically pleasing way. She showed examples of mixed use buildings as a way to show how densities might be applied. One important factor to take in consideration is if buildings have surface parking or structure parking; a building with structured parking will have a higher density than a building with surface parking. Some examples of results in other jurisdictions where similar projects were done are improved air quality, reduced congestion, reduced energy dependence and vehicle dependency and increased safety and improvement in the system efficiency.

Mr. Cheney stated there is not enough contrast on the slides and the handout between the background and printed word and that makes it hard to read. He suggested getting rid of the background before the presentation to the board. He also suggested to help illustrate the comparison results to the trend forecast on the Seminole County look at where the SunRail stations are located for the TAZ data.

Mr. Holmes asked if the map shown of the whole county with the corridors is what is being used to assign the population and employment numbers on the model.

Ms. Harris replied it is for the alternative; the trend has a set of numbers that have been reviewed by the L RTP Subcommittee and the TCC.

Mr. Holmes asked if it was on the web page.

Ms. Parlow replied it was sent in an email on October 13, 2014 but she can forward it to him.

Ms. Harris stated it was not going to be a 100% match to existing local plans because if it was it would be the same as the trend. She has been getting feedback from the Land Use Working Group on this and is making a few changes but it is very close to where it will end up.

Ms. Parlow asked if everyone received the email; the TPO really wants feedback on this. It has the maps, the density examples and the methodology. Canin Associates will revisit the Z data based on the map and is looking for feedback within the next week.

Ms. Harris stated the model will be run on both scenarios.

Chairperson Blanck stated she was anticipating some of the questions that might be asked at the board meeting and suggested Ms. Harris might have an example when she talks about reduced congestion.

Ms. Harris replied it is a percentage reduction in the three county region.

Chairperson Blanck stated they might want to pull one out that is relevant to the TPO's geographic area.

Ms. Parlow stated when they look at the SE data on the maps they will see what it actually looks like and have the opportunity to make adjustments.

B. Presentation on the Priority Process Program Changes

Mr. Keeth stated every year the TPO reviews the priority process and tries to identify ways to improve it and make it more effective. The TPO assigned the responsibility of first review to the TIP Subcommittee and they have met on two occasions; once in August and again in September. They have come to conclusions on some of the issues but not all. This is a presentation and no action is required now but he would like input from the committee and then bring this back for final review and approval at the November meeting. The first issue is a question about the process and how the TPO approaches identifying priorities and they agreed the annual call for projects process works well. One thing the TPO would like to accomplish is to reduce the number of priority lists; currently there are seven. When these lists are passed to FDOT, they have to decide which projects get funded first and that should be the TPO's responsibility. The TPO will have more control over outcomes of funding and what projects are implemented with less lists. One suggestion the committee had for doing that is to uncouple the SU funds from the bicycle/pedestrian list and from the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety list. The TPO receives an annual allocation of \$4.5 million and that is divided 40% for Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety, 30% for transit and 30% for Bicycle Pedestrian projects which leaves only \$1.5 for Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety projects. As a result the TPO has had to limit the cost of projects that go on this list to \$1.5 million per year or \$3 million over multiple years. If the TPO unhitches these lists from SU funds there would be less constraints.

Mr. Lear asked if this would preclude a project from using SU funds.

Mr. Keeth replied absolutely not; the subcommittee recommended maintaining the policy that allocates the SU funds of 40% for Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety, 30% for transit and 30% for Bicycle Pedestrian.

Mr. Cheney stated item D on page 47 should state 30% goes to "transit".

Mr. Keeth replied yes, it was left off. He stated there was a lot of discussion about the current policy that protects the top ranked projects on the different lists. The TPO has projects on the lists that sit in the protected zone that do not move; in many cases it is because the funding is not available but in some cases it is because of some defect in the project or more documentation is needed before FDOT can program it, which is the case with ITS projects. The federal government requires a system engineering management plan before they will approve funding for on an ITS project. There are cases when the original project applicant has decided the project is no longer a top priority and therefore they are not ready to submit matching funds for it.

Chairperson Blanck asked for clarification on item E; is the protected status lost due to the fault or to no fault of the applicant.

Mr. Keeth replied the statement is the applicant should lose their protected status if it is their fault. The recommendation of the subcommittee is to require the applicant update the project every five years, and include with that update a statement of why the project has not moved. If it is through their fault, or if they have not provided the match or if further documentation is needed, then that is grounds for the TPO Board to say it should not be on the list, at least in the protected zone, it would then be re-evaluated and prioritized with respect to how other projects compare. If it has not moved forward because funding has not been available, then it will maintain its protected status and continue to look for funding.

Mr. Holmes asked if the TPO would be in the process of identifying projects in jeopardy while applicants are putting in for projects.

Mr. Keeth replied the TPO would notify applicants if they are in jeopardy but the details have not been worked out yet. It is only fair that the TPO provides a notice if a project is in danger of losing its protected status. The TPO does now provide notice each year that an update of commitment to the project is required. The next issue the subcommittee considered is broadening the range of projects on the Regional Significant Non-SIS list.

This is a result of applications received from the city of Daytona Beach for roundabouts, which would be classified as traffic operations or safety improvements rather than capacity improvements. Ordinarily, a capacity project would be identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the TPO would draw from the LRTP to populate this list. Roundabouts are not identified in the LRTP; they are more a traffic operations type project but they are different because they are very expensive. It seems fair that when a project reaches a certain cost, because they are competing with capacity projects that are in the LRTP, they should be included in the LRTP and be considered along with those other projects as part of the cost feasible plan. The subcommittee suggested that the cost threshold for such projects be \$3 million. Specifically, regardless if it is a capacity project or not, if it exceeds a cost of \$3 million it should be considered in the context of the LRTP and should be identified as a cost feasible project there against the other projects. If it is adopted into the LRTP it could then be drawn out and included in this list.

Mr. Papa asked how the figure of \$3 million was devised.

Mr. Keeth replied he was not sure but it is the current cap in the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety list; it is a multi-year cap of \$3 million.

Mr. Papa asked if projects under \$3 million that are non-capacity projects should apply through the SU and be placed on that list.

Mr. Keeth replied they would apply through the annual call for projects.

Mr. Holmes asked if this was a new list.

Mr. Keeth replied no, this is the Regionally Significant non-SIS facilities list; which is an existing list. It currently includes only projects that have been identified and adopted into the LRTP, which are now essentially all capacity projects.

Mr. Cheney stated they are road widening projects and that the subcommittee just took a stab with the \$3 million cap and will evaluate it after they get some cost estimates and fine tune it.

Mr. Keeth stated since the committee is discussing unhitching the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety projects from the SU funding, there would no longer be the \$1.5 million single year or \$3 million multi-year limit. That may be the limit for SU funding if this list is unhitched from the SU funding other funding can be put on those projects.

Mr. Cheney stated most of the roundabouts that were discussed involved obtaining right-of-way in business districts.

Mr. Papa stated in terms of process, there is a series of recommendations that will come back later for approval, and he sees where one recommendation ties itself well to another; the uncoupling of funds. He asked if it was going to be presented that way, and stated from his perspective it is neater and more cohesive to tie the recommendations together.

Chairperson Blanck stated that in the past when there is something complex like this, the TPO uses a menu approach with something that has six or eight recommendations tied to it and the committee will probably address that at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Cheney asked when Mr. Keeth is done with the presentation, could the committee take a straw poll to see if any members are uncomfortable with any of the recommendations or have any major issues to take the information back to the TIP Subcommittee.

Chairperson Blanck replied that would be a good approach.

Mr. Keeth stated no matter how small they chop the items for decisions, every decision will have implications down the line. For example, if the committee agrees to uncouple SU funding from the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety and Bicycle/Pedestrian lists, that then has implications for funding limits. The projects will no longer be limited to what is in SU funding and will be able to apply other funds and asked if the cap should be raised or eliminated.

Mr. Cheney asked Mr. Ferguson to find out what the statewide average cost is for roundabouts so the TPO has a better feel for it.

Chairperson Blanck stated the next presentation is on roundabouts.

Mr. Keeth stated these decisions are not specifically limited to roundabouts.

Mr. Cheney stated \$3 million is a low threshold.

Mr. Keeth stated item G is relating to the annual confirmation of cost estimates; costs can vary widely over time based on a number of factors such as: changing regulations, the cost of borrowing, the pressure on the construction industry, etc. The recommendation of the subcommittee is to require an annual confirmation and update. The TPO is somewhat doing that now as a result of FDOT's practice asking the TPO to update FDOT project application information forms on an annual basis. The TPO does a three-year projection of project costs when doing a feasibility study; a factoring up based on the cost of living and inflation factors.

Mr. Cheney stated FDOT requires applicants that have projects in the hopper to do an update already. He does not believe the application asks for the project cost but if there is a feasibility study, it is attached to the application. This is a way to ensure the applicant keeps track of the cost since there is the policy of if there are any overruns are to be paid by the local jurisdiction, not the TPO.

Mr. Lear asked if the applicant was supposed to push things up by the Consumer Price Index (CPI); he stated every year it seems more excessive.

Mr. Keeth replied it is the applicants call; at a minimum you would want to look at CPI to see if it affects the cost but also recognize any changed conditions; regulations that might affect the design, any development that may have occurred, and new FDOT standards. There are a number of factors that can affect the price and it would be the applicant's obligation to identify those factors and provide a new cost estimate if appropriate.

Mr. Lear stated smaller cities do not have the staff to do that and it seems like consultants will get more work with this.

Mr. Ferguson stated he would be happy to share FDOT's inflation factor.

Mr. Keeth stated in most cases the applicant would just have to adjust cost based on those inflation factors. If the applicant recognizes something has changed that might have a bearing on cost then it should be identified. He asked if everyone is in agreement or had any concerns.

Mr. Lear stated he had concerns with item G but did not know how to fix it.

Mr. Keeth stated FDOT is asking the TPO for updated FDOT project application information forms now on an annual basis and that does require an estimate of cost.

Mr. Cheney stated it needed to be conveyed back to the TIP Subcommittee that the smaller cities have concerns about the annual cost estimate.

Mr. Keeth stated this will be back for further review and a vote, but he wants to understand the concerns the committee has now. There are a number of issues the TIP Subcommittee has not resolved; the first is related to whether or not FDOT should be permitted to submit applications on their own. This came about from

FDOT's request for Volusia County several years ago to submit applications on their behalf for projects on US 92.

Mr. Cheney stated FDOT was in a catch-22; their traffic operations were doing evaluation studies on different projects and if it was over a certain dollar threshold or involved major drainage work, it would go into the design section because it was too much for them to build. Now FDOT and their design department are saying they will not look at the projects submitted by one section of FDOT unless it is on the TPO's project priority list. Traditionally, the county has worked with traffic operations to move those projects forward as a local sponsor. The county's concern is item B, as a local sponsor, the county would have to do the 10% local match. When Ms. Mary Schoeziel was the FDOT Liaison to the TPO, she said any project submitted that was on a state road, FDOT would pick up the local match. That is why he put these two items forward; should FDOT be allowed to submit applications and who would be able to provide the local match if so.

Mr. Keeth stated there are two issues here, one is should FDOT be permitted to apply and the second is if they are not and have to apply with a partner, who is responsible for the local match and the updates.

Mr. Ervin asked if this was a way to efficiently cut through the red tape and help minimize the amount of money a local government would have to spend.

Mr. Cheney replied it was a catch-22; FDOT cannot do the project because it is not on the list, and they cannot submit so it cannot be put on the list. The TPO is missing out on money FDOT could spend in Volusia County.

Mr. Ervin asked is this a situation where they will participate in the process.

Mr. Cheney replied when he spoke to Ms. Calzaretta, she made it sound like FDOT did not want to do the project because they did not want to do the paperwork.

Mr. Ervin stated he would support anything that would not put the county or local governments responsible for the local match and if it is a way to get a needed project funded, then go for it.

Mr. Keeth stated if the TPO adopted a policy that they would not use their XU or TAP funds on state facilities, then there would not be a match because a match is only required with those two funds. The TPO has \$450,000 a year in TAP funds and \$4.5 million in SU funds that is allocated 40/30/30 so there is not a lot of money. If it is not spent on state highway projects, it will go a lot farther to fund off system projects. That may be the solution.

Mr. Cheney asked if there could be co-sponsors; if there is a local government that supports the FDOT project, they are the co-sponsor but FDOT does all the upgrades. FDOT did a study on SR 472 where they are wanting to lengthen the westbound left turn lane onto westbound I-4 because it backs up into the through traffic each morning but they cannot do it because there is drainage involved and it is beyond their pushbutton cost threshold.

Mr. Ferguson replied the reason they do this is because there is a state law, a certain amount of money is required to trigger it and it has to be on the main priority list. Otherwise, they could have maybe twenty or thirty of these projects and it could stop the hope of funding other large projects. It is challenging for FDOT to figure out if a \$3 million project is more important than a \$30 million project.

Mr. Cheney stated there is a root problem and the question is how to solve the problem and get more money back into Volusia County. The other TPOs may have already figured this out and so the money is going to other cities and counties.

Mr. Paradise stated that is a good point; if other TPOs have figured it out, have they been asked how. That is an interesting starting point. It has been a problem with the SU pot of money; it is difficult to do anything for a myriad of reasons.

Mr. Ferguson stated his background is with MetroPlan Orlando, and he worked as their liaison for the last seven years. They went through two different complete lists; they directed the state to do as many of those as possible and ran out of those projects. He suggested they might want to throw in some state intersection projects in; the projects had to be needed, ideally they have a study of some kind or at least some evidence there is a definite corridor problem. To the extent that the projects actually involve a majority of work on the state highway system, the state is in a position to pick up those projects completely; both the state part and the local part, providing the majority of the costs are a state road. To the extent the projects are mainly turn lanes from a local road to a state road, those are not so much the state's responsibility and it is much harder to get the money from the state for them. If there is intersection or other ITS type projects along a state corridor that are more expensive than the TPO is accustomed to, he would not discourage the TPO from trying to find a way to make them eligible for state funding.

Mr. Cheney stated the big difference between MetroPlan and the River to Sea TPO is the local match required by the River to Sea TPO. That goes back to a local jurisdiction submitting an FDOT project and providing 10% and being asked why they are funding state road projects.

Chairperson Blanck suggested FDOT attend the next TIP Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Keeth stated the next issue is related to cost overruns; the consensus is there needs to be a clear definition of what they are and have clearer guidelines that let the TPO decide when the cost overrun should be covered by the applicant or the TPO. From the TPO's standpoint, a cost overrun is the difference between the amount programmed in the TIP and the Work Program and the actual cost. It is very difficult to estimate the cost of a project with so many variables and changes over time and the TPO allows that number to be adjusted up to the point it is programmed. When it is programmed there should be a clear indication that it is a good estimate and anything over that would be considered a cost overrun. There are cost overruns that are not the fault of the applicant and the TPO should recognize when that happens and not impose on them to make up the cost overrun. There is policy to waive this requirement if it is not the fault of the applicant or there are unforeseen circumstances.

Chairperson Blanck suggested establishing a contingency level everyone is comfortable with; in her experience 10% of any kind of project is a threshold. If it goes beyond 10% the TPO should determine some kind of process.

Mr. Cheney stated when the county does cost estimates they typically have a 10% contingency but when they fill out the application and submit it to FDOT they say you cannot have a 10% contingency and so there is a cost overrun.

Chairperson Blanck stated if a tolerance level is established, it would help.

Ms. Alkhatib stated cost overruns are happening a lot; especially now with the economy coming back. After you break down the funding for the design phase and construction and then start doing the design, and you have much more technical information and a more detailed cost estimate, then would be the time to let FDOT know and update the cost estimate and try to get more funding toward that project. Usually the design funding is established two years before the construction phase, so then you could let FDOT know there is going to be a cost overrun of more than a 10% contingency. She thinks this would be the best way to handle it. This is what they have had to do with the Matanzas Woods interchange project.

Mr. Ferguson stated FDOT has been experiencing the same dynamics; they are having cost increases routinely, in design, right-of-way and construction. That is becoming more and more common and a sign of the recovering economy.

Mr. Keeth stated the final item on this topic was not discussed by the TIP Subcommittee but FDOT is encouraging the TPO to establish a priority list for planning studies. It has been discussed internally and the TPO feels it should be worked into the call for projects. He asked the committee what they thought about it.

Mr. Cheney stated he likes the idea but was not sure how to implement it.

Mr. Keeth asked if it should be carried out like the TPO now does with construction projects through a call for projects and the same cycle.

Mr. Cheney replied it should be the same cycle.

Mr. Lear stated it would be a good idea to let the subcommittee decide.

Presentation and Discussion on Roundabouts

Ms. Martha Moore, Ghyabi & Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation and a brief overview on roundabouts. She stated FDOT changed their policy regarding roundabouts on January 1, 2013 and now looks at roundabouts as one of the first options when they are doing screenings for traffic intersection control.

Mr. Cheney asked how much they cost.

Ms. Moore replied it depends on if there is right-of-way or not.

Mr. Cheney asked what the range of cost is for single-lane versus multi-lane roundabouts, understanding that right-of-way can be an issue.

Ms. Moore replied she can get a cost range; some of the operating costs can be lower if you are not maintaining traffic signals.

Mr. Keeth stated he had the opportunity last week to go through a roundabout at Wickham Road in Viera and he was quite confused by the signage and he had difficulty getting through it. He saw that a local realtor had created a website on how to get through the roundabout.

Discussion continued.

C. FDOT Report

Mr. Ferguson stated there was nothing new to report.

Chairperson Blanck stated the FDOT report was included in the agenda for everyone to review at their leisure and if anyone has any questions Mr. Ferguson will answer them.

Mr. Cheney asked for Mr. Ferguson's phone number.

Mr. Ferguson provided his number.

D. Volusia County Construction Report

Mr. Cheney stated they have completed and opened all lanes at the Tymber Creek Road project in Ormond Beach, the Saxon Boulevard project in Orange City and the Calle Grande sidewalk project in Holly Hill. They are currently under construction on two segments of the East Coast Regional Rail Trail, Segment 3 between SR 415 and Guise Road, that is the one that Osteen residents are challenging construction and Segment 6 from Cow Creek to Dale Street. On the Howland Boulevard project, between Courtland Boulevard and SR 415 they have received the bids and are waiting on the council's award of that project. It is funded partially by FDOT and the county greatly appreciates that. Also, the Dunn Avenue paved shoulders project has been advertised for construction and they should be receiving bids within the next two weeks. Not shown on the report is a project Ponce Inlet and the county have partnered on and they anticipate beginning construction in the next few weeks.

Mr. Keeth stated Ms. Alkhatib has provided a report from Flagler County and starting next month it will be a regular item on the agenda.

VI. Staff Comments

→ Discussion on Coast to Coast Summit

Mr. Harris stated the summit was held October 1, 2014 at the Winter Garden City Hall and the purpose was two-fold; the first was to inform the stakeholders of the status of the Coast to Coast Trail and the second was to establish a framework to organize and implement a regional system of local trails. Ms. Lois Bollenback also attended along with board members Ms. Patricia Northey and Ms. Leigh Matusik. Funding for the trails was discussed and there is a constitutional amendment on the ballot next month, Amendment 1, and if it passes will allow funds to be spent on trails from the Land Acquisition Trust Fund. Also, earlier this year, Governor Scott signed into law a bill that appropriates \$15.5 million to closing gaps in the Coast to Coast Connect and FDOT has programmed \$18.8 million toward that project on top of \$26 million that is already on projects along the trail that are currently in different stages. Representatives from all the MPO's and TPO's that had segments in their planning area and each representative gave a status report on their gaps. He made a presentation that focused on the gap at the Volusia/Seminole County line at US 17/92; \$682,000 is currently programmed for design in the current year. The gap runs from where the Spring to Spring Trail ends at Lake Monroe Park to where the sidewalk ends at Wayside Park at the Seminole County line. He spoke about the status of the Rail Trail and the Spring to Spring Trail. Ms. Bollenback spoke on the Regional Trails Corridor Assessment and the idea for an extension for the Coast to Coast Trail from where the Rail Trail ends in Edgewater near Rotary Park northward to New Smyrna Beach over the north causeway to the Atlantic Ocean. Senator Gardner attended and Bike Walk Central Florida presented him with an award for being Florida Legislator of the Year for promoting trails. All the presentations, the agenda and maps have been uploaded to the Office of Greenways and Trails website.

→ Budget Impact of VCOG Closing

Mr. Keeth stated VCOG has shared office space, utilities and the copier for many years. Late last month the VCOG Board decided to shut down VCOG and they are vacating the offices now. The TPO will be looking for another entity to fill the space and provide the TPO with some income to make up for what is being lost with VCOG's departure; about \$30,000 per year. The TPO's lease on the building is for another three years. It would be best if another government entity or non-profit could occupy the space. The TPO is looking for ways to fill the hole in the budget and reduce costs and asked the committee to let staff know of any interested parties.

→ Comments on Statewide and Metropolitan Planning

Mr. Keeth stated the Federal Highway Administration issued a proposed notice of rule-making; the purpose of these rules is to implement the new provisions to MAP-21, the federal transportation planning act. In the agenda packet is a letter from Ms. Bollenback regarding those changes and addresses some concerns raised by the draft regulations in two issue areas. One issue is related to the makeup of the TPO Board and representation; particularly relating to transit. The TPO is very much in support of providing good representation relating to transit but wants to make sure they have flexibility to address the particular needs here and not create any problems by allowing a non-elected official to stand in as a representative of the transit agency when members of the board who are elected officials and stand over the transit agency from a policy standpoint. The other area of concern relating to the proposed rules with respect to the performance based planning as is now required; the TPO is now required to identify performance targets and measures to determine whether or not those targets are met; the TPO wants to make sure they have the flexibility there that is necessary to do that in the TPO's best interest.

→ SunRail

Mr. Keeth stated ridership overall has declined from the high in June to a low in September of about 3,000 riders per day. This is somewhat predictable; there are natural cycles in transit ridership. The average from the beginning stands at about 4,200 riders per day; just under the target of 4,300 per day. Ridership should pick up again when construction begins on I-4. DeBary is the number one station in terms of ridership; just over 8,000 in September. The next high volume station is Sand Lake Road; others are Winter Park and Church Street. The number of boardings with bicycles is around 200 per day. For parking lot counts, the DeBary station averages at 58% occupied per month. There are plans to expand the parking lot in 2015. In terms of performance, the system has generally been on time.

VII. TCC Member Comments

There were no member comments.

VIII. Information Items

- **Long Range Transportation Plan Workshop**
- **River to Sea TPO Board Meeting Summary**
- **Resolutions Regarding the Need for Widening West Park Avenue in Edgewater and Request for Funding**

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, the TCC meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

HEATHER BLANCK, CHAIRPERSON
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC)

CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the River to Sea TPO certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the October 21, 2014 regular meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), approved and duly signed this 18th day of November 2014.

DEBBIE STEWART, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## REAFFIRMING THE POLICY FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY PROJECTS

Background Information:

The TIP Subcommittee met three times in recent weeks to review the Priority Process and related policies. A summary of the subcommittee's final recommendations is attached. The enclosed draft resolution establishes the overall policy for developing transportation project priorities. Two additional resolutions regarding the allocation of funds and local match requirements will be presented at the January TPO meetings.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## REAFFIRMING THE POLICY FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY PROJECTS



**TIP Subcommittee
November 5, 2014
Meeting Summary**

- Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present. The following members were present: Chairman Tom Harowski, Richard Belhumeur, Jon Cheney, Bobby Ball, Scott Leisen, Ron Paradise and Gene Ferguson.
- Members discussed proposed priority process program changes and recommended the following:
 - uncouple SU funds from the Bicycle/Pedestrian list and the Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety list;
 - maintain the current TPO policy of allocating 40% of SU funds to Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety projects, 30% to Bicycle/Pedestrian projects, and 30% to Transit projects;
 - if a project has not been programmed within five years from the time it first obtained protected status, require the sponsor to submit an updated application with a statement as to why the project has not advanced; if the project has not been programmed due to the fault of the project sponsor, then re-evaluate and re-prioritize the project accordingly;
 - broaden the range of projects on the Regionally Significant, Non-SIS project list to include, in addition to capacity projects, any non-capacity project that exceeds a cost threshold of \$3 million;
 - allow FDOT to submit applications with a local co-sponsor;
 - authorize the TPO Executive Director to approve the use of state or federal funds to cover some or all of a project overrun up to and including 10% of the approved project cost estimate; and
 - create a new priority project list for planning studies.
- Members also discussed the following, but made no recommendations:
 - benefits of periodically reviewing the status of priority projects at TCC meetings; and
 - annual confirmation of project cost estimates; it was noted that FDOT already requires confirmation of cost estimates for projects that appear to be ready for programming.

~~VOLUSIA~~ RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION 2014-~~07~~##

RESOLUTION OF THE ~~VOLUSIA~~ RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION REAFFIRMING THE POLICY FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING TRANSPORTATION PRIORITY PROJECTS

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 ~~Volusia~~ 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 cities of Flagler Beach and Beverly Beach in Flagler County 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 ~~Volusia~~ 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 ~~Volusia~~ 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 ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO to establish project priorities ~~within the Volusia TPO's planning for all areas of Volusia County and the cities of Beverly Beach and Flagler Beach in Flagler County~~ the TPO's MPA; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO that the following policies are established to prioritize transportation projects ~~in Volusia County and the cities of Beverly Beach and Flagler Beach in Flagler County~~ throughout the TPO's MPA:

1. The project application and evaluation criteria approved by the ~~Volusia~~-River to Sea TPO Board shall be used to solicit and evaluate projects for priority ranking in ~~various~~-the transportation program categories listed below:
 - a. Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Projects;
 - b. Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Roadway Projects;
 - c. Traffic Operations and Safety Projects;
 - d. Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects;
 - e. Regional Trails Projects;
 - f. Transportation Alternative Program Projects
 - g. Public Transit Projects
 - h. Major Bridge Projects
 - i. Planning Studies
2. ~~Volusia~~-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) ~~Roadway~~-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 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 three on the Prioritized List of ~~Bascule Bridge~~Major Bridge 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 eight on Tier "B" of the Prioritized List of ~~XU (Urban Attributable)~~-Traffic Operations/~~ITS/~~and Safety ~~Set-Aside~~-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. Projects which are ranked one through three on Tier "B" of the Prioritized List of ~~XU~~-Bicycle/Pedestrian ~~Set-Aside~~-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;

8. Projects which are ranked one through eight on the Prioritized List of Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Projects (to be funded with the ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO's allocation of TAP funds) 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;
9. Projects which are ranked one through eight on the Prioritized List of Regional Trail 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;
10. The ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO will not re-prioritize protected projects ~~except in the following cases: unless~~
 - ~~a. projects from the prioritized lists of projects for the expanded metropolitan planning area (including portions of Bunnell, Palm Coast, and unincorporated Flagler County) as approved by the Flagler County Board of County Commissioners on August 5, 2013 may be incorporated into the TPO's protected list if warranted by ranking or score; or~~
 - ~~b. the~~ ~~Volusia~~ TPO Board determines unusual circumstances dictate otherwise;
11. It is the responsibility of the ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO and FDOT staffs to provide the ~~Volusia~~ 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;
- ~~12.~~ The ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO shall, in its discretion, make all decisions regarding the final prioritized project lists that are annually submitted to FDOT;
- ~~12.~~ 13. Once a project has attained protected status, it should be programmed within 5 years. If it has not been programmed during that time due to the fault 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.~~ 14. The policies set forth in this resolution shall remain in effect unless and until they are repealed by the TPO; and
- ~~14.~~ 15. the ~~Chairman~~ Chairperson of the ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO, (or his/her designee) is hereby authorized and directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the:
 - ~~b.~~ a. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT);
 - ~~c.~~ b. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and

~~d.c.~~ Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation)

DONE AND RESOLVED at the regular meeting of the ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO held on the ____ day of _____, 2014.

~~VOLUSIA~~ RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

VOLUSIA COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER PATRICIA NORTHEY

CHAIRPERSON, ~~VOLUSIA~~ RIVER TO SEA TPO

CERTIFICATE:

The undersigned duly qualified and acting Recording Secretary of the ~~Volusia~~ 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 ~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO held on _____, 2014.

ATTEST:

PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP, RECORDING SECRETARY

~~VOLUSIA~~ RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

IV. ACTION ITEMS

B. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PRIORITY PROCESS PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Background Information:

The XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Application and the Transportation Alternatives Project Application have been revised to incorporate the TIP Subcommittee's recommended changes to the Priority Project Process and the related resolutions. These proposed changes are presented in the enclosed draft applications for your review and recommended approval.

Notable changes to the XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Project Application are as follows:

1. References to XU (SU) funding have been removed to reflect the "uncoupling" of the list from those particular fund types.
2. The paragraph regarding Award Limits on page 2 of the General Instructions has been revised to provide that projects on the list may be funded with any combination of federal, state, and/or local funds, but that no more than \$3 million of federal and/or state funds may be allocated to any single project. More costly traffic operations and safety projects would be prioritized on the SIS Projects list or the Regionally Significant, Non-SIS Projects list.
3. The paragraph regarding Local Match Requirements on page 2 of the General Instructions has been revised to prescribe the local match requirement for SU funds as a ratio of 90/10 (SU/local) consistent with the changes proposed to Resolution 2013-09 (to be presented for review and approval in January).
4. Criteria #1, Location, on page 2 of the application for Feasibility Study has been revised to distinguish between urban and rural minor collector roads. Projects on urban minor collector roads are generally eligible for federal aid whereas project on rural minor collector roads generally are not.

Notable changes to the Transportation Alternatives Project Application are as follows:

1. The paragraph regarding Local Match Requirements on page 2 of the General Instructions has been revised to prescribe the local match requirements for TALU funds as a ratio of 80/20 (TALU/local) consistent with the changes proposed (to be presented for review and approval in January).
2. The paragraph regarding the award of points for extra local match has been revised to clarify that the required match relates to the amount of TALU funds programmed on the project, not total project cost. The difference could be significant if state and/or federal funds other than TALU are used on the project. The paragraph is further revised to clarify that extra points may be awarded in proportion to the amount of match over 20% of total project cost, not the amount of match over 20% of TALU funds programmed on the project.

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PRIORITY PROCESS PROJECT APPLICATIONS

2014-2015 Application for Project Prioritization

~~XU~~ Traffic Operations ~~ITS~~ and Safety Projects

January 2014-2015

General Instructions:

For the 2014-2015 Call for Projects, the ~~VTPOR~~2CTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

The ~~VTPOR~~2CTPO has two different application forms for ~~XU~~ Traffic Operations ~~ITS~~ and Safety Projects. One is to be used when applying for a Feasibility Study; the other is to be used when applying for Project Implementation. When applying for Project Implementation, the applicant 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 ~~VTPOR~~2CTPO 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.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

Project Qualification:

Except for certain improvements identified in 23 U.S.C. §133¹, only projects located on Federal-Aid Roads (roads on the National Highway System (NHS) or functionally classified as Urban Minor Collector ~~/Rural Major Collector~~, or higher) may be funded ~~with Federal XU~~ through this program.

Only applications for ~~T~~traffic ~~O~~perations, ~~I~~ntelligent ~~T~~ransportation ~~S~~ystems (ITS) and ~~S~~safety ~~P~~rojects will be considered. These projects are relatively low-cost enhancements to improve the operational safety and efficiency of the existing traffic circulation system. They are quick responses to implement low-cost improvements. They are typically narrow in scope and focus on improvements to traffic operations and modifications to traffic control devices. Projects costing \$3 million or more are not eligible for prioritization and funding in this project category. The following list of projects is representative of qualifying projects; however, it is not exhaustive:

1. Adding or extending left and/or right turn lanes;
2. improved signage or signalization;
3. targeted traffic enforcement;
4. limitation or prohibition of driveways, turning movements, truck traffic, and on-street parking;
5. modification of median openings;
6. replacement of standard intersections with traffic circles or roundabouts;
7. traffic incident response plans;
8. realignment of a road;

¹ These exceptions include: carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways, modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings.

9. intelligent transportation systems (ITS) such as dynamic message signs and adaptive signal control systems;
10. traffic calming roadway designs or devices; and
11. street lighting to improve traffic safety.

Award Limits:

Projects on this list may be funded with any combination of federal, state, and/or local funds. However, no more than \$3 million of federal and/or state funds will be allocated to any single project. No more than \$1.5 million in ~~XU~~SU funds will be awarded to any single project in any single application cycle, and no more than \$3 million in ~~XU~~SU funds will be awarded over multiple years toward the completion of any single project. Waivers/exceptions may be granted by the ~~VTPO~~R2CTPO Board.

Local Match Requirement:

~~VTPO~~R2CTPO Resolution ~~2013-09~~2015-## ~~requires a local match of ten percent (10%) of the total amount of XU funds programmed for each project~~ provides that the governmental entity requesting SU funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratios of 90/10 (SU/local).

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 ~~VTPO~~R2CTPO's policy that the applicant (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with ~~XU~~SU funds unless the project is on the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns.

Electronic and "Hard Copy" Submittal Requirement:

1. Applications and supporting documentation shall be submitted as digital media in Portable Document Format (PDF), compatible with MS Windows and Adobe Acrobat Version 9.5 or earlier.
2. Electronic documents may be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive.
3. The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one electronic PDF file.
4. All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.
5. Page size shall be either 8-1/2" by 11" (letter) or 11" by 17" (tabloid).
6. PDF documents produced by scanning paper documents are inherently inferior to those produced directly from an electronic source. Documents which are only available in paper format should be scanned at a resolution which ensures the pages are legible on both a computer screen and a printed page. We recommend scanning at 300 dpi to balance legibility and file size.
7. If you are unable to produce an electronic document as prescribed here, please call us to discuss other options.
8. 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.

~~VTPO~~R2CTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an application to any member local government that requests it.



2014-2015 Application for Project Prioritization – FEASIBILITY STUDY
~~XU~~ Traffic Operations ~~ITS~~ and Safety Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (project sponsor): _____ Date: _____

Contact Person: _____ Job Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

E-mail: _____

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

[If not the same as Applicant, attach a letter of support for 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 applicant's responsibility will be.]

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applicant: _____

Project Description: _____

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

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

- ☐ the proposed improvement is located on the Federal-aid system;
- ☐ 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: _____

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

Criteria #1 - Location – Indicate the functional classification of the roadway on which the proposed improvement is located.

Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Urban/Rural Major Collector	Urban Minor Collector	Rural Minor Collector or Local Street Road	Not Applicable
<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0

Criteria #2 - Mobility and Operational Benefits – The proposed project will significantly reduce traffic congestion and/or delays.

Commentary: _____

Criteria #3 - Safety Benefits – The project will significantly reduce the number and/or severity of crashes; it will significantly reduce the number of fatalities and/or serious injuries.

Commentary: _____

Criteria #4 - Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality – The proposed project will directly contribute to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan; 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).

Commentary: _____

2015 Application for Project Prioritization – **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

~~XU~~ Traffic Operations ~~ITS~~ and Safety Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (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 necessary.

Commentary: _____

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

Criteria #1 – Location (5 points max.)

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.

~~VTPOR~~R2CTPO staff will review the application to determine the classification of the roads benefitting from the proposed project.

Project located on a ...			Points
Non-Federal Functionally Classified Road	Select only one	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Local Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Rural Minor Collector (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Urban Minor Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Major Collector Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Minor Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Principal Arterial Road (Federal Functional Classification)		<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Subtotal			0 - 5

Commentary: _____

Criteria #2 – Project Readiness (15 points max.)

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.

Phasing Already Completed or Not Required ¹				Required But Not Completed (no points)	Unknown or TBD (no points)	
		Completed	Not Re- quired			Points
Feasibility Study/Conceptual Design/Cost Estimate/SEMP ²	Check only one in each row	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
PE (Design)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Environmental		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Right-of-Way Acquisition		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Permitting		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
Subtotal						0 - 15

¹ Since XU funding is Federal funding, 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.

² A Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) is generally required for ITS projects.

Commentary: _____

Criteria #3 – Mobility and Operational Benefits (30 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. When putting your application together please include a copy of any approved signal warrant or street lighting studies.

Mobility and Operational Benefits				Points
Existing volume to capacity ratio (i.e., existing congestion severity) [Must be documented.]	Select on- ly one	< 0.75	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		0.75 to 0.99	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
		1.00 to 1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
		>1.25	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Mobility Enhancements (i.e., level of increased mobility that a project will provide)	Select all that apply	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Bike, Pedestrian, ADA or Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 5
		Access Management, ITS, Critical Bridge, Intersection Improve- ment, or Traffic Signal Retiming ³	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 10
Approved signal warrant (new signals only), left turn phase warrant, left turn lane warrant, street light warrant or widening justification ⁴ , access management or ITS improvements ⁵	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 5
Hurricane evacuation route upgrade including, but not limited to, converting traffic signal to mast arm or other operational improvements. ⁶	Select only one	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
		Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 5
Subtotal				0 - 30

³ Attach Traffic Signal Timing Study.

⁴ Attach Warrant Study to application; otherwise ~~VTP~~~~OR~~~~2CTPO~~ staff will assume that a Warrant Study justifying the improvement has not been completed.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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 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 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 help to achieve those benefits. ~~VTPOR~~R2CTPO staff will work with the appropriate agencies to determine the intersection and corridor crash rates.

Safety Benefits ⁷			Points
The specific project location is on FDOT’s High Crash List or has otherwise been identified as having an overrepresentation of severe crashes? (Provide supporting documentation (e.g., intersection crashes per million entering vehicles ⁸ , corridor crashes per million vehicle miles ⁸ , Community Traffic Safety Team report, etc.)	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 – 5
The “problem” described on page 1 of this application is a safety issue that falls within one or more of the eight Emphasis Areas identified in the [forthcoming] 2012 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) or does contribute to the ability of emergency response vehicles to effectively respond to an incident.		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 – 5
The proposed project represents a strategy that is professionally recognized as being effective in reducing the frequency and/or severity of traffic accidents.		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 – 10
Subtotal			0 – 20

⁷ If an application scores very high in this criterion, the ~~VTPOR~~R2CTPO may submit application to either the East or West Volusia Community Traffic Safety Team (CTST) for Safety Fund consideration.

⁸ Applicant 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 and Economic Vitality (10 points max.)

This criterion looks at 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 applicant 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.

Support of Comprehensive Planning Goals and Economic Vitality			Points
Directly contributes to the achievement of one or more goals/objectives in the adopted comprehensive plan	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 5
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)		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 5
Subtotal			0 - 10

Commentary: _____

Criteria #6 – Infrastructure Impacts (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.

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).

Infrastructure Impacts			Points
Major Drainage Impact – relocating or installing new curb inlets or other extensive drainage work is required, or drainage impact has not yet been determined ⁹	Select only one	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Minor Drainage Impact – extending pipes, reconfiguring swales or other minor work is required		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 2
No Drainage Impact – no drainage work required		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 4
Relocation of private gas utility or fiber optic communication cable is not required ¹⁰	Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 4
Relocation of public/private water or sewer utility is not required ¹⁰		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 4
Relocation of telephone, power, cable TV utilities is not required ¹¹		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 4
No specimen or historic trees ≥ 18” diameter will be removed or destroyed		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 - 4
Subtotal			0 - 20

⁹ ADA pedestrian crossings at intersections may impact drainage significantly. Attached Traffic Study should address drainage impacts.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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.)

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

Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost? Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?		
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	3

17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	7
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	9
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		10

Criterion #7 Description (if needed): _____



**THIS FORM SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR ALL PROJECTS
NOT CURRENTLY IN THE FDOT WORK PROGRAM.
FDOT PROJECT INFORMATION APPLICATION FORM**

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):

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Study | <input type="checkbox"/> PD&E | <input type="checkbox"/> Design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

Work Type	Requested Fiscal Year (July 1-June 30)
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	
Design	
Right-of-way Acquisition	
Construction/CEI	
Other	

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)? No. If necessary, the City will work with the River to Sea TPO to include this project in the 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? Yes- Certification in 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).

Provide an estimate of the total cost of the project phase(s) and attach supporting documents that supports the requested phase estimate (i.e. man-hour estimate and rates, equipment cost and right of way cost).

Work Type	Phase Complete? Yes/No/NA	Responsible Agency (Who performed or who will perform the work?)	Procurement Method? In-house/Advertise	Project Cost Estimate
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	-		-	\$
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	-		-	\$
Design	-		-	\$
Right-of-way Acquisition	-		-	\$
Construction	-		-	\$
CEI	-		-	\$
Other:	-		-	\$
Total Project Cost Estimate:	\$0			

- **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

EXHIBIT “A”

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 18 (Planning)

FPN (If Known): **FAN:**

Name of Project:

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):

Phone: **Email Address:**

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

Procurement Method:

☐ Advertisement

Fee Estimate: (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)

FPN (If Known): **FAN:**

Name of Project:

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):

Phone: **Email Address:**

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

Procurement Method:

☐ Advertisement

Fee Estimate: (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): **FAN:**

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: (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:

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:

CEI Procurement Method:

- ☐ In-House
☐ Advertisement

CEI Estimate (LAP Projects Only) (Attach supporting man-hours and rates)

Const Estimate (LAP Projects Only): (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:

2014-2015 Application for Project Prioritization

Transportation Alternatives Projects

OVERVIEW:

This is not a grant program. Applicants should expect to pay for the work and be reimbursed from their award. Items eligible for reimbursement include, project planning and feasibility studies, environmental analysis or preliminary design, preliminary engineering, land acquisition, and construction costs.

Eligible Project Sponsors

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**¹:

1. Transportation Alternatives as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) (MAP-21 1103):
 - a) Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other 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.

¹ It is the ~~Volusia~~ 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.

- 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 rules and procedures governing federally funded transportation projects. Certified Local Agencies comply with all applicable Federal statutes, rules and regulations.

FDOT WEB site reference: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/projectmanagementoffice/lap>

No more than \$500,000 in Transportation Alternatives (TAP) funds will be awarded to any single project in any single application cycle. *Waivers/exceptions may be granted by the ~~VTP~~R2CTPO Board.*

Resolution 2014-## provides that the governmental entity requesting TALU funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratio of 80/20 (TALU/local). ~~A twenty percent (20%) local match is required for funding of TAP projects.~~ Projects whose sponsors are willing and able to provide a local match greater than 20% of the total project cost will be awarded additional points.

All projects must be consistent with local comprehensive plans, including future land use and transportation elements, required under Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. Transportation Alternatives dollars are to be allocated with the caveat that all projects meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Each application shall include the following information:

- a) A completed copy of FDOT's Project Information Application Form.
- b) A project map that clearly identifies the location & termini of the project and proximity of the project to Community Assets (as described in the criteria). Each map should be no larger than 11"x17". In addition, all maps must include a scale (in subdivisions of a mile), north arrow, title and legend.
- c) Right-of-way (ROW) information as available. (*i.e., deeds, easements, donations, recordable documents*).
- d) Project cost estimates. (*i.e., FDOT's Long Range Estimates (LRE)*).
- e) Documentation of commitment to provide required matching funds.
- f) Each applicant must provide a statement ensuring that the project is consistent with local comprehensive plans, including future land use and transportation elements, required under Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

2. Applications shall be submitted electronically as prescribed below:

- a) The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one Portable Document Format (PDF) file, compatible with MS Windows and Adobe Acrobat Version 9.5 or earlier.

- b) The file may be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive.
 - c) All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.
 - d) Page size shall be either 8-1/2" by 11" (letter) or 11" by 17" (tabloid).
 - e) 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 a minimum 300 dpi to balance legibility and file size.
 - f) If you are unable to produce an electronic document as prescribed here, please call us to discuss other options.
3. **Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application.**
4. **All applications must be received by the ~~VTPOR~~CTPO by the application deadline [to be determined]. Applicant's are strongly advised to request verification that your applications have been received.**

Initial Project Screening

1. Any project submitted by a local government for consideration needs to meet the following screening criteria:
 - a) Project must demonstrate a clear and definitive link to transportation.
 - b) Projects submitted with individual components or phase must be physically or functionally related. For example multiple sidewalk segments, non-contiguous segments must reasonably serve a common purpose.
 - c) The applicant must have authorization from responsible jurisdiction to submit for project funding. (For example, a city that submits a project on a State road must have authorization from the State). For multi-jurisdictional portions each respective agency must co-sponsor the project or provide a formal letter of agreement.
 - d) All work must be done by pre-certified vendors and contractors of FDOT or the LAP sponsor. Projects or project phases completed by these firms are also required to meet federal guidelines. Provide documentation on how sponsor will address this criterion.
 - e) Transportation Alternatives projects are allowed on any classification of roadway or on locations not on the roadway system provided that such land is publicly owned, or over which public access has been granted through an easement or other conveyance extending over the foreseeable useful life of the completed project.
 - f) 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.
 - g) Is this Sidewalk project at least 5 feet wide?
If yes, the project is eligible.
If no, the project application is not acceptable.



2014-2015 Application for Project Prioritization Transportation Alternatives Projects

Scoring Criteria Summary

Priority Criteria	Maximum Points
(1) Safety/Security	25
(2) Contribution to "Livability" and Sustainability in the Community	20
(3) Enhancements to the Transportation System	20
(4) Demand/Accessibility	15
(5) Project Readiness	10
(6) Local Matching Funds > 20% of Total Project Cost Provided	10
Total	100

Project Title: _____

Applicant (project sponsor): _____

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

Governmental entity with maintenance responsibility for roadway facility on which proposed project is located (if different from Applicant): _____

[Attach letter from responsible entity expressing support for proposed project. This letter of support must include a statement describing the responsible entity's expectations for maintenance of the proposed improvements, i.e., what the applicant's responsibility will be.]

Projects that contribute directly to the completion or enhancement of the following trail systems may be eligible for inclusion on the VTPO's Regional Trail Projects List:

1. the Priority and Opportunity Land Trail of the Florida Greenways and Trails Systems (FGTS) Plan;
2. the Regional Trail Network of the Central Florida MPO Alliance;
3. trails/connections along SR 40;
4. a northern extension of the Coast to Coast Trail to New Smyrna Beach; and
5. the East Coast Greenway (both alternate and coastal routes).

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

(1) Safety/Security (Maximum 25 Points)

In the space provided below, describe how and to what extent the proposed facility would enhance safety conditions for motorized travelers, non-motorized travelers, or the community. Provide documentation that illustrates how it does.

Safety/Security (Maximum 25 Points)

- How does the project address a hazardous, unsafe or security condition/issue?
- How does the project remove or reduce potential conflicts (bicyclist/automobile and pedestrian/automobile)?
- Does the project eliminate or abate a hazardous, unsafe, or security condition in a school walk zone as documented in a school safety study or other relevant study?

Criterion (4) Describe how this project promotes Safety and/or Security: _____

(2) Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (maximum 20 points)

Describe 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 in relation to a one-half mile buffer around the project.

Contribution to “Livability” and Sustainability in the Community (Maximum 20 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 achieves a significant reduction of non-renewable energy usage.
- 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 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 “walkability” and “bikeability”. The following are key indicators of walkability and bikeability:
 - Are there safe walking spaces? (smooth, unobstructed, separated from traffic, crossings with appropriate signs and signals)
 - Are there places to bicycle safely? (on the road, sharing the road with motor vehicles or an off road path or trail)
 - Can pedestrians and bicyclists see and detect traffic (oncoming vehicles) day and night?
 - Are the surfaces adequate for walking or bike riding? (free of cracked or broken concrete/pavement, slippery when wet, debris)
 - Is there enough time to cross streets and intersections?
 - Is there access to well designed sidewalks and crossings?
 - Are there signs and markings designating routes? (including crosswalk markings, way finding and detour signs)
 - Are there continuous facilities? (sidewalks and trails free from gaps, obstructions and abrupt changes in direction or width)
 - Is driver behavior conducive to safe walking or biking? (yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, maintaining at least 3’ passing distance from bicyclists)

Criterion (1) Describe how this project contributes to the “Liveability” and Sustainability of the Community: _____

(3) Enhancements to the Transportation System (maximum 20 points)

This criterion 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.

Enhancements to the Transportation System (Maximum 20 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? Some factors that can help establish this relationship include:
 - Is the project near a highway or a pedestrian/bicycle corridor?
 - Does the project enhance the aesthetic, cultural, or historic aspects of the travel experience?
 - Does it serve a current or past transportation purpose?
- 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 it conform to TOD principles?
- Is the project an extension or phased part of a larger redevelopment effort in corridor/area?

Criterion (2) Describe how this project enhances the Transportation System: _____

(4) Demand/Accessibility (Maximum 15 points)

Describe indications of existing demand (e.g., photographs of worn pathways that demonstrate ground wear from use) and the degree to which the project will satisfy that demand. Describe expressions of community support and include supporting documentation (e.g., letters of support or petitions from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators, etc.) Describe how the project improves accessibility to activity centers, town centers, office parks, post office, city hall/government buildings, shopping centers, employment centers, trail facilities, recreational and cultural facilities, schools and other points of concentrated activity.

Demand/Accessibility (Maximum 15 Points)

- Is there a documented obvious indication of demand?
- Is documentation of public support for the project provided?
- Does the project enhance mobility or community development for disadvantaged groups, including children, the elderly, the poor, those with limited transportation options and the disabled? Documentation that will help determine a score include school access routes, proximity to public housing or public facilities that can currently only be accessed by roadways.

Criterion (3) Describe how this project satisfies Demand and improves Accessibility: _____

(5) Project “Readiness” (Maximum 10 Points)

Describe.

Project Readiness (Maximum 10 Points)

- Is there an agreement and strategy for maintenance once the project is completed, identifying the responsible party?

- Project has been completed through design. Only construction dollars are being sought.
- Is right-of-way readily available and documented for the project?

Criterion (5) Description (if needed): _____

(6) Matching Funds (Maximum 10 Points)

Resolution 2014-## provides that the governmental entity requesting TALU funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratio of 80/20 (TALU/local). ~~Local matching funds equal to twenty percent (20%) of the total project cost are required.~~ That equates to a local match of 20% of total project cost when the project is funded with TALU and local funds only. A greater match will be viewed as an expression of the Applicant's dedication and commitment to the project. Therefore, points may be awarded in proportion to the amount of local match over ~~the required~~ 20% of the total project cost. Applicants and/or project sponsors should demonstrate the availability of the match for project. In lieu of a cash match, Applicant/project sponsor match may include other valuable services such as planning, engineering, design, construction or environmental activities approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation and right-of-way donations by private parties. Applicants must demonstrate the feasibility of such in-kind arrangements in their applications. Applicants must specify the amount, origin and availability of matching funds.

Check the appropriate box and describe.

Local Matching Funds > 20% of Total Project Cost Provided (Maximum 10 Points)

Check all that apply:

Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 20% of the estimated <u>total</u> project cost?	Check One	Max. Points
20.0% < local match < 22.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
22.5% ≤ local match < 25.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
25.0% ≤ local match < 27.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
27.5% ≤ local match < 30.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
30.0% ≤ local match < 32.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
32.5% ≤ local match < 35.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
35.0% ≤ local match < 37.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	7
37.5% ≤ local match < 40.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
40.0% ≤ local match < 42.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	9
42.5% ≤ local match	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
<u>Maximum Point Assessment</u>		<u>10</u>

Criterion (6) Description (if needed): _____



**THIS FORM SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR ALL PROJECTS
NOT CURRENTLY IN THE FDOT WORK PROGRAM.
FDOT PROJECT INFORMATION APPLICATION FORM**

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):

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Study | <input type="checkbox"/> PD&E | <input type="checkbox"/> Design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

Work Type	Requested Fiscal Year (July 1-June 30)
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	
Design	
Right-of-way Acquisition	
Construction/CEI	
Other	

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)? No. If necessary, the City will work with the River to Sea TPO to include this project in the 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? Yes- Certification in 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).

Provide an estimate of the total cost of the project phase(s) and attach supporting documents that supports the requested phase estimate (i.e. man-hour estimate and rates, equipment cost and right of way cost).

Work Type	Phase Complete? Yes/No/NA	Responsible Agency (Who performed or who will perform the work?)	Procurement Method? In-house/Advertise	Project Cost Estimate
Planning Development (Corridor or Feasibility Study)	-		-	\$
Project Development and Environment Study (PD&E)	-		-	\$
Design	-		-	\$
Right-of-way Acquisition	-		-	\$
Construction	-		-	\$
CEI	-		-	\$
Other:	-		-	\$
Total Project Cost Estimate:	\$0			

- **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

EXHIBIT “A”

Preliminary Scope & Study Schedule - Phase 18 (Planning)

FPN (If Known): **FAN:** TBD

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)

FPN (If Known): **FAN:**

Name of Project:

Local Agency Contact (Project Manager):

Phone: **Email Address:**

Project Scope/Description, Termini, Project Length:

Procurement Method:

☐ Advertisement

Fee Estimate: (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):

FAN:

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:

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:

CEI Procurement Method:

- ☐ In-House
☐ Advertisement

CEI Estimate (LAP Projects Only) (Attach supporting man-hours and rates)

Const Estimate (LAP Projects Only): (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:

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

IV. ACTION ITEMS

C. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## AMENDING THE FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

This proposed TIP amendment addresses two projects:

1. 4347121 – US 92 Daytona Beach Airport SIS Connector Signal Improvements. FDOT is requesting the TPO to extend the project limits and increase the project budget. The current limits are SR 5A (Nova Road) to SR 5 (US 1). The new limits will be SR 5A (Nova Road) to east of Beach Street. Total project cost will increase from \$1,055,223 to \$2,082,492 due to adding signals and upgrading signal control equipment cabinets.
2. 4355911 – SR 421 (Dunlawton Avenue) Pedestrian Walk Lights Phase 1. FDOT is requesting the TPO to remove this project from TIP until the City of Port Orange can provide plans. The construction phase is currently programmed in FY 2015/16.

The proposed amendment is more fully described in the enclosed Resolutions 2014-## and Attachment "A".

ACTION REQUESTED:

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2014-## AMENDING THE FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION 2014-##

RESOLUTION OF THE RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AMENDING THE FY 2014/15 TO FY 2018/19 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

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 designated urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, 23 CFR 450.310, and Florida Statutes 339.175, 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, 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 requested the River to Sea TPO to amend the TIP as prescribed herein; and

WHEREAS, the River to Sea TPO has determined that it is in the public's interest to amend the adopted TIP to accommodate the requested amendments and to maintain consistency with FDOT's Five-Year Work Program;

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

1. River to Sea TPO's FY 2014/15 - FY 2018/19 TIP is hereby amended as described below and more particularly indicated in "Attachment A":
 - a) extend the limits and increase the project budget for FM# 4347121, US 92 Daytona Beach Airport SIS Connector Signal Improvements; and to
 - b) delete FM# 4355911, SR 421 (Dunlawton Avenue) Pedestrian Walk Lights Phase 1; and
2. The Chairperson of the River to Sea TPO (or her designee) is hereby authorized and

directed to submit the FY 2014/15 to FY 2018/19 TIP as amended to the:

- a) Florida Department of Transportation;
- b) Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (through the Florida Department of Transportation); and the
- 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 26th day of November 2014.

RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

VOLUSIA COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBER PATRICIA NORTHEY
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 November 26, 2014.

ATTEST:

PAMELA C. BLANKENSHIP, RECORDING SECRETARY
RIVER TO SEA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

ATTACHMENT “A”

Resolution 2014-##

Amending the

FY 2014/15 to FY 2018/19

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

November 26, 2014



{Strike through indicates deletion; underline indicates addition.}

FM # 4347121 - US 92 Daytona Beach Airport SIS Connector Signal Improvements

From: W. of Tomoka Farms Rd

To: ~~SR 5 (US 1)~~ East of Beach St

Work Mix: TRAFFIC OPS IMPROVEMENT

County: Volusia

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>FY 2014/15</u>	<u>FY 2015/16</u>	<u>FY 2016/17</u>	<u>FY 2017/18</u>	<u>FY 2018/19</u>	<u>Total</u>
CST (52)	ACNP	-933,000	0	0	0	0	-933,000
CEI (61)	ACNP	-122,223	0	0	0	0	-122,223
<u>PE (31)</u>	<u>DIH</u>	<u>19,887</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19,887</u>
<u>PE (39)</u>	<u>DIOH</u>	<u>6,171</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6,171</u>
<u>CST (52)</u>	<u>ACNP</u>	<u>1,856,811</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,856,811</u>
<u>CST (59)</u>	<u>DIOH</u>	<u>59,975</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>59,975</u>
<u>CEI (61)</u>	<u>ACNP</u>	<u>125,568</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>125,568</u>
<u>CEI (62)</u>	<u>ACNP</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,000</u>
<u>CEI (69)</u>	<u>DIOH</u>	<u>9,868</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9,868</u>
		<u>-1,055,223</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-1,055,223</u>
		<u>2,083,280</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,083,280</u>

Description: Upgrade approximately 20 existing signal cabinets to allow for adaptive signal control, including additional detection required by the system and any hardware/software design under continuing services contract. Project length: 5.3 miles. (Reference 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, Table 8.2, pg 122.)

Upgrade 22 existing signal cabinets to allow for adaptive signal control, including additional detection required by the system and any hardware/software design under continuing services contract. Project length: 5.346 miles. (Reference 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, Table 8.2, pg 122.)

Comment: *Extend the project limits and increase the project budget.*

{Strike through indicates deletion; underline indicates addition.}

~~FM # 4355911 - SR 421 (Dunlawton Avenue) Pedestrian Walk Lights Phase 1~~

~~From:~~ SR 5 (Ridgewood Avenue)

~~To:~~ Summer Trees Road

~~Work Mix:~~ LIGHTING

~~County:~~ Volusia

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>FY 2014/15</u>	<u>FY 2015/16</u>	<u>FY 2016/17</u>	<u>FY 2017/18</u>	<u>FY 2018/19</u>	<u>Total</u>
CST (58)	XU (SU)	-0	-576,314	-0	-0	-0	-576,314
CST (58)	LF	-0	-64,035	-0	-0	-0	-64,035
CEI (61)	XU (SU)	-0	-3,202	-0	-0	-0	-3,202
CEI (68)	XU (SU)	-0	-40,342	-0	-0	-0	-40,342
CEI (68)	LF	-0	-4,482	-0	-0	-0	-4,482
		<u>-0</u>	<u>-688,375</u>	<u>-0</u>	<u>-0</u>	<u>-0</u>	<u>-688,375</u>

Description: LAP agreement with the City of Port Orange to install pedestrian walk lights for safety along SR 421 between SR 5 (Ridgewood Avenue) and Summer Trees Road. (Reference 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, pgs 63-73.)

Comment: Delete project.



Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

719 South Woodland Boulevard
DeLand, Florida 32720

ANANTH PRASAD, P.E.
SECRETARY

November 5, 2014

Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization
2570 West International Speedway Boulevard, Suite 100
Daytona Beach, FL 32114-8145

RE: Request for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

Dear Ms. Bollenback:

The Florida Department of Transportation requests the following amendment be made to the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization's Adopted 2015 – 2019 TIP.

1. **ADD-Project FM#434712-1**
US 92 DAYTONA BEACH AIRPORT SIS CONNECT FROM W OF TOMOKA FARMS TO E OF BEACH ST– This Traffic Improvement Project will upgrade 22 existing signal cabinets to allow for adaptive signal control and hardware/software installation.

<u>Award Year</u>	<u>Phase</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2015	31	DIH	\$19,887
2015	52	ACNP	\$1,856,811
2015	61	ACNP	\$125,568

Project is being modified to facilitate intersection safety in the tourist corridor. If you have any questions about this proposed change, please contact Claudia Calzaretta 386-943-5089.

Sincerely,

Frank J. O'Dea, P.E.
Director of Transportation Development
District Five

FJO:cc:n

cc: Susan Sadighi, Intermodal Systems Development Manager
Mary Schoelzel, Government Operations Manager
Claudia Calzaretta, FDOT Liaison
Gene Ferguson, FDOT Liaison

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC INTERMODAL SYSTEMS (SIS) PROJECTS

Background Information:

There is a significant amount of transportation infrastructure activity currently underway within the River to Sea TPO metropolitan planning area. I-4 and I-95 are both under construction to add lanes that will expand segments of these facilities from 4 to 6 lanes. Construction projects are programmed in the current year to add an interchange on I-95 at Matanzas Woods and to completely rebuild the systems interchange at I-95, I-4 and US 92. In addition, the I-4 Ultimate Project, including the addition of the managed-use toll lanes PD&E, is progressing.

Mr. Frank O'Dea, Director of Transportation Development for FDOT, will provide an overview of these projects as well as other activities currently being undertaken by FDOT.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE COMMITTEE

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON FHWA ORDER 5020.2 AND FHWA/FDOT COORDINATED PROCESS FOR LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAM (LAP) CONTRACT AWARD ADJUSTMENT (TCC ONLY)

Background Information:

FHWA recently released Order 5020.2 – Stewardship and Oversight of Federal-Aid Projects Administered by Local Public Agencies (LPAs.) This order implements a two-phased approach to assessing a state transportation agency's (STA's) stewardship and oversight of LPA-administered federal-aid projects which may result in significant changes to the way cities and counties manage federal-aid transportation projects under FDOT's Local Agency Program (LAP.) Summary information is attached and the full order can be viewed at:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pgc/results.cfm?id=5437>

TPO staff will lead a discussion regarding changes pertaining to the **LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAM (LAP) CONTRACT AWARD ADJUSTMENT**. Deobligation of federal funds to match the contract award must be requested within 90 days after award, so the federal funds can be released and used on other projects. The state is required to maintain a process to adjust project cost estimates.

Specifically, the state shall revise the federal funds obligated within 90 days after it has determined that the estimated federal share of project costs has decreased by certain thresholds. In an effort to provide more flexibility, FDOT Central Office, in coordination with FHWA, has developed an amended process for contract award adjustments (see attached).

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Excerpt from FHWA Order 5020.2 – Stewardship and Oversight of Federal-Aid Projects Administered by Local Public Agencies

On August 14, 2014 FHWA released FHWA Order 5020.2 – Stewardship and Oversight of Federal-Aid Projects Administered by Local Public Agencies (LPAs.) The 46-page Order's Purpose is to:

- Define the role of the State transportation agency (STA),
- Establish a uniform method for assessing risk in the STA's stewardship and oversight of LPA administered projects, and
- Establish a uniform method for ensuring compliance with Federal requirements on these projects.

The Order outlines official internal policy and procedures relative to the STA's stewardship and oversight (S&O) of LPA-administered Federal-aid projects. The intended outcome of this Order is:

- Improved program integrity and compliance, and
- Effective oversight by the STAs' on their LPA-administered Federal-aid projects.

FHWA has noted that they have not sufficiently addressed the issue of LPA administered projects from the Corporate (National) level. Programmatic weaknesses continue as identified in reports published in 2007, 2011, and 2014.

This Order implements a two-phased approach to assessing a STA's stewardship and oversight of LPA-administered Federal-aid projects.

Phase 1, Program Assessment, is to be conducted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015. In Phase 1, FHWA, through the division offices, will assess programs to:

- Assess the effectiveness of the STAs' stewardship and oversight of LPA-administered projects,
- Document their state-of-the-practice,
- Determine their degree of compliance at the program level
- Determine if the STA's established LPA policy and procedural guidance are adequate and are being followed, as well as
- Determine the overall risk of the STA's S&O of their LPA program.

After completion of the Program Assessment Division offices will work with the STAs to develop and implement necessary Plans of Corrective Actions (PCAs). Division offices are to submit Program Assessment results to the Office of Program Administration's Stewardship and Oversight Team (HIPA-40) by January 31, 2015.

Once the program assessment phase is complete, the next effort will be to determine the overall level of compliance at the project level. Phase 2, Project Compliance Determination is to be conducted in FY 2016. This phase will include completing Compliance Assessment Program (CAP) reviews based on a corporate review guide for LPA-administered Federal-aid projects. This effort will supplement other division office LPA oversight activities that are conducted through:

- CAP core and technical reviews,
- Projects of Division Interest (PoDI) reviews, and
- Conventional program/process reviews.

Collectively, these reviews will enable the division office to:

- Provide reasonable, statistically based assurance that Federal-aid requirements are being met, and
- Determine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in LPA program administration and oversight.

The Program Assessment and Compliance Determination will be on a 3-year cycle. The third year will give division offices with Plans of Corrective Action (PCAs) additional time to address identified compliance concerns from Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 before the next round of the assessment cycle. For this cycle, corrective action plans will be released to STAs by FY 2017.

Amended Process for Contract Award Adjustment - FDOT

Part IV, Chapter 6, Section D Work Program: Federal projects must be modified to match the contract award amount. Obligation of additional federal funds to match the contract award must be approved by FHWA prior to the award of the contract. Deobligation of federal funds to match the contract award must be requested within 90 days after award, so the federal funds can be released and used on other projects.

23 CFR 630.106(a)(4) The State shall maintain a process to adjust project cost estimates. For example, the process would require a review of the project cost estimate when the bid is approved, a project phase is completed, a design change is approved, etc. Specifically, the State shall revise the Federal funds obligated within 90 days after it has determined that the estimated Federal share of project costs has decreased by \$250,000 or more.

In an effort to provide more flexibility, Central Office, in coordination with FHWA, has developed an amended process for contract award adjustments:

1. Action is required if the difference of the LAP Agreement amount and the Local Agency contract award amount is greater than or equal to \$250,000 (**23 CFR 630.106**).

Example: LAP Agreement = \$1 million
 Agency Contract Amount = \$700,000
 Difference = \$300,000

A Supplemental Agreement (SA) will be drafted and executed to adjust the LAP Agreement amount to match the Local Agency contract award amount.

2. No action is required if the difference between the LAP Agreement amount and the Local Agency contract award amount is less than 10% and less than \$250,000.

Example: LAP Agreement = \$1 million
 Agency Contract Amount = \$950,000
 10% Threshold amount = \$95,000
 Difference = \$50,000

Supplemental Agreement is not required.

3. Action is required if the difference between the LAP Agreement and the Local Agency contract award amount is greater than 10% and less than \$250,000.

Example: LAP Agreement = \$1 million
 Agency Contract Amount = \$800,000
 10% Threshold amount = \$80,000
 Difference = \$200,000

The District may adjust the federal obligation to match the Local Agency contract award amount or adjust the original obligation to an amount not to exceed 10% of the contract award amount.

In all cases where “excess” funds remain:

- a. The funds remaining on the contract may be utilized for changes as approved by FDOT staff.
- b. ***If an Agency authorizes or performs a change of work prior to receiving District LAP Administrator concurrence, the change will not be eligible for reimbursement. The agency will incur the entire cost of the changes per Chapter 22 of the LAP Manual.***
- c. Premium costs as defined by federal rule are not eligible for reimbursement.
- d. Any remaining funds will be released once the contract is closed.

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

C. PRESENTATION ON THE 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) FINANCIAL RESOURCES PLAN

Background Information:

Ghyabi & Associates will be presenting an overview of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan *Financial Resources Plan*. This plan, when complete, will identify existing available transportation funding sources, along with potential revenue sources, projected throughout the period of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE COMMITTEE

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. FDOT REPORT

Background Information:

Mr. Gene Ferguson, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), will be present to answer questions regarding projects on the FDOT Construction Status Report and the Push-Button Report.

The Construction Status Report and the Push-Button Report will be provided under separate cover.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE COMMITTEE

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

V. PRESENTATIONS, STATUS REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

E. VOLUSIA AND FLAGLER COUNTY CONSTRUCTION REPORTS

Background Information:

Staff from Volusia County Traffic Engineering and Flagler County Traffic Engineering will present an update on the county projects that are either under construction or close to being ready for construction. The Volusia County Construction Report and Flagler County Construction Reports are included for your information.

ACTION REQUESTED:

NO ACTION REQUIRED UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Volusia County Construction Report – OCTOBER 2014

Recently Completed:

- 1) LPGA Blvd. (Old Kings Rd. to Nova Rd.)
- 2) E.C.F. Regional Rail Trail Section 1 & 2 - (Providence Blvd. to SR 415)
- 3) Garfield Ave. & New Hampshire Ave. Sidewalks (DeLand)
- 4) Spring to Spring Trail - Segment 2B: Dirksen Dr. (Mansion Dr. to Deltona Bl.)
- 5) North Boston Ave. and Lindley Blvd. Sidewalks
- 6) Tymber Creek Rd (from SR 40 to Peruvian Way)
- 7) Saxon Blvd. Medians/ six-laning (Enterprise Rd. to I-4)
- 8) Calle Grande Sidewalk (from Nova Rd./Golf Ave. to W. of US1)

Under Construction or Advertised for Construction:

- 1) Rail Trail Bridge over SR 415 – Construction underway
- 2) Rail Trail Bridge over SR 442 – Construction underway
- 3) ECRRT - Segment 3 (SR 415 to Guise Rd.) w/Trail Head at SR 415. – under construction
- 4) ECRRT - Segment 6 (Cow Creek to Dale St.) – under construction
- 5) S. Williamson Blvd. Ext. (Pioneer Tr. to Airport Rd.) – Construction Pending
- 6) Spring to Spring Trail (Blue Springs Park to Detroit Terrace) – Construction Underway
- 7) Howland Blvd. (Courtland Bl. to SR 415) – Awarded 11/06/14
- 8) Dunn Ave. (Bill France Bl. - Clyde Morris B.) Paved shoulders – Pending Award

Near Construction Projects:

- 1) Tenth St. (Myrtle to US 1) – Waiting for Railroad approvals.
- 2) Pioneer Trail Curve Realignment at Turnbull Bay Rd. – Const. funds FY 2014/2015
- 3) Atlantic Ave. Sidewalk (Major Ave. to Marcelle Ave.) – Const. funds FY 2013/2014
- 4) Spring to Spring Trail - Grand Ave. (Lemon St. to King St.) – Const funds FY 2015/2016
- 5) LPGA Blvd. (Jimmy Ann Dr. to Derbyshire) – Const. funds FY 2014/2015

Design Projects:

- 1) Veterans Memorial Bridge (Orange Ave.) – Construction LAP funded in FY 2014/2015.
- 2) Turnbull Bay Bridge – The Construction LAP funded in FY 2014/2015. In ROW acquisition phase.
- 3) Beville Road/Airport Business Park (Pelican Bay) - Intersection improvement with Mast Arm signal.
- 4) ECRRT – Segment 4A (Guise Rd. to Gobblers Lodge) - ROW LAP funded 2013/14, Const. 2018/19
- 5) ECRRT – Segment 4B (Gobblers Lodge to Maytown Spur) – Const. funded 2014/15
- 6) Spring to Spring - Segment 3A (SunRail Station to Detroit Terrace) – In the Study phase.
- 7) Orange Camp Rd. (MLK Blvd. to I-4) – In design. Construction funded in FY 2014/2015
- 8) SR 44 & Kepler Road intersection improvements - In design. Const. funded in FY 2015/2016
- 9) Doyle Rd. (Courtland Bl. to SR 415) – Paved shoulders – In design. Const. funded FY 2014/15
- 10) ECRRT (Brevard County Line to Cow Creek Rd.) – Design FY 2014/2015. Const. FY 2014/2015
- 11) Plymouth Ave. Sidewalk (from E. of Hazen Rd. to W. of SR 15A) – needs ROW
- 12) Old New York Sidewalk (from Shell Rd. to SR 44) – needs ROW

Note: Dates are subject to change due to normal project development issues.

Please see Volusia County's road program at <http://www.volusia.org/publicworks/> for more information.

Flagler County Construction Report- OCTOBER 2014

Recently Completed:

1. Matanzas Woods Parkway Sidewalk (US1 to Bird of Paradise)
2. SR 100 Sidewalk (Belle Terre to Bunnell City Limits)
3. SR 100 Sidewalk (Bulldog to Roberts Road) Phase 2 & 3
4. Old Kings Sidewalk (SR100 to Old Kings Elementary)
5. CR 305 Bridge Replacement, Bridge No. 734082
6. Turn Lanes at Old Kings Elementary
7. Bulldog Drive and SR 100 Intersection (COPC)
8. SR 5/ US 1 Sidewalk, E. Woodland Street to Royal Palms Parkway

Under Construction or Advertised for Construction:

1. CR 305 Bridge Replacement, Bridge No. 734086
2. CR 305 Box Culvert Replacements
3. SR 100 Landscaping (SR-5/US 1 to Belle Terre Parkway)
4. Palm Coast Parkway (Boulder Rock Dr.. to Florida Park Dr.)- Construction underway (COPC)
5. Royal Palms Parkway Shoulder- Construction contract awarded. Construction begins in Winter 2014. (COPC)
6. Colechester Drive Bridge Rehabilitation- Construction begins is FY2014/15 (COPC)
7. Bunnell Elementary Trails- Sidewalks around Bunnell Elementary school and connection to Trailhead improvements at Joann B. King Park
8. John Anderson Widening and Resurfacing

Near Construction Projects:

1. Roberts Road Sidewalk
2. Palm Harbor Parkway Extension- Waiting for Environmental Permits. Construction funded FY 2014/15. (COPC)
3. Seminole Woods Parkway Multi-Use Path Phase 2 & 3 – Construction funded FY 2014/15. (COPC)
4. Matanzas Woods Parkway Interchange at Interstate 95

Design Projects:

1. CR 13 Widening and Resurfacing from CR205 to US 1
2. CR 302 Resurfacing from CR 305 to SR 100
3. CR 2009 Widening and Resurfacing From Lake Disston to CR 305
4. CR 205 Widening and Resurfacing from SR 100 to CR 13
5. CR 305 Widening and Resurfacing from Bridge No. 734008 to Bridge No. 734006

6. Old Kings Rd South Widening and Resurfacing from SR 100 to Volusia County Line
7. SR A1A- Island Estates Median Improvements
8. Varn Park Improvements
9. SR A1A Landscaping at Matanzas Shores HOA (Island Estates to St. Johns County Line)
10. New Road Extension for Old Kings Road from Forest Grove to Old Kings Road
11. Old Kings Rd. Widening to 4 Lanes, Palm Coast Parkway to Forest Grove Drive- Under Design. ROW funding in FY 2014/15. (COPC)

**MEETING SUMMARY
CAC & TCC
NOVEMBER 18, 2014**

VI. STAFF COMMENTS

→ Discussion of VCOG Closure/Office Space

VII. CAC/TCC MEMBER COMMENTS

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- SunRail Feeder Route Changes
- River to Sea TPO Meeting Summary
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Project Application

IX. ADJOURNMENT

******The next meetings of the CAC & TCC will be on January 20, 2015******

Votran feeder route changes effective December 1, 2014



Effective December 1, 2014 Votran will implement changes to SunRail feeder bus routes 30 and 31. The changes will maintain the same service area along the U.S. 17-92 corridor, but bus frequency will be improved. On December 1 routes 30 and 31 will be combined to create one route known as Route 31. The new Route 31 will travel between the International Speedway/Amelia superstop and the DeBary SunRail station with key stops at the DeLand Intermodal Transit Facility (ITF), the Veteran's Administration Clinic in Orange City and all other established Votran stops as necessary. Bus frequency will be improved from one-hour frequency to 30-minute frequency during peak travel times in the a.m. and p.m., but service no longer will be considered "express bus" service. There will continue to be no bus service to or from the DeBary SunRail station during midday, off-peak hours.

For more information contact Votran at 386-943-7033 or visit us on the web at votran.org.

WEEKDAY SERVICE FROM INTERNATIONAL SPEEDWAY/AMELIA TO DEBARY SUNRAIL STATION SOUTHBOUND

A.M. TRIPS

INT'L SPEEDWAY/ AMELIA	DELAND ITF	WOODLAND McGREGG	VOLUSIA GRAVES	V.A. CLINIC	CHARLES BEALLE/ HIGHBANKS	DEBARY SUNRAIL STATION	TRAIN DEPARTS STATION
4 :22	4 :34	4 :44	4 :52	5 :00	5 :06	5 :15	5 :30
4 :52	5 :04	5 :14	5 :22	5 :30	5 :36	5 :45	6 :00
5 :22	5 :34	5 :44	5 :52	6 :00	6 :06	6 :15	6 :30
5 :52	6 :04	6 :14	6 :22	6 :30	6 :36	6 :45 (E)	7 :00
6 :22	6 :34	6 :44	6 :52	7 :00	7 :06	7 :15	7 :30
6 :52	7 :04	7 :14	7 :22	7 :30	7 :36	7 :45	8 :00

P.M. TRIPS

3 :22	3 :34	3 :44	3 :52	4 :00	4 :06	4 :15	4 :30
3 :52	4 :04	4 :14	4 :22	4 :30	4 :36	4 :45	5 :00
4 :22	4 :34	4 :44	4 :52	5 :00	5 :06	5 :15	5 :30
4 :55	5 :10	5 :19	5 :26	5 :33	5 :37	5 :45	6 :00
5 :22	5 :34	5 :44	5 :52	6 :00	6 :06	6 :15	-- --
-- --	-- --	-- --	6 :36	6 :44	6 :47	6 :52	-- --
-- --	-- --	-- --	7 :06	7 :14	7 :17	7 :22	-- --
-- --	-- --	-- --	7 :36	7 :44	7 :47	7 :52	-- --

WEEKDAY SERVICE FROM DEBARY SUNRAIL STATION TO INTERNATIONAL SPEEDWAY/AMELIA NORTHBOUND

A.M. TRIPS

DEBARY SUNRAIL STATION	CHARLES BEALLE/ HIGHBANKS	V.A. CLINIC	VOLUSIA GRAVES	WOODLAND ORANGE CAMP	DELAND ITF	INT'L SPEEDWAY/ AMELIA	TRAIN ARRIVES STATION
5 :15	5 :20	5 :23	5 :31	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
5 :45	5 :50	5 :53	6 :01	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
6 :15	6 :20	6 :23	6 :31	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
7 :20	7 :26	7 :30	7 :36	7 :41	7 :48	8 :00 (E)	7 :18
7 :55	8 :04	8 :10	8 :18	8 :26	8 :36	8 :48 (E)	7 :48

P.M. TRIPS

-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
4 :45	4 :50	4 :53	5 :01	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
5 :25	5 :34	5 :40	5 :48	5 :56	6 :06	6 :18	5 :18
5 :55	6 :04	6 :10	6 :18	6 :26	6 :36	6 :48	5 :48
6 :25	6 :34	6 :40	6 :48	6 :56	7 :06	7 :18	6 :18
6 :55	7 :04	7 :10	7 :18	7 :26	7 :36	7 :48 (E)	6 :48
7 :25	7 :34	7 :40	7 :48	7 :56	8 :06	8 :18 (E)	7 :18
7 :55	8 :04	8 :10	8 :18	8 :26	8 :36	8 :48 (E)	7 :48

Votran feeder route changes effective December 1, 2014



SunRail is Central Florida's brand new commuter train.

WEEKDAY SERVICE

Rush Hour
EVERY 30 MINUTES

Midday
EVERY 2 HOURS

FREE TRANSFERS

- Ride Votran to SunRail. Get SunRail pass from bus driver.
- Swipe pass at any SunRail ticket vending machine.
- Your SunRail base fare is free!

SUNRAIL FARES

\$2.00 + **\$1.00**
BASE FARE EACH ADD'L ZONE

SUNRAIL.COM

855.RAIL.411

- DeBary
- Sanford
- Lake Mary
- Longwood
- Altamonte Springs
- Maitland
- Winter Park
- Florida Hospital Health Village
- LYNX Central
- Church Street
- Orlando Health/Amtrak
- Sand Lake Road

SCHEMATIC MAP
NOT TO SCALE



**River to Sea TPO Board
October 22, 2014
Meeting Summary**

- Approved the Consent Agenda including the September 24, 2014 TPO Board minutes and Resolution 2014-34 accepting the FY 2013/14 River to Sea TPO Audit Report
- Approved Resolution 2014-35 amending the FY 2014/15 – 2018/19 Transportation Improvement Program
- Approved the 2015 River to Sea TPO Legislative Priorities
- Approved planning studies request to direct FDOT to allocate \$160,330 from the Bicycle/Pedestrian box to a pedestrian safety and mobility study on SR A1A and \$75,031 from the Traffic Ops/ITS/Safety box to an intersection study on Belle Terre Parkway
- Received member request to consider placing the SR 100 planning study high on the next fiscal year's priority list
- Received PowerPoint presentation on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) alternative land use forecast activities underway and requested collaboration with FDOT and the cities regarding the studies currently underway
- Received presentation on recommended priority process program changes under review by the TIP Subcommittee
- Received presentation on roundabouts
- Received FDOT report noting there are no project updates to report
- Received the Executive Director's report on the Coast to Coast Summit
- Discussed making the Edgewater/New Smyrna Beach connector as an entrance point to the Coast to Coast Connector Trail
- Received Executive Director report providing an update on the budget impact of VCOG closing and a request for monthly updates on the situation
- Received Executive Director report including a PowerPoint presentation on SunRail

The next River to Sea TPO Board meeting will be on Wednesday, November 26, 2014



2014 2015 Application for Project Prioritization ~~XU~~ Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

January 20142015

General Instructions:

For the 2014 2015 Call for Projects, the ~~VTPO~~ R2CTPO is accepting applications for Feasibility Studies and Project Implementation.

The ~~VTPO~~ R2CTPO has two different application forms for ~~XU~~ Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects. One is to be used when applying for a Feasibility Study; the other is to be used when applying for Project Implementation. When applying for Project Implementation, the applicant 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 ~~VTPO~~ 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.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

Initial Project Screening:

Any project submitted by a local government for consideration needs to meet the following screening criteria:

For any proposed facility to be considered eligible through the TPO process, the project must be included on the ~~Volusia TPO's~~ 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.

Award Limits:

No more than \$1.5 million in ~~XU~~ SU funds will be awarded to any single project in any single application cycle, and no more than \$3 million in ~~XU~~ SU funds will be awarded over multiple years toward the completion of any single project. Waivers/exceptions may be granted by the ~~VTP~~ R2CTPO Board. Other funds (in addition to SU funds) may be used to fund project phases or overall costs above these limits.

Funding Local Match Requirements:

~~VTP~~ R2CTPO Resolution ~~2013-09 2015-##~~ requires a local match of ten percent (10%) of the total amount of XU funds programmed for each project provides that the governmental entity requesting SU funds shall be required to match those funds programmed on the project with local funds at the ratios of 90/10 (SU/local). The local 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 ~~For this purpose,~~ local match is defined as non-federal cash match and/or in-kind services that advance the project. ~~The local match for feasibility studies can only be satisfied with a non-federal cash match.~~ This resolution also reaffirms the ~~VTP's~~ R2CTPO's policy that the applicant (project originator) shall be responsible for any cost overruns encountered on a project funded with ~~XU~~ SU funds unless the project is on the state highway system, in which case, the State DOT shall be responsible for any cost overruns. Projects whose sponsors are willing and able to provide a local match **greater than 10%** 90/10 (SU/local) will be awarded additional points.

Other Funding Requirements:

Project applications submitted for bicycle/pedestrian funds that contain more than a strictly bicycle/pedestrian component (i.e. roadway improvements, bridge replacements, etc.) may be funded in part with ~~XU~~ SU funds. The limitations are as follows: a maximum of 10% of the total project cost may be funded with bicycle/pedestrian ~~XU~~ SU funds, but that amount MAY NOT exceed 10% of the total annual allotment of bicycle/pedestrian ~~XU~~ SU funds. These projects will be ranked separately and only the top two (2) projects will be recommended for funding in a given year. All project applications are subject to approval by the ~~Volusia~~ R2CTPO Board.

Project Application 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 may be submitted through our FTP site, as an attachment to email, on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive.
3. The application and all supporting documentation shall be included in one electronic PDF file.
4. All document pages shall be oriented so that the top of the page is always at the top of the computer monitor.
5. Page size shall be either 8-1/2" by 11" (letter) or 11" by 17" (tabloid).
6. PDF documents produced by scanning paper documents are inherently inferior to those produced directly from an electronic source. Documents which are only available in paper format should be scanned at a resolution which ensures the pages are legible on both a computer screen and a printed page. We recommend scanning at 300 dpi to balance legibility and file size. If you are unable to produce an electronic document as prescribed here, please call us to discuss other options.
7. In addition to the digital submittal, we require one (1) complete paper copy of the application and all supporting documents. This must be identical to the digital submittal.

8. Submit any available right-of-way information.
9. **Each application MUST include a Project Map** that clearly identifies the termini of the project, Proximity to Community Assets and Network Connectivity through the use of a one (1) mile radius buffer for Shared Use Path projects and a one-half (½) mile radius buffer for Sidewalk projects. Maximum map size is 11" x 17".
10. In addition, all maps MUST include a **Scale** (in subdivisions of a mile), **North Arrow**, **Title** and **Legend**. Photographs are optional.

~~VTPO~~ R2CTPO staff will provide assistance in completing an application to any member local government that requests it.



2014 2015 Application for Project Prioritization – FEASIBILITY STUDY

XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (project sponsor): _____ **Date:** _____

Contact Person: _____ **Job Title:** _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **FAX:** _____

E-mail: _____

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

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

Priority of this proposed project relative to other applications submitted by the Applicant: _____

Project Description: _____

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

Project Eligibility for XU SUFunds (check the appropriate box):

- ☐ the proposed improvement is located on the Federal-aid system;
- ☐ 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.

Commentary: _____



2014 2015 Application for Project Prioritization – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Project Title: _____

Applicant (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:

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

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

This measure will estimate the potential demand of bicyclists and pedestrians based on the number of productions or attractions the facility may serve within a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Paths or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalks. A maximum of 30 points will be assessed overall, and individual point assignments will be limited as listed below.

List and describe how the facilities link directly to community assets and who is being served by the facility. Show each of the Community Assets on a Project Area Map through the use of a buffer: a one (1) mile radius for Shared Use Path projects or a one-half (½) mile radius for Sidewalk projects.

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

School bus stop	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Maximum Point Assessment		30

Criterion #1 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #2 – Connectivity (30 points max.)

This measure considers the gaps that exist in the current network of bike lanes, bike paths and sidewalks. The measurement will assess points based on the ability of the proposed project to join disconnected networks or complete fragmented facilities.

List and describe how this project fits into the local and regional bicycle/pedestrian networks and/or a transit facility. Depict this on the map and describe in the document.

Network Connectivity	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Project provides access to a transit facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Project extends an existing bicycle/pedestrian facility (at one end of the facility)	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Project provides a connection between two existing or planned/programmed bicycle/pedestrian facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Project has been identified as “needed” in an adopted document (e.g., comprehensive plan, master plan, arterial study)	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		30

Criterion #2 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #3 – Safety (25 points max.)

This measure provides additional weight to applications that have included safety as a component of the overall project and includes school locations identified as hazardous walking/biking zones and areas with significant numbers of safety concerns.

List and describe whether the proposed facility is located within a “hazardous walk/bike zone” in the ~~Volusia~~ **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.

Safety	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia or Flagler County School District Student Transportation Services and within the Volusia River to Sea TPO planning area. If applicable, provide documentation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	15
The project removes or reduces potential conflicts (bike/auto and ped/auto). There is a pattern of bike/ped crashes along the project route. If applicable, provide documentation such as photos or video of current situation/site or any supportive statistics or studies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		25

Criterion #3 Description (if needed): _____

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

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

Describe whether the proposed facility has public support and provide documentation (e.g., letters of support/signed petitions/public comments from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators). Describe any special issues or concerns that are not being addressed by the other criteria.

Special Considerations	Check All that Apply	Max. Points
Is documented public support provided for the project? Are there any special issues or concerns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Maximum Point Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	5

Criterion #4 Description (if needed): _____

Criterion #5 – Local Matching Funds > 10% of Total Project Cost (10 points max.)

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

Local Matching Funds > 10%	Check One	Max. Points
Is a local matching fund package greater than 10% of the estimated project cost documented for the project? <u>Is the Applicant committing to a local match greater than 10% of the estimated total project cost?</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
10.0% < Local Matching Funds < 12.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
12.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 15.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
15.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 17.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
17.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 20.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
20.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 22.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
22.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 25.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
25.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 27.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	7
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	9
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		10

Criterion #5 Description (if needed): _____

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

Projects with equal scores after evaluations using the five Project Proposal Criteria are subject to the Value-Added Tie Breaker. The BPAC and Project Review Subcommittee are authorized to award tie breaker points based on the additional value added by the project. A written explanation of the circumstances and amount of tie breaker points awarded for each project will be provided.

~~Volusia~~ River to Sea TPO
~~2014~~ 2015 Priority Process for
~~XU~~ Bicycle/Pedestrian 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