



Project Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting # 8 Final Meeting Notes

Attendees: **PAG Members**

Date: July 8, 2015

Time: 1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

1. Lois Bollenback, R2CTPO
2. Aerti Sherma, R2CTPO
3. Gary Huttman, MetroPlan Orlando
4. Pedro Leon, Daytona Beach International Airport
5. Steve Cooke, Daytona Beach International Airport
6. Carleen Flynn, LYNX
7. Jeff Hopper, Seminole County
8. Mike Cash, City of Sanford
9. Jon Cheney, Volusia County
10. Heather Blanck, VOTRAN
11. Elizabeth Matej, City of Daytona Beach
12. Hardy Smith, City of Daytona Beach
13. Ron Paradise, City of Deltona
14. Wendy Hickey, City of Orange City
15. Joe Bitar, FDOT
16. Susan Sadighi, FDOT

Consultant Team to FDOT

- Alan Danaher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ralph Bove, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Chuck Hymes, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- LaChant Barnett, Tindale Oliver
- Patricia Whitton, Tindale Oliver
- Ginger Corless, Tindale Oliver
- Pat Northey, Ghyabi & Associates (FDOT Public Information Liaison Contract)

Place: Volusia County Administrative Center
1st Floor Training Room
123 W Indiana Avenue
DeLand, FL 32720

Project No.: 173970A
Re: Volusia Transit Connector Study
Project Advisory Group Meeting # 8

Prepared by: Ginger Corless

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.***

The following materials were distributed:

Meeting handouts:

- PAG Meeting #8 Agenda and Presentation
- Handout – Summary of Bus Alternatives Capital Cost Estimate (7/1/15)
- Handout – Summary of Rail Alternatives Capital Cost Estimate (7/1/15)
- Handout – Summary of Bus Alternatives O&M Estimate (7/1/15)
- Handout – Summary of Rail Alternatives O&M Estimate (7/1/15)

Meeting highlights

Welcome

Joe Bitar welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for a round of introductions. Joe stated that today is a critical meeting in that the goal is to select at least two alternatives to move forward into the refined alternatives analysis phase. Alan Danaher then reviewed the meeting agenda.

PowerPoint Presentation & Related Discussion

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

Alan reviewed the status of the action items identified from the June 10 PAG meeting:

- Supplemental screening measure table (sent out week of June 29th) – Completed, and distributed to the PAG for review.
- Review contamination screening measure – Complete with no effect on total scores.
- Rename headings on Initial Screening Summary Tables – Completed.
- Send meeting invitation for July 8th PAG meeting – Completed.
- Meeting with Daytona Beach International Airport (DBIA) and International Speedway Corporation to review initial rail alternatives– Completed.
- Meeting with Duke Energy – In Progress. Initially met with FDOT District 5 Utility Coordinator, with follow up contact with Duke Energy to be scheduled.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES (slides 6 - 9)

- Ralph Bove provided a public involvement update and an overview of the June and July 1st elected officials briefings. It was noted that Volusia County and all of the cities have received a briefing.
 - Volusia County Council - Ralph stated that the team needs help from certain members of the PAG (Jon Cheney, Lois Bollenback, others?) to obtain detailed data on employment projections as requested by Volusia County Councilman Wagner. In particular Comm. Wagner would like to know the names of specific employers that were assumed to comprise the 2040 employment projections which went into the 2040 Volusia LRTP Update modeling, and which are intended to be used in the modeling for the Volusia Transit Connector Study.

- Orange City – Pat Northey provided an update on the June 30 Orange City Council briefing. She stated that the City endorsed the fact that the study was being conducted. She shared that there were concerns by the Orange City Council on how the refined alternatives were going to be selected. The Council, especially Councilman Saylor, wanted to ensure that whichever alternatives were selected that they reach the Deltona population. They did not have a preferred alternative and felt that cost should be a major factor.
- Deltona – Ralph provided the update on the June 15 Deltona City Commission briefing. He stated that the presentation included extra slides on how the existing and planned Votran local bus system would operate with the alternatives. It was noted that members of the project team met with the new City Manager prior to the Commission briefing and shared that she has a strong transit background, and appreciated the initial briefing and the approach being applied for the alternatives analysis.
- Daytona Beach – Hardy Smith stated that the June 17 briefing to the City Commission went well. He commented that once we reach the point that there needs to be an endorsement or action by the City Commission of preferred alternatives, the format needs to be more than a briefing. He wanted to make sure it was understood that there would be no decision made by Daytona Beach City staff on preferred alternatives. Alan indicated that at this time the study team just was looking to screen down to a smaller set of alternatives for more detailed definition and evaluation, and to get a proper range of modes and routes that would provide a broader base for the crafting of a final recommended alternative. Joe stated that at the end of the study we will go to the TPO for adoption of the locally preferred alternative. Joe also stated that the preferred alternative will also be taken to each of the local partners for endorsement.
- DeBary – Ralph provided the update on the July 1 DeBary City Council briefing. He shared that Councilman Brady asked about the timing between the implementation of this study and Ultimate I-4.
- Seminole County – Joe will be coordinating to provide each of the commissioners with a copy of the presentation that was made and, if requested, speak with commissioners that have questions.
- DBIA and Speedway – Pedro Leon helped setup this meeting. It was noted that the updated Airport Master Plan will be moving forward and that it is important to include the recommended alternative for the Intermodal Transfer Station into the Master Plan. Steve Cooke stated that he likes the routing of rail in the Midway Avenue corridor on the north side of the airport, and south side of the speedway. He stated that the Midway Corridor looks like the best option to serve the airport. It was noted that the Speedway also expressed a preference for the Midway Corridor option and that both parties would work with the project to provide for the needed rail right-of-way between the airport and the speedway.
- Duke Energy/FDOT Utility Coordinator – The project team received information from the FDOT Utility Coordinator regarding potential issues in using the utility easement along Alternative 2. The FDOT Utility Coordinator also provided contact information for Duke Energy. A meeting still needs to be held with Duke Energy. Ralph shared FDOT Utility

concerns that the use of the Duke Energy easement along the Dirksen Corridor has numerous challenges.

3. RECAP INITIAL ALTERNATIVES (slides 10-22)

- Alan Danaher provided a review of the seven (7) alternatives (4 bus/BRT alternatives and 3 rail alternatives, including an alternative generated from the April public meetings).
- The potential intermodal transfer sites in Daytona Beach were discussed. Jon Cheney inquired which site the airport preferred. Steve Cooke stated that Site D was the preferred site, especially for rail. It was noted that the star on the Intermodal Station Study graphic designating Site D is incorrect and the site is actually located a little further north.
- Alan reviewed the screening results (see slide 22).

4. BUS ALTERNATIVES CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS (slides 23 -26)

- Alan Danaher discussed how the capital and O&M cost estimates were completed. He noted that the capital cost estimates did not include the cost for exclusive bus lanes on urban streets (assumed to operate in mixed traffic).
- Pedro Leon stated that he felt there was a need to look at exclusive lanes to reduce overall congestion and enhance the urban environment so that people will use transit. Alan stated that they will look at exclusive lanes for the bus/BRT alternative(s) that will be refined in the next phase of the study.
- Mike Cash asked if transit signal priority (TSP) will negatively impact vehicular traffic. Alan indicated that general traffic operating in the same traffic stream as buses would benefit from reduced travel time with transit signal priority. TSP systems which have been implemented have shown in general minimal impact on general traffic operations if priority as opposed to preemption is the applied strategy and if TSP is not applied near or at capacity conditions.
- Jon Cheney inquired if the TSP system that is to be installed in the short term by FDOT associated with selected SunRail feeder bus routes was included in the bus/BRT capital cost estimate. Alan stated that a more general unit cost for TSP per signal was assumed, but that the specific FDOT project costs will be integrated into the refined alternatives evaluation.
- Bus Alternatives – O&M Cost Estimate Assumptions
 - Did not include the costs related to implementation of Votran feeder bus enhancements – Alan stated that those enhancements will be evaluated in the refined alternatives analysis.
- Preliminary Capital Cost Table (slide 26)
 - Four of the alternatives focus on bus/BRT
 - Alternative 3 has the lowest cost for capital improvements.
 - Alan discussed that an assessment of capital cost per 1,000 revenue hours was completed to show the impact of different service levels on cost for the different alternatives – Lois Bollenback stated that if the operational characteristics were changed then the costs will change. Alan so noted, and that service levels will be reassessed during the refined alternatives analysis.

- Jon Cheney confirmed that it is typical for the capital costs to be funded with the federal government picking up 50 percent, state picking up 25 percent, and local picking up 25 percent of the share and for O&M locals picking up 100 percent of the cost. Alan indicated projects that have higher local contributions rank higher.
- Hardy Smith asked if operating funding for the preferred alternative(s) would be the same as the current SunRail operating funding. Alan stated that a financial feasibility analysis would be initiated in the refined alternatives analysis, including identification of potential funding sources, with a preliminary financing strategy identified for the recommended alternative. It was noted that the current SunRail operating funding agreement applies to the SunRail Phases I and II only, and would not extend to any future SunRail extensions.

5. RAIL ALTERNATIVES CAPITAL AND O&M (sides 27 – 31)

- Chuck Hymes provided an overview of the rail alternatives capital and O&M cost estimates.
- Three alternatives with commuter rail were summarized.
- O&M estimates were based on SunRail Phase II North costs since they are more current. SunRail Phase I and Phase I south costs were also evaluated.
- Chuck stated that rail grade separation was assumed at major highways, including access in and out of I-4, across I-95 and across International Speedway Blvd. – The US 17-92 crossing for Alternatives 2 and 5 were assumed to be at grade at this time but that the team noted these crossings would need to be reevaluated in the next phase of the study.

6. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES (slide 32 – 36)

- Ralph Bove provided the overview.
- 11 X 17 handouts were provided (Rail and Bus Alternatives) for comparison.
- Rail alternatives are easier to compare. Comparison of bus alternatives are not as easy since there is a mix of bus modes (local/express/BRT) and specific impact is more difficult to identify.
- The public alternative has numerous community impacts including residential relocation, environmental impacts, and the fact that it does not reach the larger population areas in the southwest portion of the county, in particular Deltona.
- Alternatives 2 and 5 are along I-4 and have the ability to attract a greater market of users.
- Jon Cheney requested that a bullet be added to the rail alternatives regarding the need for right of way acquisition and that implications for expansion of SunRail to existing funding agreements with the regional partners be reviewed.

7. REFINED INITIAL ALTERNATIVES FOR FURTHER EVALUATION (slide 37)

- Alan stated there was a need to come up with a smaller set of alternatives (2-3) that will be looked at in greater detail during the next phase. He stated that they would like direction from the PAG on at least one express bus/BRT alternative and one rail alternative.

- There was extensive discussion among PAG members. Based on the discussion, and a final polling of each PAG member on the relative attractiveness of each alternative, it was determined that three build alternatives would move forward to the next phase (Refined Alternatives).
 - Alternative #4
 - Alternative #5
 - Public Alternative

Site D will be evaluated as the intermodal station site east of I-95 for all three build alternatives.

It is noted that the evaluation of two build alternatives is in the current study scope, but supplemental funding is available to cover a third alternative.

For the portion of the study corridor east of a new intermodal station on the west side of Daytona Beach, along ISB to the existing Votran transfer center east of US 1, the mode alternatives initially evaluated in the previous ISB Coalition-sponsored study will be reevaluated. The intent is to recommend a refined alternative in this area to be matched with the recommended alternative for the study corridor west of Daytona Beach.

8. NEXT STEPS (slide 39)

- Complete evaluation of refined alternatives (October 2015)
- Additional public meetings (November 2015)
- Identify draft recommended alternative (November 2015)
- Added elected official briefings (November-December 2015)
- Identify final recommended alternative and final reports (May 2016)

A more detailed schedule for work during the refined alternatives evaluation phase will be prepared, including any schedule implications from the evaluation of an added build alternative.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

- ***PAG Meeting #9 to be scheduled, likely in late August, to present the detailed definition of alternatives, ridership projections, and tools used for final refined alternatives evaluation.***

9. FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

1. Proceed to the refined alternative phase: *Parsons Brinckerhoff*
2. Send meeting appointment for PAG Meeting #9 to the PAG members. *Responsible Party: Tindale Oliver*

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