



**Project Advisory Group (PAG)  
Meeting # 1  
Meeting Notes**

Attendees: **PAG Members**

Date: September 15, 2014  
Time: 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

- John Angiulli, Volusia County
- Jon Cheney, Volusia County
- Gabriella Arismendi, MetroPlan Orlando
- Steve Cooke, Daytona Beach Intl Airport
- Carleen Flynn, LYNX
- Heather Blanck, Votran
- Carole Hinkley, River to Sea TPO
- Bill Wharton, Seminole County
- Mike Cash, Sanford
- Elizabeth Matej, Daytona Beach
- Hardy Smith, Daytona Beach
- Blanche Hardy, DeLand
- Chris Bowley, Deltona
- Michael Wright, Lake Helen
- Alison Stettner, Orange City
- Libertad Acosta-Anderson, FDOT
- Maryam Ghyabi, Consultant to FDOT
- Sam Weekley, FDOT
- Jesse Blouin, Consultant to FDOT

**Consultant Team**

- Alan Danaher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ralph Bove, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Kelli Muddle, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ginger Corless, Tindale Oliver
- Patricia Whitton, Tindale Oliver
- Anoch Whitfield, Tindale Oliver

**Additional Guests**

None

Place: FDOT D5  
Materials Office - Sailfish Room  
1650 North Kepler Road  
DeLand, FL 32724

Project No.: 173970A  
Re: Volusia Transit  
Connector Study  
Project Advisory  
Group Meeting # 1

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 Materials Distributed

Each Project Advisory Group (PAG) member present was presented with a Study binder and the information packet for Tab 1, which included the following:

- Meeting agenda
- Project Advisory Group Overview
- Volusia Connector Study – Project Advisory Group Roster
- Volusia Connector Study – Project Schedule
- PowerPoint Presentation

## Meeting highlights

### Welcome

Libertad Acosta-Anderson (LAA) opened the meeting by thanking the PAG members for their attendance and introduced the Study Team. LAA introduced Alan Danaher (AD) as the Consultant Project Manager and Ralph Bove (RB) as the Deputy Project Manager. LAA asked that the attendees introduce themselves, indicate which agency they represent and whether they were representing their agency as a primary or alternate member.

## Power Point Presentation & Related Discussion

### 1. PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP OVERVIEW (slides 3 – 5)

- Following the introductions, LAA provided an overview of the role and responsibilities of the PAG and the importance for PAG members to attend the monthly meetings and actively participate/engage in the discussions as the study progresses.
- LAA asked members to let the Study Team know which days of the month, time of day and location would be most convenient for the group.
- She also let the group know that materials and communications with and between the Study Team would be through ProjectSolve (Parsons Brinckerhoff's SharePoint site), E-mail notices, and project update meetings.

### 2. PROJECT OVERVIEW – BACKGROUND(slides 6 – 16)

- AD provided a general overview of the study, including background information, study goals, study area, and the study approach (slide 8). He clarified that the study area has been expanded to include U.S. 1 in Daytona Beach and to northern Seminole County at S.R. 46 (slide 9).
- AD shared the study 18-month schedule and the tiered screening approach to evaluate the modal alternatives, identify the viable alternatives and identify a recommended alternative. The evaluation will consider the effects of the proposed new intermodal center and transfer points in Daytona Beach as well as local transit services and facilities in other communities.

- AD noted that the study approach will be consistent with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) process for evaluation, rating and approval and will consider the evaluation criteria of MAP-21 and the FTA New Starts requirements in identifying a recommended alternative.

### 3. PUBLIC OUTREACH OBJECTIVES (Slides 17 – 20)

- RB presented the public outreach objectives of the study and the strategies that the Team would employ to reach out to the general public and key stakeholders to obtain their feedback and input. He noted that the PAG would assist in coordinating with the public, including public agencies.
- RB highlighted that the Study Team recognizes the importance of public feedback and will be working closely with Maryam Ghyabi, the Department's Public Information Liaison for Volusia County projects, to help ensure a comprehensive outreach approach.
- RB indicated that the StudyTeam will coordinate with local governments, transit agencies, and separate corridor stakeholders.
- RB highlighted that the public outreach objectives and strategies comply with Federal and State Title VI requirements.
- RB provided a summary of the Public Involvement Plan, noting that the Plan included agency kickoff meetings, public meetings/workshops, and additional meetings and that the Team would be available to meet with PAG members one-on-one or in small group meetings.
- During this portion of the presentation, John Angiulli (JA) asked whether and how the Team would inform and engage the Spanish-speaking population. RB replied that key study materials will be developed in Spanish and distributed to Spanish newspapers and other media. LAA added later that she is also fluent in Spanish and could assist or answer questions from Spanish speakers.
- RB: The goal of the public outreach for this study is to reach as many people as possible to get the greatest amount of public feedback.
- In terms of the project schedule, RB stated that the study would occur over an 18-month period and that tentative timeframes have been developed for the three major public meetings (refer to Slide 20).

### 4. OPEN DISCUSSION

Following the presentation, PAG members asked questions and made comments, which are documented below:

- Gabriella Arismendi (GA): Will there be any SunRail surveys in DeBary and if so, when?
  - LAA: SunRail will conduct its own Origin & Destination (O/D) surveys.
  - Jesse Blouin (JB): The SunRail Program Management Team will need to circle back with this study's Team because SunRail does not have an answer/decision at this time on whether it will do a survey. They have the initial ridership surveys.
  - AD: This question came up as well during the presentation with the Volusia County Council. The big question to look at with respect to the DeBary station, as it is becoming a strong destination station, is where the trips are coming from/what their origins are. The trend seems to be that people are going to the

- DeBary Station instead of the Sanford Station because of the congestion on Interstate 4 (I-4).
- RB: It would also be informative to evaluate and quantify the mid-day trips as well.
  - JB: In terms of the Existing Conditions, is the Team assuming that there will be a rail envelope within the I-4 corridor?
    - RB: The Department is in the process of reevaluating the previous I-4 PD&E study from S.R. 434 in Seminole County to S.R. 472 in Volusia County. The section north of the St. Johns River Bridge to S.R. 472 is being re-evaluated to assess potential integration of a multi-modal envelope. The median along I-4 from S.R. 472 to S.R. 44 has an existing 44-foot envelope available and a 44-foot envelope will be provided in the reconstructed section of I-4 from S.R. 44 to I-95.
    - JB: Reiterated that it should be a consideration for alternative mode development.
    - AD: The simple answer is yes – the Team is considering where there could be a transit envelope and recognizes that there is limited opportunity to cross the natural lands within Volusia County. The Team will work closely with FDOT to address limited access and may require planned and programmed type scenarios (existing plus committed) (E+C).
  - Michael Wright (MW): What will be the role of this group in terms of its interaction with the SunRail group?
    - AD: It is recognized that the Phase 2 North SunRail extension to the west side of DeLand is in project development, and that coordination with the SunRail team will be needed to evaluate alternate connections in the current study to that planned commuter rail extension. Is there a need for premium transit on I-4? These are some unknowns. A market analysis will be needed to do a market analysis to know the need as initial and then viable alternatives are developed. The Team is working with transit agencies and will be looking at the regional model. SunRail cannot be extended without looking at the role that Voltran plays. There has not been a County household travel survey since 2002, thus the need to evaluate trip patterns. Cellular travel data will be obtained to provide updated insights on current weekday trip patterns, as well as trip patterns on weekends, including 500 Race activity weekends.
  - Jon Cheney (JC): How are we handling I-4 managed lanes? I-4 is failing at Saxon Boulevard. What are the assumptions? Have the decisions of I-4 with regards to this analysis been made?
    - AD: The Department is having discussions with the County. If rail is being evaluated, it would require right-of-way outside of the existing I-4 cross section between the St. Johns River Bridge and S.R. 472. A managed lanes envelope, if developed, could have express bus operation.
    - GA: Asked for clarification then that there is no determination yet on maintaining the envelope.
    - RB: Asked JC for a clarification of his question – is JC's question regarding modeling and capacity? JC replied in the affirmative. I-4 is congested at the St. Johns River Bridge. If future managed lanes on I-4 are assumed, then I-4 will not be congested. If not assumed, then it will be congested. Thus, the Team needs to consider long range plans affecting or involving I-4 during the modeling.

- Alison Stettner (AS): As alternatives are evaluated and if I-4 is preferred, how will this impact Orange City and DeBary? What are the options for travel – wants this to be a consideration as the study progresses.
  - RB: An evaluation of how rail could be routed to the east and then operate on I-4 will be assessed. Have to look at multiple modes and understand the benefits and challenges of each.
- John Angiulli (JA): The Team needs to consider the Daytona International Speedway activities and the Speedway as a destination for travel.
  - AD: Yes, the Speedway is recognized as a major trip attractor and thus destination trips during the modeling.
- Blanche Hardy (BH): It is her understanding that All Aboard Florida already has a contract and is planning to run rail to Miami, so will there be a connection to All Aboard Florida?
  - AD: All Aboard Florida is planned to operate on the FEC corridor between Cocoa and Miami (as part of the overall new service to Orlando International Airport) but could continue north on the FEC to Jacksonville. We recognize that this interaction needs to be reviewed. The Intermodal Transit Station in Daytona Beach is a driving factor.
- MW: Has the Team looked at a comparison to Europe and Asia? Are there any lessons learned with respect to Europe and Asia?
  - AD: All modes will initially be evaluated, European and Asian enhanced transit services operate within urban areas and within the city, whereas this project is intercity across a vast expanse of protected environmentally sensitive lands. The Team will look at all modes, typically evaluated throughout the world, then narrow or winnow them down to the viable alternatives.
  - RB: Parsons Brinckerhoff works on other projects within the U.S. (i.e. Boston and Providence), so we are also considering conducting a peer review of lessons learned.
  - AD: We have several examples around the Country that we can draw lessons from.
- Hardy Smith (HS): Can this group be used as a forum for understanding the status of the FEC project (the Amtrak Study, the proposed East Coast north-south study)?
  - JB: The Federal Rail Administration (FRA) languished on it but never approved it – so no action was taken. It is on a future list but not in the near future. HS asked if the cost is approximately \$150 million and where it has gone. JB stated that he was not sure but can follow up and bring an update back to the PAG at the October meeting.
- AS: Does the scope require just one mode for the preferred/recommended alternative or does it allow for multiple modes.
  - AD: There will be a market analysis, and all mode options will initially be screened connectivity options to the existing and planned intermodal centers in the study area. The Team will also look at the primary corridors and be open to the multiple technology application in certain corridors.
- AS: When is the next meeting?
  - AD: At the October meeting, the findings of the Existing Conditions Analysis, and at the November meeting, the Purpose and Need will be presented as well as the Performance Measures. In December, initial public kickoff meetings will be held

to introduce the study to the general public. In January, the screening of the initial mode and corridor alternatives will commence.

- LAA and RB asked if the attendees were able and willing to discuss and get a consensus on the best meeting days, time, and location for future PAG meetings.
  - After some discussion, the group agreed to hold the monthly PAG meetings every 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday, from 1:30 to 3:30, at the Sailfish Room of the FDOT Materials Office.

## 5. NEXT STEPS (Slide21)

- The Team will continue agency kickoff meetings through October; most of these have already been scheduled with each agency, and will establish a project website.
- The Team will continue data collection, review and evaluation through October and November and should be ready to present the Existing Conditions findings to the PAG at the November meeting as part of preparations for the first Public Kickoff Meeting in December.
- The goal is to complete the Existing Conditions task and have a public kickoff by early December 2014 so that the Team can begin evaluating the alternative modes at the first of 2015.
- The meeting closed with the study's FDOT and consultant contact information on the screen.

### NEXT PAG MEETING

- The PAG members in attendance agreed to hold the monthly PAG meeting every 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday, from 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM at the Sailfish Room of the FDOT Materials Office located at 1650 North Kepler Road, DeLand, FL.

- **NEXT MEETING:**

- **Wednesday, October 22, 2014**, 1:30PM - 3:30 PM  
FDOT District 5 Materials Office  
Sailfish Room  
1650 North Kepler Road  
DeLand, FL 32724

### Action or Follow-Up Items

1. Provide a status report of the FEC Amtrak Study; *Responsible Party: Jesse Blouin*
2. Provide status of SunRail Origin-Destination Survey; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
3. Set up recurring PAG meeting calendar appointments; *Responsible Party: Tindale Oliver*

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