



**Project Advisory Group (PAG)
Meeting # 5
Draft Meeting Notes**

Attendees: **PAG Members**

Date: February 25, 2015
Time: 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm

1. Carole Hinkley, R2CTPO
2. Pedro Leon, DBIA
3. Heather Blanck, Votran
4. Jeff Hopper, Seminole County
5. Melissa Winsett, Volusia County
6. Elizabeth Matej, Daytona Beach
7. Blanche Hardy, DeLand
8. Ron Paradise, Deltona
9. Alison Stettner, Orange City
10. Joe Bitar, FDOT
11. Sam Weekley, FDOT

Consultant Team to FDOT

- Alan Danaher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ralph Bove, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- John Lafferty, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Adriana Rodriguez, Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Ginger Corless, Tindale Oliver
- Jamie Snow, AECOM (FDOT Modeling Contract)
- Pat Northey, Ghyabi & Associates (Public Involvement Liaison (PIL) for FDOT)

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

Project 173970A
No.:
Re: Volusia Transit
Connector Study
Project Advisory
Group Meeting # 5

Prepared by: Ginger Corless/
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:

- PAG Meeting #5 Agenda and Presentation
- Maps of Proposed Segments

Meeting highlights

Welcome

Joe Bitar welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for a round of introductions since there were new alternates representing Volusia County, City of Deltona and the Daytona Beach International Airport. 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 (slide 4)

- Verify Beyond the Ultimate Improvements are included in the regional transportation model – PB/AECOM confirmed that the improvements are included in the model.
- Median width south of St. Johns River Bridge – This effort is currently on-going. Based on the current FDOT Project Reevaluation, it appears the previous multi-modal/transit envelope in Seminole County is being utilized for the proposed I-4 Beyond the Ultimate improvement.
- Public Outreach – The event summaries have been posted on the project website.
- Initial Mode Screening- PB incorporated industry-standard cost per mile comparisons in the screening process.
- Review Screening Measures – Measures are in the process of being refined based on input received from FDOT and the PAG.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES (slides 5 - 21)

- Ralph Bove provided an overview of the public involvement activities completed to date.
- He stated that there was a wide range of comments, but generally comments were in support for enhanced transit.
- Ralph Bove and Pat Northey provided a briefing of the Community Liaison Group (CLG) meeting that was held on February 11th. Highlights include the following:
 - 20 members attended
 - Group was supportive and desired to have a clear message to take to the public
 - Project fact sheet and story boards will be prepared regarding project and upcoming meetings in April
 - CLG members agreed to get the word out to the public
- Ralph Bove discussed the public meetings to be held in April. He stated that the events will present information on the modes evaluation, corridor segments and initial alternatives.

- Ralph also requested that each of the PAG members assist in promoting these events. Information will be provided to the PAG for easy posting and distribution.

3. PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT(slides 22-23)

- Alan reviewed the refined Purpose and Need Statement. There were no comments made during the presentation; however, it was noted that the word “enhanced” should be used instead of “premium” when discussing the project. Parsons Brinckerhoff will revise the Purpose and Need Statement to reflect this change.

4. UPDATED 2040 DATA (slides 24 – 27)

- Alan Danaher and Jaime Snow reviewed the 2010 and 2040 data and how the data related to population, employment, and person trips.
 - Melissa Winsett, Volusia County (representing Jon Cheney) inquired if the Daytona Beach numbers included areas outside of the city limits. She felt that Daytona Beach numbers were too high; her understanding was Deltona had a higher population than Daytona Beach.
 - Jamie stated the numbers were provided to AECOM and came from the model being used to update the R2CTPO LRTP. It was her understanding the numbers reflected the City of Daytona Beach only.
 - The PAG questioned the data and requested it to be reevaluated.
 - NOTE: This issue was investigated following the meeting, and it was determined that the Daytona Beach numbers presented to the PAG did include data from the greater Daytona Beach region. AECOM is in the process of updating the information and revised numbers will be discussed at the next Technical Working Group meeting.
- Group agreed on the need to schedule a Technical Working Group Meeting prior to the next PAG meeting, scheduled for March 25th, starting at noon and wrapping up prior to 1:30 PM PAG meeting. A meeting invite will be sent to the entire PAG; all are welcome to participate. The purpose of the Technical Working Group meeting is to reach a resolution on the updated data to be used during the evaluation process.

5. PRELIMINARY MODE SCREENING RESULTS (slides 28 – 73)

- John Lafferty, Parsons Brinckerhoff, was introduced. John provided an overview of the different initial modes being screened: commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, monorail/people mover, bus rapid transit, express bus and local bus enhancements (slides 29 thru 26). There were comments from the PAG to add the cost per mile and right-of-way requirement information to each of the mode description slides.
- John reviewed the preliminary mode screening rating system. (slides 38-46)
 - Pedro Leon, Daytona Beach International Airport, inquired if the evaluation was based on industry accepted standards.
 - Alan stated that both industry standards and local knowledge of the area are used in the screening process, for both objective and subjective assessments.
 - Blanche Hardy, DeLand, stated in her opinion and the opinions of many elected officials in Volusia County, rail is accepted by the Volusia County community and

- it should be evaluated accordingly when applying the criterion “will it integrate well into the community?”.
- Regarding Slide 42, Alison Stettner, Orange City, inquired why commuter rail was ranked low under the threshold of environmentally sustainable. Alan stated that the impact is where there is not an existing rail line. Alan explained the difference between the single and double track requirements of commuter rail.
 - There was a discussion of differences between and definitions of BRT and express bus. Most of the PAG present felt it should be viewed as being in exclusive lanes; therefore, the potential environmental impact of BRT (?) would be greater than what may be shown.
 - Regarding Slide 42, There was consensus that under the threshold, “will it integrate well into the community”, commuter rail, light rail and BRT will be ranked 2 (medium) for both environmental sustainability and right-of-way requirements.
 - The PAG agreed to eliminate light rail, monorail and people mover from future consideration. Thus the following will be advanced as the modes assessed during the refined screening process.
 - Commuter Rail
 - Streetcar
 - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
 - Express Buss
 - Local Buss
 - Alan reviewed the preliminary mode screening rating system by segment (Slides 46-59). He stated, at this time, that the measures were un-weighted. He stated the PAG may seek to add weights to some or all of the measures in the future.
 - There was a concern that if we do not evaluate a transit corridor for I-4 there will be problems down the road.
 - There was agreement on slide 47, South to Seminole, to change the “no” (red) under I-4 for commuter rail to “maybe” (yellow).
 - Ron Paradise, Deltona, inquired if cost/benefit had been factored into the segment assessment. Alan stated that a financial assessment will be included later in the process for the identified viable alternatives.
 - Elizabeth Matej, Daytona Beach, inquired if some modes will fall out before selecting a viable alternative. Alan stated that mode applicability will be further evaluated; however, at this time, the scope of the study is to produce a small set of viable alternatives for the complete study area.
 - Regarding the segment SunRail to I-4 (slide 51), Alison recommended “reducing traffic capacity” as part of the rationale for streetcar.
 - Regarding Slide 49, DeBary to DeLand segment, there was a discussion regarding BRT on this segment. Blanche stated that US 17/92 is shown in some documentation to be a 6-lane facility. She stated this may influence the mode selection in this area and should be verified.
 - In the Daytona Beach area, a discussion ensued regarding the location of the future intermodal station and the possible station for All Aboard Florida along the FEC rail line. It was determined that additional research was needed.
 - A brief discussion was held regarding weighting the goals. Alan stated that they are not weighted, and if the PAG desires a weighted system, then they will need

to provide clear direction. It was determined to proceed with the initial corridor screening without weighting, and revisit that issue after all of the segment evaluations are completed (at the March 25 PAG meeting).

- There was a discussion that the preliminary assessment appears to show commuter rail not being a viable mode outside the planned expansion from DeBary to DeLand. The PAG felt this was an issue.
- The PAG was requested to take the evaluation criteria back to their organizations and submit written comments back to Joe and Alan within a week or so.
- Immediately following the meeting, it is noted that Alison Stettner submitted the following:
 - Slide 66, DeBary to DeLand Segment, goal 1, under the measure of local and regional transit service, for CSX, why is this ranked poor if a rider can get on SunRail and get to OIA?
 - Slide 68, DeBary to DeLand Segment, goal 3, initial measure; is the percent of corridor adjacent to historic districts a good or bad thing?
 - Slide 68, DeBary to DeLand Segment, under goal 3, if a corridor exists, such as the CSX rail line, why would there be a negative impact on the surrounding environment?
 - Slide 69, goal 4 – number of planned new developments along the CSX and US 17/92 corridors, there was a 0 – why is the team not counting the DeBary TOD Overlay District and the other new development, Highland Subdivision? Why are we not giving credit for comp plan policies supporting transit and urban development patterns?
 - Slide 69, goal 4 – Linear miles through designated economic development areas – Nearly the entire US 17/92 corridor is either within a community redevelopment district or economic development area.
 - Slide 69, goal 4 – number of natural/cultural tourist attractions – This should be further evaluated. What about all of the parks, trails, and springs, etc.?

6. NEXT STEPS (slide 74)

- Continue with Initial Mode and Corridor Screening
- Prepare for public meetings in April
- Next Technical Working Group meeting, March 25th
- Next PAG meeting, March 25th

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

(NOTE: THESE MEETING TIMES ARE CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW BASED ON CONFLICTS WITH THE VOLUSIA COUNTY STATE OF THE REGION MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 25TH)

- **Technical Working Group Meeting**
Wednesday, March 25th, from Noon to 1:15 PM
FDOT District 5 Materials Office
Sailfish Room
1650 North Kepler Road
DeLand, FL 32724

- **PAG Meeting # 6:**
Wednesday, March 25, 2015, 1:30 PM - 3:30 PM
FDOT District 5 Materials Office
Sailfish Room
1650 North Kepler Road
DeLand, FL 32724

7. FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

1. Refine the purpose and need statement to replace the word “premium” with “enhanced” prior to placing it out to the public. *Responsible party: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
2. Verify what is included in the Daytona Beach population numbers. NOTE: This was checked following the PAG meeting and it was determined that the population numbers provided do include population numbers from municipalities outside of the City of Daytona Beach’s city limits. Therefore, demographic information and related assessments will be updated. *Responsible party: Parsons Brinckerhoff/AECOM*
3. Post CLG meeting minutes on project website; *Responsible parties: Parsons Brinckerhoff*
4. Create project fact sheet and April meeting information and forward to PAG members for posting on their agency website; *Responsible parties: Tindale Oliver and Parsons Brinckerhoff*
5. Send out meeting invite to the PAG for the Technical Working Group Meeting; *Responsible parties: Tindale Oliver*
6. Review and provide feedback on the initial corridor and segment screening process; *Responsible party: PAG Members, with comments to Joe Bitar/Alan Danaher no later than Friday, March 6, 2015*

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