



MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

Please be advised that the Volusia Transportation Planning Organization (VTPO) **BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE** will be meeting on:

DATE: Thursday, January 6, 2011

TIME: 3:00 PM

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

Agenda

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call/Determination of Quorum
- II. Action Items
 - A. Review and Recommend Approval to Set Aside XU Funding for Corridor Studies
 - B. Review and Recommend Approval of the Revised Project Prioritization Process
 - C. Review and Recommend Approval to Expand the Range of Eligible Project Types
 - D. Review and Recommend Approval to Revise Local Matching Fund Requirements for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
 - E. Review and Recommend Approval of Policy Preserving Top-Ranked Projects
 - F. Review and Recommend Approval of the 2011 Priority Application for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
 - G. Review and Recommend Approval of the 2011 List of Prioritized XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
- III. Staff Comments
- IV. Subcommittee Member Comments
- V. Press/Citizen Comments
- VI. Adjournment

BPAC Project Review Subcommittee Members:

Mike Chuven
A.J. Devies
Tina Skipper
Roy Walters
Susanne Wilde

cc: Joan Carter (FDOT)
Steve Friedel (FDOT)
Mary Schoelzel (FDOT)
TPO staff
Press

Note: Individuals covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in need of accommodations for this public meeting should contact the Volusia TPO office, 2570 W. International Speedway Blvd., Daytona Beach, Florida 32114-8145, (386) 226-0422, extension 21 at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

A) Review and Recommend Approval to Set Aside XU Funding for Corridor Studies

Background Information:

Staff would like to know whether the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee supports the idea of the VTPO funding studies of major corridors (e.g. U.S. 1, U.S. 17-92, etc.) for the purpose of developing comprehensive, multi-modal transportation improvement strategies.

These studies would be funded by reallocating \$50,000 (1/2) of the set aside for Bicycle/Pedestrian Project feasibility studies, all of the \$100,000 set aside for ITS/Traffic Operations/Safety Project feasibility studies and an additional \$100,000 from the XU set aside for Transit Projects. This \$250,000 would likely fund at least two corridor studies per year. The studies would identify a wide range of mutually supportive project types for programming, including traffic operations, ITS, safety, bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

B) Review and Recommend Approval of the Revised Project Prioritization Process

Background Information:

In order to ensure that the VTPO will always have a full list of well-considered Priority Projects to program as funds become available, staff recommends that we now issue a "Call for Projects" twice per year.

Further, staff recommends that we review and rank project applications first for feasibility studies (unless a feasibility study or comparable review has already been done), then for project implementation (ranking again with the more complete information determined from the study). A separate application would be required for each of the two steps. This recommended process is illustrated in the flow chart provided with this agenda packet for your review.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

C) Review and Recommend Approval to Expand the Range of Eligible Project Types

Background Information:

The VTPO currently limits XU-funded projects to the following categories: Bicycle/Pedestrian, Traffic Operations, ITS, Safety and Transit. In order to provide maximum flexibility to program XU funds, TPO staff recommends expanding the range of eligible project types (e.g. roadway widening and bridge design).

The attached list illustrates the types of projects that are now accepted for funding and the attached excerpt from the federal code describes the full range of projects that may be funded with XU funds.

Staff requests direction from the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee regarding whether or not the current list of eligible projects should be expanded. If so, what new types of projects should be considered.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

D) Review and Recommend Approval to Revise Local Matching Fund Requirements for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Background Information:

VTPO staff is looking for direction from the BPAC Project Review Subcommittee to establish local match requirements.

Federal law requires that XU funds be matched with “local funds”¹ at a rate of 18.07%. Historically, FDOT has covered all of this match requirement for projects that are on the federal-aid system and one-half the match for those that are not on the federal aid system. Recently, however, FDOT has decided to cover this match requirement with “soft” toll credits, rather than real money. This “soft” match satisfies the federal match requirement, but it doesn’t cover actual project costs. Thus, the lost FDOT cash match will now have to be made up with an additional contribution from the VTPO or the project applicant.

In addition to the federal match requirement, the VTPO Board has required that XU funds be matched at a rate that has varied over the years from 50% to 15%. There were two reasons that the VTPO Board required the match. It showed a real local commitment (better ensuring that projects would be truly needed), and it leveraged the VTPO’s XU funds, resulting in more projects being completed. However, recognizing the recent financial difficulties that local governments are facing, the VTPO Board voted at their November 23, 2010 meeting to waive the local match requirement entirely. The waiver is limited to the next two years.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

¹ In this case, “local match” means any non-federal match.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

E) Review and Recommend Approval of Policy Preserving Top-Ranked Projects

Background Information:

New candidate projects can be ranked higher than projects ranked in previous years. However, to ensure a reasonable degree of predictability, the VTPO Board has enacted a policy that protects the highest ranked projects in each category. This policy currently provides that, unless the VTPO Board determines unusual circumstances dictate otherwise:

1. Projects ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of Florida **Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Roadway Projects** and are not currently funded through the construction phase will remain in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program;
2. Projects ranked one through five on the Prioritized List of **Regionally Significant Non-SIS Roadway Projects** that are not funded through the construction phase will be ranked in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program;
3. Projects ranked one through three on the Prioritized List of **Bascule Bridge Projects** that are not funded through the construction phase will be ranked in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program;
4. Projects ranked one through three on the Prioritized List of **XU Traffic Operations/ITS/Safety Set-Aside Projects** that are not funded through the construction phase will be ranked in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program;
5. Projects ranked one through three on the Prioritized List of **XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Set-Aside Projects** that are not funded through the construction phase will be ranked in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program; and
6. Projects ranked one through eight on the Prioritized List of **Enhancement Projects** that are not funded through the construction phase will be ranked in their current spot or moved to the next available higher spot until they are fully funded through the construction phase and drop out of the Work Program.

The VTPO Board generally reviews this policy annually. Staff is looking for your recommendations concerning the policy, reflecting consideration of any changes to the Project Prioritization Process that you may also recommend.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

F) Review and Recommend Approval of the 2011 Priority Application for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Background Information:

The 2011 Priority Application for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects is provided with this agenda packet for your review. TPO staff requests that you review the application and be prepared to recommend any additional changes that may be necessary to properly evaluate and rank projects.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

**SUMMARY SHEET
BPAC PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
JANUARY 6, 2011**

II. Action Items

G) Review and Recommend Approval of the 2011 List of Prioritized XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Background Information:

The 2011 List of Prioritized XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects is provided with this agenda packet for your review. TPO staff also encourages the subcommittee to consider a limitation on the amount of time a project is allowed to remain on the lower tiers of the List of Prioritized XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects awaiting a local commitment or resolution of any issues that would prevent FDOT from programming the next appropriate phase.

Action Requested:

As directed by the Subcommittee.

- III. Staff Comments**
- IV. Subcommittee Member Comments**
- V. Press/Citizen Comments**
- VI. Adjournment**

Volusia TPO

2011 Priority Application for XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

Initial Project Screening:

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

- For any proposed facility to be considered eligible through the TPO process, the project must be included on the ***Volusia TPO's Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan***.
- A ***local match*** is NOT required for funding of XU projects. Projects whose sponsors are willing and able to provide a local match will be awarded additional points.
- Is this **Trail/Side-path** project at least 8 feet wide?
 - If **Yes** – the project is eligible.
 - If **No** – if this project is at least 5 feet wide then it may be eligible to be submitted as a sidewalk project.
- Is this **Sidewalk** project at least 5 feet wide?
 - If **Yes** – the project is eligible.
 - If **No** – the project application is not acceptable.

XU Project Application Submittal Procedures:

Any project submitted by a local government for consideration **MUST** include the following information/materials:

- **Each application MUST include a Project Map** that clearly identifies the termini of the project and Proximity to Community Assets through the use of a one (1) mile radius buffer for Trail/Side-path projects and a one-half (½) mile radius buffer for Sidewalk projects. 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**. Photographs are optional.
- Each application **MUST** be submitted as: (1) an Adobe Acrobat® readable file (*.pdf format), and (2) include seven printed "hard-copies."
- **Applications will be reviewed for ranking two times each year (deadlines in month1 and month2).** The TPO will then distribute the copies to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for review and scoring.
- Applications will be ranked based on the information supplied in the application.
- **Please submit any ROW information as available.**
- **Incomplete applications will not be accepted.**

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 > 25%	10
(6) Value-Added Tie Breaker (if necessary)	variable
Total (excluding Value-Added Tie Breaker)	100

Project Title: _____**Applicant (city/county):** _____**Contact Person:** _____ **Job Title:** _____**Address:** _____**Phone:** _____ **FAX:** _____**E-mail:** _____**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.]***Is the Applicant certified to administer the proposed project through LAP?** ☐ Yes ☐ No**If Applicant is not LAP certified to administer the proposed project, name a qualified Project Administrator who will manage the proposed project:** _____*[Attach letter from Project Administrator agreeing to serve in that capacity.]***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 Purpose and Need:** _____**The Applicant is requesting a Feasibility Study:** ☐ Yes ☐ No*[Note: after a Feasibility Study has been completed, the Applicant will be required to submit a new application for funding to implement the project.]***A Feasibility Study has been completed or is not needed; the Applicant is requesting project implementation with the programming of these phases:** (check all that apply)**Design** ☐ **Environmental** ☐ **Right-of-Way** ☐ **Construction** ☐ **Other** _____

[Attach copies of all completed studies, analyses, warrants, designs and/or permits that are relevant. Project scope, schedule and cost estimate must be included.]

Criteria #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 Trail/Side-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.

For the application 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 Trail/Side-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

Criteria #1 Description (if needed): _____

Criteria #2 – Connectivity (30 points max.)

This criterion 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.

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

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

Criteria #2 Description (if needed): _____

Criteria #3 – Safety (25 points max.)

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

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

Safety	All that Apply	Max. Points
The project is located in an area identified as a hazardous walk/bike zone by Volusia County Schools.	<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. Please 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

Criteria #3 Description (if needed): _____

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

This is an opportunity for applicant to provide other relevant data that may provide **additional** information as related to the project application.

For the application list and describe whether the proposed facility has examples of public support (i.e., documented requests from community groups, homeowners associations, school administrators, as well as letters of support, signed petitions, documented public comments) or any special issues or concerns that are not being addressed by the other criteria.

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

Criteria #4 Description (if needed): _____

Criteria #5 – Local Matching Funds > 25% (10 points max.)

If local matching funds greater than 25% of the estimated project cost are available, describe the local matching fund package in detail.

Local Matching Funds > 25%	Check One	Max. Points
Is a local matching fund package greater than 25% of the estimated project cost documented for the project?		
25.0% < Local Matching Funds < 27.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
27.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 30.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
30.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 32.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	3
32.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 35.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
35.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 37.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
37.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 40.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	6
40.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 42.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	7
42.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 45.0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	8
45.0% ≤ Local Matching Funds < 47.5%	<input type="checkbox"/>	9
47.5% ≤ Local Matching Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
Maximum Point Assessment		10

Criteria #5 Description (if needed): _____

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

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

**Volusia TPO
2011 Project Process for
XU Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects**

1. Local government submits project(s)
2. BPAC reviews and ranks projects for feasibility studies, if required. Projects that have a feasibility study completed will be scored and ranked for programming
3. TPO pays for a consultant to perform feasibility studies on the highest ranking projects. (Local governments can bypass the TPO Study if the local government pays for the feasibility study themselves.)
4. Feasibility study is completed, if required
5. Projects with completed feasibility studies are ranked for programming
6. Local government gives the TPO an “unofficial” go-ahead for their project, based on the cost from the feasibility study
7. FDOT (i.e., Special Projects Coordinator) conducts a field review of the project
8. Local government submits a project letter of commitment to the TPO
9. FDOT schedules an intake meeting with the local government, TPO and FDOT staff to review the project
10. TPO coordinates with FDOT to program the project in the next available fiscal year of the FDOT Work Program
11. Construction of top ranked project: 2-3 years

