



**Project Advisory Group (PAG)
Meeting # 4
Final Meeting Notes**

Attendees: **PAG Members**

Date: January 28, 2015
Time: 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm

1. Carole Hinkley, R2CTPO
2. Gary Huttman, MetroPlan Orlando
3. Steve Cooke, Daytona Beach Intl Airport
4. Heather Blanck, Votran
5. Jeff Hopper, Seminole County
6. Mike Cash, Sanford
7. John Angiulli, Volusia County
8. Jon Cheney, Volusia County
9. Elizabeth Matej, Daytona Beach
10. Blanche Hardy, DeLand
11. Jason Yarborough, Lake Helen
12. Alison Stettner, Orange City
13. Joe Bitar, FDOT
14. Libertad Acosta-Anderson, FDOT

Consultant Team to FDOT

- Alan Danaher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ralph Bove, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Adriana Rodriguez, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Kelli Muddle, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ginger Corless, Tindale Oliver
- Anoch Whitfield, Tindale Oliver
- Jamie Snow, AECOM (FDOT Modeling Contract)
- Pat Northey, Ghyabi & Associates (FDOT Public Information Liaison Contract)

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 # 4

Prepared by: Anoch Whitfield/
Ralph Bove/Alan Danaher

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) 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:

- Complete binders (for prime/alternates who have not previously received one)
- PAG 4 Agenda and Presentation
- Initial Corridor and Viable Alternatives Screening Measures
- Initial FTA Project Justification Criteria and Measures (for informational purposes)
- Community Liaison Group (CLG) Roster (updated as of 1/27/15)
- CLG Sample Invitation Letter

Meeting Highlights

Welcome

Joe Bitar welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for a round of introductions. Joe recognized and welcomed the newest PAG member, Jason Yarborough, Interim City Administrator for the City of Lake Helen, who will be replacing K.C. Cichon, Planning Administrator, on the PAG. Joe provided a general overview of what would be covered in this PAG meeting and turned the meeting over to Alan Danaher and Ralph Bove.

PowerPoint Presentation & Related Discussion

1. FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING (slides 3 - 4)

- Status of FEC/Amtrak study – Project status email from Jesse Blouin was sent to the PAG following PAG Meeting # 3. This project is currently on hold.
- December 17th PAG Meeting – Meeting was cancelled, and that meeting date/time was used for the Technical Working Group Meeting # 1.
- Median width south of St. Johns River Bridge – this effort is currently on-going. The R2CTPO adopted a resolution to maintain a transit envelope in the median of I-4 from the Seminole County line to SR 472, the limits of the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate (BtU) improvement. In addition, the TPO resolution requested two managed lanes in each direction along I-4 to the Rhode Island Road extension (located north of Saxon Boulevard). The FDOT is in the process of selecting firms for the final design of I-4 BtU. There are more questions than answers. Need to evaluate what can and cannot be done. Jon Cheney shared that three (3) firms will be meeting with the County on this subject.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES (slides 5 - 6)

- Ralph Bove provided an overview of the public involvement activities completed to date and those that are upcoming, including:
 - Completed Activities: December public outreach events at the farmers markets in Orange City, DeBary, Daytona Beach, and Volusia County. The study team

talked directly with about 45-50 people, distributed 92 newsletters, and received 7 comment cards.

- Upcoming Activities:
 - Information booth at City of Deltona City Commission meeting on February 2nd. Conducting a public outreach event in Deltona was at the request of the City of Deltona, and conducting the event at the City's February 2nd City Commission meeting was at the recommendation of the City Planning Director.
 - Community Liaison Group (CLG) Kick-Off Meeting – Scheduled for Wednesday, February 11th at the FDOT District 5 Materials Office (Sailfish Room). Copies of the CLG Roster and sample invitation letter were provided to the PAG for their information.
- Ongoing Activities: Ralph indicated that the team is currently planning for the 2nd round of public outreach events/open houses to share the purpose and need and initial alternatives with the general public. The open house dates are planned for mid-April. Ralph also shared that the study website has been launched and is now active. He asked each PAG member to post a link of the project website onto their respective websites. Study team will provide to the PAG a brief narrative on the study as well as the link to the study website.
- Discussions on the events:
 - Jon Cheney (Volusia County) asked about the general comments heard at the December outreach events. Ralph provided highlights of some of the comments from the seven comment cards received.
 - Jon asked if there was any follow up to the question raised by the County. Libertad responded that a written response (via email) was provided to the County and that the public outreach planned in Deltona on February 2nd was a result of responding to the City.
 - Jon indicated that the intent of his question was to point out that slide 6 did not provide the PAG with any information on what happened at the December events. He asked when the outreach events summary will be available to the PAG. Ralph responded that the summary is currently under review by the Department and should be available and posted on the study website by the end of next week. Ralph noted that, moving forward, the team will include in the presentation slides a brief summary of future public outreach events.

3. TRAVEL DEMAND MODELING UPDATE (slides 7 – 8)

- Jamie Snow (AECOM) provided a summary of the discussion during the December 17th Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting, to summarize:
 - Regarding the Central Florida Regional Planning Mode (CFRPM) Timeline Summary, the study team presented the history of the CFRPM development in order to obtain buy in from the TWG as to which version of the model should be used for the study.
 - Regarding ZDATA, network and flow information process, the team walked through what is usually checked in the model to verify that the model is performing well and understand what industry standards serve as a guide.

- Regarding socio-economic (SE) data comparison, the team provided a comparison between the 2005 previous LRTP model SE data and the current proposed 2010 SE data.
- Regarding a comparison of destination trip percentages, the team provided a series of maps depicting how the model forecasts home-based work trips compared to the American Community Survey (ACS) work travel patterns.
- Regarding the 2010 district to district trips, the team provided the travel patterns for total trips by trip purpose (home-based work, non-home-based work, and home-based other) and for transit trips by trip purpose.
- Jon Cheney stated that he concurred with Jamie, and there was no further discussion.

4. PURPOSE AND NEED REVIEW (slides 9 – 28)

- Ralph provided a brief summary of the steps in developing a purpose and need (P&N) statement, indicating that it forms the foundation for developing/evaluating alternatives, identifies the problems that the study is to address, and defines the causes with factual and quantifiable (baseline) data.
- Ralph briefly went over the results of the P&N survey results and the components of the P&N statement, which include consistency with adopted plans, transportation capacity, social demands, economic development, modal interrelationships, system continuity and safety (slides 13 – 14).
- Ralph and Alan went through each of the components of the P&N statement, and specific discussion on these components were relative to:
 - Capacity (slides 15 – 22):
 - Jon Cheney asked, in terms of existing deficiencies (slide 15), whether the projected volumes on I-4 used in the model included the changes resulting from the I-4 Ultimate project. Jamie replied that the I-4 Ultimate improvements are not in the existing model but will be evaluated during this study.
 - With respect to Weekday Person Trip (slide 18), a question was asked on what jurisdictions were included in the 95,000 trips from SW Volusia. The response was that it represented the whole subarea and all modes.
 - With respect to Weekday Non-Work Person Trips, Elizabeth Matej (Daytona Beach) still questioned the trip flow patterns (slide 20).
 - There was some discussion on trip volumes during race weekends, including potential traffic impacts prior to, during and after a race, the impacts of Daytona Rising, etc. Heather Blanck (Votran) shared some information with the study team on the number of visitors coming into the region for the races and how these visitors look to alternative modes for accessing/visiting other parts of Central Florida during their stay.
 - Social Demands and Economic Development (slides 23 – 25):
 - Heather stated that age is an important factor to consider, irrespective of whether or not it is relevant in the model. Alan noted that there are FTA criteria for evaluating transit-dependent ridership.
 - Jason Yarborough asked the study team to explain how the data will be used in the screening/tier process to arrive at the initial alternatives, what are the measures, are they weighted, etc... Alan explained the overall

- process and potential modifications in the process/evaluation measures based on information and direction from the PAG.
- Based on the numbers presented, Jon commented that Volusia County continues to export trips outside of the County for work trips thus continuing to be a bedroom community to Orlando/Orange County.
 - Steve Cooke (Daytona Beach International Airport) questioned why the team is looking only (or narrowly) at transit-dependent ridership. This study may affect the airport, which typically has more affluent riders who typically are not transit-dependent. Alan responded that the study will evaluate transit oriented development demands as well.
 - System Continuity (slide 27): Orange City was excited to hear about the possibility of evaluating an Orange City Station.

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (slides 29 – 39)

- Ralph provided a brief recap of the study goal categories and how they are consistent with the FTA project justification criteria and went through each of the goals and objectives to explain how they were modified to address the PAG comments received at the November 19th PAG meeting # 3.
- Alan directed the PAG's attention to the Evaluation Framework handout and went through the steps and anticipated timeframes to go from initial screening to the viable alternatives. Specifically, the Initial Screening work effort (left side of the Framework) will be completed in the spring and will evaluate potential fatal flaws and transit options, including an extension of SunRail, streetcar/light rail, bus rapid transit, express bus, and local bus enhancements. The Viable Alternatives Evaluation (right side of the Framework) will be completed in the fall and will include the feasibility of the sub-segments within the corridor within the study area. Discussions on the Framework included:
 - Jason Yarborough asked whether the study will consider life-cycle cost or up front capital costs and whether the measures will be weighted. Alan explained that expenditures (such as operation and maintenance costs) will be evaluated and that the study can be expanded to include the life-cycle costs to the year 2040 to match the long term horizon of the ridership projections. Whether or not the measures are weighted will be considered later and will be based on input from the PAG as the study progresses.
 - John Angiulli also asked about the cost per mile and end costs. Ralph/Alan explained that some industry standards and average cost per mile could be provided at the next PAG meeting.
 - Steve Cooke commented about economic viability, e.g. enhanced transit generates more ridership/revenue.
- Regarding the Initial Corridor Analysis Segments Map, Alan explained that in addition to evaluating the corridors, the team has broken the corridors down into seven (7) segments, with the potential for further division into sub-segments. The PAG discussed the industrial spur track in DeLand, congestion levels at Saxon Boulevard, and the possibility of reaching out to All Aboard Florida regarding their planned station locations. DeLand strongly expressed that the City will not allow any transit improvements along the spur that would lead into the City's historic district. Lastly, Alan provided the PAG with a "homework assignment" – review and provide comments on the Initial Corridor

and Viable Alternatives Screening Measures (handout) for each of the goals and objectives for the study.

6. NEXT STEPS (slide40 – 41)

- Hold information booth at the City of Deltona City Commission on Monday, February 2nd, from 5:30pm to 6:30pm
- Conduct Community Liaison Group Kick-Off meeting on Wednesday, February 11th, at the FDOT District 5 Materials Office (Sailfish Room)
- Finalize the Existing/Future Conditions Report (anticipated to be completed/posted on the project website by week of February 9th)
- Finalize the Purpose and Need Statement (anticipated to be completed/posted on the project website by week of February 16th)
- Finalize goals and objectives
- Finalize evaluation measures
- Proceed with the initial mode and corridor screening

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

- **Community Liaison Group Kick-Off Meeting**
Wednesday, February 11th, from 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm
FDOT District 5 Materials Office
Sailfish Room
1650 North Kepler Road
DeLand, FL 32724
- **PAG Meeting # 5:**
Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 1:30PM - 3:30 PM
FDOT District 5 Materials Office
Sailfish Room
1650 North Kepler Road
DeLand, FL 32724

7. FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

1. Verify whether the Ultimate I-4 improvements are included in the regional model; *Responsible Party: Parsons Brinckerhoff and AECOM*
2. Continue working on getting information on the median width south of the St. Johns River Bridge; *Responsible party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
3. Post Public Outreach Events Summary on project website; *Responsible parties: Tindale Oliver and Parsons Brinckerhoff*
4. Provide industry standards in cost per mile for the modes to be evaluated in the initial mode screening; *Responsible party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
5. Review and provide comments on the Initial Corridor and Viable Alternatives Screening Measures; *Responsible party: PAG Members, with comments to Joe Bitar/Alan Danaher*

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