



**Community Liaison Group (CLG)  
Meeting # 2 (Kick-Off Meeting)  
Meeting Notes**

Attendees: **CLG Members**

Date: April 1, 2015  
Time: 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

- Dave Castagnacci, VCARD/FCARD
- Michelle “Missy” Chaves, DeLand Chamber of Commerce
- Nick Conte, DeLand Chamber of Commerce
- Steve Eckman, Daytona State College
- Janie Graziani, Stetson University
- Ginger Adair, Volusia County Land Management
- Donald King, Florida Forestry Service
- Doug Hall, Citizen Advocate for Persons with Disabilities
- Nancy Burgess-Hall, Citizen Advocate for Persons with Disabilities
- Claudia Roth, League of Women Voters – Volusia County
- Steven Viola, Florida Hospital DeLand
- Joe Bitar, FDOT
- Libertad Acosta-Anderson, FDOT

**Consultant Team**

- Alan Danaher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ralph Bove, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Anoch Whitfield, Tindale Oliver
- Pat Northey, Public Information Liaison, Ghyabi & Associates Consultant to FDOT

Place: Sanborn Activity Center  
Conference Room # 1  
815 South Alabama Avenue  
DeLand, FL 32724

Project 173970A  
No.:  
Re: Volusia Transit  
Connector Study  
Community Liaison  
Group Meeting # 2

Prepared by: Anoch P. Whitfield

**NOTE:** These meeting notes are Parsons Brinckerhoff’s attempt at capturing the key discussion points, decisions, action/follow up items, and resolutions discussed at the meeting. If you would like to clarify or comment on any point, please notify Alan Danaher by phone (407-587-7835) or email ([danaher@pbworld.com](mailto:danaher@pbworld.com)) within 48 hours of this email distribution. **If no comments are received within 48 hours, these meeting minutes will be assumed to serve as the official meeting record.**

**Meeting Handouts:** The following materials were distributed:

- CLG Presentation with agenda provided in Slide # 2

## Meeting Highlights

### Welcome

Joe Bitar welcomed everyone to the meeting, provided a brief overview of what would be covered in the meeting, and asked for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Joe welcomed Pat Northey to provide a brief welcome and then turned the meeting over to Alan Danaher and Ralph Bove.

## PowerPoint Presentation & Related Discussion

### 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT UPDATE (slides 4 – 5)

- Ralph Bove provided a reminder that three public meetings have been scheduled for Tuesday, April 14<sup>th</sup>, Wednesday, April 15<sup>th</sup>, and Thursday, April 16<sup>th</sup>. He explained that the materials and content for each meeting will be identical and that three meetings were being held along the corridor (in the southern, central and northeastern parts of the corridor) in an effort to provide maximum opportunity for public participation and feedback. He also provided an update of the public outreach efforts completed to date, specifically:
  - Display advertisements in the *Daytona Beach News-Journal*, *West Volusia Beacon*, *Sanford Herald*, and *La Prensa*.
  - Letters have been emailed to elected officials and appointed officials as well as to the CLG and Project Advisory Group (PAG) for distribution. Ralph thanked those CLG members, including Nick Conte, Missy Chaves, Dave Castagnacci, Claudia Roth and others not in attendance at this meeting, for sharing the public meeting announcement with their respective groups.
  - FDOT Press Release
  - Public meeting flyer
- He also shared that the Department has been talking with the News-Journal, and there will be an article about the study and the public meetings published closer to the time of the public meetings.
- No discussions or specific questions on public outreach.

### 2. PRELIMINARY SCREENING RESULTS (slides 7 – 8)

- Alan Danaher provided a general overview of the modes screening process and how the study team narrowed the list of alternative modes to the top five (5) modes that would be further evaluated. The top modes are: commuter rail, streetcar, bus rapid transit, express bus, and local bus enhancements. Alan provided a brief description of each mode type.

- Alan explained how the team used the mode types to identify and evaluate travel segments within the corridor. Seven (7) segments have been identified:
  1. DeBary to DeLand
  2. DeLand
  3. East-West Connection
  4. East Daytona
  5. South to Seminole
  6. Rail to I-4
  7. West Daytona
- Alan went through each segment, describing each one and the existing conditions that led to the identification of each segment.
- No discussions or specific questions on preliminary screening and segments.

### 3. INITIAL PROJECT BUILD ALTERNATIVES (slides 10 – 15)

- Alan provided an overview of the goals and objectives that were used in evaluating the possible transit alternatives. He explained that the team evaluated all of the possible transit options against 30 measures, which were based on the goals and objectives, to identify six (6) initial alternatives. Alan described each alternative in detail, including the mode type(s) evaluated for each alternative and why each mode is being considered for that alternative and begin/end points and possible transfer/connection points for each alternative.
- Following Alan's description of each initial alternative, the group engaged in a dynamic and informative discussion. The summary below identifies the top concerns expressed by the CLG and provides highlights of the discussion for each (please note, for ease of review, the discussion is categorized by topic and not in sequential order of the discussion):
  - DeLand SunRail Station and public perception of this study taking away from a future DeLand SunRail Station
    - Comments:
      - Lots of public pessimism and frustration about current status of the Phase 2 SunRail North extension and added DeLand SunRail Station, including the funding and construction schedule of the extension. Missy Chaves (DeLand Chamber of Commerce) stated that if SunRail does not go north to DeLand, nobody will agree or want it to go east from DeLand toward Daytona Beach. This includes any connection options between the rail corridor and I-4 south of DeLand.
      - Nick Conte (DeLand Chamber of Commerce) cautioned that Alternatives 2 (I-4 Commuter Rail from DeBary) and 5 (I-4 Commuter Rail via SR 472) are going to raise angry eyebrows.
      - Janie Graziani (Stetson University) agreed with Missy and Nick. Stetson University students want and need enhanced transit options to get them from the university to downtown Orlando, i.e. for internships and work). This is a key connection for them. She concurs that there could potentially be a significant impediment to this study if there is no DeLand SunRail station. She also stated

that the alternatives may result in DeLand being omitted or overlooked because it is only one of the alternatives and might not be selected.

- Missy shared that there is still a great deal of skepticism, that there are “a lot of eyes on the DeLand Station prize” and that many businesses have not been asked about this station and how it would impact SunRail ridership.
  - Ralph explained that, for this study, SunRail Phase 2 North (DeBary to DeLand) is a committed and programmed transportation project and is included in the study’s assumptions. He further explained that this study is not intended to replace a DeLand SunRail Station but rather will enhance a DeLand Station. Ralph asked CLG members for their guidance and thoughts on how the team could best strengthen that message.
- Recommendations:
    - It needs to be absolutely clear that this study assumes the presence of the Phase 2 North SunRail extension and an added DeLand SunRail Station and that transit improvement projects resulting from this study would be developed AFTER the DeLand SunRail Station opens.
    - It is a timing issue, so the team needs to explain that there are two different and separate projects with different funding sources – that this study will not detract or take money from the implementation of the Phase 2 North SunRail extension and DeLand SunRail Station.
    - It is important to let the public know that this is only a general planning study and how the message is presented/delivered to the public.
  - Ensuring effective and efficient travel and movement of persons with disabilities
    - Comments:
      - Nancy Burgess-Hall (representative of persons with disabilities) stated that Daytona Beach folks need a connection to DeLand and then to downtown Orlando. She also stated that, understanding the conversation about connections between major hubs, enhanced transit needs to get people to the places they want to go but without having to make a bunch of connections/transfers and without folks having to wait extended periods of time. The system should be flexible enough so that if something happens, a delay at one connection point does not “mess up” the entire trip.
      - Nick Conte commented about the relevance/importance of the first and last mile of a trip.
    - Response:
      - Alan stated that these alternatives would include further evaluation and identification of local bus service and network enhancements developed in conjunction with Votran.

#### 4. NEXT STEPS (slide 17)

- Slide 17 provides an overview of the next steps; however, in going with the flow of the conversation, the team and CLG members proceeded to the review and discussion of the display boards for the public meetings.

#### 5. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC MEETING BOARDS

- The following comments and recommendations resulted from a discussion of the display boards:
- Specific Comments/Recommendations:
  - Map scale makes it difficult to see the routes, options and treatments for DeLand and Daytona Beach.
    - Recommendation: Provide inserts in larger scale for DeLand and Daytona Beach
  - Graphical boards need to have clear verbal descriptions of the information shown/depicted on the boards. It should be noted that, as part of public outreach, information on the boards will be clarified as needed by the Team at the various stations during the public meetings.
    - Recommendation: Team will provide both graphical and written display boards
  - Can the boards show data of who needs what, how and where?
    - Recommendation: Team will produce a Markets board to show end-users of enhanced transit
  - Time savings data. Boards should show (or information should be provided to show) how the alternatives makes the time to get from point A to point B more efficient
    - Recommendation: Team showed the board on Transit Mode Comparison which identifies relative travel speeds for different modes. Specific travel time savings will be identified for refined viable alternatives.
  - Regarding the goals and objectives board, Goal 4 should be moved up to # 1, and a question was asked about weighting the goals. Perhaps the size of the blocks (which contain the description for each goal) may give the appearance of weight – meaning the larger the block, the greater the weight that goal has – when in reality, the larger block size is due to the amount of text within the block.
    - Response: Provide a clarification statement that all goals are equally important to the corridor and thus are all equally weighted.
- Other general comments:
  - Doug Hall stated that people want to know how fast, efficient and accessible the enhanced alternative will be – that people need to believe that they can get to where they need to go when they want to go there.
  - Dave Castagnacci (VCARD/FCARD/Daytona Beach Chamber of Commerce) commented that as a person growing up with mass transit, mass transit was never viewed as quick and convenient and that it would get people directly to their destinations quickly like a car would (no direct connection panacea). Rather, there was an expectation that using transit involves making transfer or connections and having to wait for the bus or train.

- Steve Viola (Florida Hospital DeLand) stated that people need to know where they are going and an estimated time to get there – regardless of the mode and number of connections. He also commented on parking problems for the hospital. So, if the recommended alternative results in even 20-30 employees taking transit, that is a benefit to the hospital's ability to provide parking to patients.
- Nick Conte stated that this area is hungry for rail and the economic development potential that goes with it.
- Nancy Burgess-Hall stated that in general people still value their cars (e.g. retirees from the north)
- Others commented that the millennial generation does not want or value cars, instead they want more multimodal transportation options.

## 6. DISCUSSION

- Joe Bitar shared about the joint PAG/CLG Field Review Bus Tour that would take place on Wednesday, April 8<sup>th</sup>. Meeting time is at 8:15 am at the Saxon Park and Ride Lot, and the tour would end at noon.
- Joe asked CLG members to reply to the email (that was sent previously) if they wanted to join the tour.

## 7. FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

1. Develop additional boards/modify existing boards to reflect CLG comments; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff and FDOT*
2. Develop clear verbal descriptions of the public meeting materials; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
3. Post the Transit Modes Comparison display board on project website by end of day; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
4. Post all public meeting materials on project website following the public meetings; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*

cc: Attendees  
Other Invitees Unable to Attend  
Parsons Brinckerhoff File #173970A