BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN/GREENWAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE - AGENDA

DATE: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015
TIME: 9:07 A.M.
PLACE: Vista Center 4th Floor Conference Room 4E-12
        2300 North Jog Road, 4th Floor
        West Palm Beach, Florida 33411

1. REGULAR ITEMS
   A. Roll Call
   B. MOTION TO ADOPT Agenda for February 5, 2015
   C. MOTION TO APPROVE Minutes for December 4, 2014
   D. Comments from the Chair
   E. Bicycle/Pedestrian/TDM Coordinator’s Report
   F. General Public Comments and Public Comments on Agenda Items
      Any members from the public wishing to speak at this meeting must complete a
      Comment Card which is available at the welcome table. General Public
      comments will be heard prior to the consideration of the first action item. Public
      comments on specific items on the Agenda will be heard following the
      presentation of the item to the Committee. Please limit comments to three
      minutes.

2. ACTION ITEMS
   A. MOTION TO ELECT OFFICERS for the 2015 Calendar Year
      The first regular meeting of the calendar year is known as the Annual Meeting at
      which time the officers for the ensuing year are elected from the voting
      membership. At the Annual Meeting, the BGPAC, by majority vote of the voting
      members present, elects a Chair and a Vice Chair who shall serve for one year
      or until the next Annual Meeting. Since there are no January meetings
      scheduled, the election results will take effect in February.
      Mr. Alex Hansen is the current Chair and Ms. Sally Channon is the current Vice
      Chair.
B. MOTION TO RECOMMEND RECEIPT AND FILE of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan full documentation

The 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was adopted by the Palm Beach MPO on October 16, 2014. The full documentation upon which the plan was based will be distributed to FHWA, FTA and FDOT. That documentation can be reviewed at www.palmbeachmpo.org/2040LRTP

3. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Local Initiatives (LI) and Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program Schedule

Staff will present the application schedule and highlight important dates for both the Local Initiatives (LI) Program for FY 21 and the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program for FY 19. Additional information can be found at www.palmbeachmpo.org/Grants/grants2015

B. U.S. Department of Transportation Mayor’s Challenge

On January 22, 2014, U.S. Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx launched the Mayors’ Challenge for Safer People and Safer Streets—inviting mayors and other local elected officials to take significant action to improve the safety of their constituents who walk or bicycle in the next year. The challenge is based on the attached 2010 USDOT Policy statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation. More information is available at www.dot.gov/mayors-challenge.

The NACTO Urban Street Design Guide outlines both a clear vision for complete streets and a basic road map for how to bring them to fruition with principles and practices from the nation's leading urban engineers, planners and designers. Each MPO member local government will receive a copy of the latest edition. More information is available at www.nacto.org/usdg

C. Florida Bike Month

Staff will present information about Florida Bike Month planning activities scheduled for March 2015. Information will be dispersed about how each municipality can become involved.

D. WalkSafe® Program

The WalkSafe Program is a pediatric pedestrian injury prevention program based out of the University of Miami. The program provides training to local schools on key pedestrian safety concepts in an interactive and engaging fashion. It is an FDOT grant funded program; Palm Beach County is one of the target counties for this year's grant activities.

E. Presentation by Dr. Hartwig Henry Hochmair “Walk to School Route Planner”

University of Florida (UF) and Florida International University (FIU) worked in collaboration to develop the “Walk to School Route Planner” (http://maps.fiu.edu/srts/) with funding from the Miami Dade MPO. This route planner is a Web application that dynamically identifies the designated elementary school for a given home location in Miami-Dade County and computes the safest route to that designated school.

F. Correspondence

FDOT response to MPO actions regarding the FY 16-20 Draft Tentative Work Program
G. Summary Points from December 8, 2014 MPO Board Meeting and January 15, 2015 MPO Board Rolling Retreat.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS
   A. Member Comments
   B. Next Meeting – March 5, 2015
   C. MOTION TO ADJOURN

NOTICE

In accordance with Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, if a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purposes, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services for a meeting (free of charge), please call 561-684-4143 or send email to MBooth@PalmBeachMPO.org at least five business days in advance. Hearing impaired individuals are requested to telephone the Florida Relay System at #711.
1. REGULAR ITEMS

A. Roll Call

CHAIR HANSEN called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. The Recording Secretary called the roll. A quorum was present as depicted on Exhibit of these Minutes.

B. Motion to Adopt Agenda for December 4, 2014

MS. ARNOLD asked if she could address the Committee on the Town of Jupiter AIA Corridor project plans.

A motion was made by VICE CHAIR CHANNON to adopt the agenda with the modification; seconded by MR. SABIN. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Motion to Approve Minutes for October 9, 2014

CHAIR HANSEN asked if there were any other additions, deletions or changes to the October 9, 2014 minutes. There were none.

A motion was made by MR. HOWE to approve the October 9, 2014 minutes; seconded by MR. SABIN. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Comments from the Chair

CHAIR HANSEN had no comments.

E. Bicycle/Pedestrian/TDM Coordinator’s Report

MR. LAMBERT introduced FRANCHESCA TAYLOR. She is the new Senior Planner and Bike/Ped Coordinator. MS. TAYLOR will be assuming this position on January 5, 2015.

F. General Public Comments and Public Comments on Agenda Items

There were no comments from the public.
2. ACTION ITEMS
   A. Motion to Elect Officers for the 2015 Calendar Year

This item was tabled until the February 5, 2015 meeting.

B. Motion to Recommend Approval of the FDOT FY 16-20 Draft Tentative Work Program and the Palm Beach County FY 16-20 Five Year Road Program

Pursuant to §339.135(4)(d), Fla. Stat. (2014), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) shall present the work program to the MPO “to determine the necessity of making any changes to projects included or to be included in the district work program and to hear requests for new projects to be added to, or existing projects to be deleted from, the district work program.” FDOT has provided its draft Tentative Work Program for FY 16-20. For a similar purpose, the County has provided its draft annual update to the Five Year Road Program for FY 16-20. These documents include federal, state and local transportation funding for all modes for capital improvements, maintenance and operations.

A summary of the status of MPO Priority Projects, construction activities for FY 16, and significant changes between the adopted programs and the new draft documents were reviewed. In addition the Citizen’s Report for Palm Beach County, the report for district and state-wide projects affecting the County, the Turnpike’s Tentative Work Program for the County, and the County’s Five Year Road Program were reviewed.

A motion was made by MS. LEJEUNE to recommend approval of both the Draft Tentative Work Program and the Palm Beach County FY 16-20 Five Year Road Program with the following suggested modifications; seconded by VICE CHAIR CHANNON. The motion carried with CHAIR HANSEN in the minority.
   1. Allocate 30% of available “other arterial” revenue to local initiatives
   2. Allocate 100% of SU funds to local initiatives
   3. Restore funding to the SR7 extension to Northlake Blvd. in FY 16-19
   4. Fund SR 80 projects with SIS revenue

MS. ARNOLD explained the Village of Jupiter’s A1A Corridor Existing Project Plans and asked for Committee member approval.

A motion was made by MR. KREJCAREK to approve the Village of Jupiter’s proposal; seconded by VICE CHAIR CHANNON. By show of hands four members approved and five were opposed. The motion did not carry.

3. INFORMATION ITEMS
   A. Presentation by DR. HARTWIG HENRY HOCHMAIER “Walk to School Route Planner”

The speaker was not present at the meeting.

B. Presentation by Kimley-Horn on the Greenways, Blueways and Trails Plan Mapping Project

The City of Boynton Beach has been working with Kimley-Horn on their Greenways, Blueways and Trail Plan mapping program. The BGPAC was identified as a stakeholder in the scope of work. MR. STEWART ROBERTSON with Kimley-Horn, explained the initial connectivity map.

C. Presentation by Human Powered Delray on recommendations to an update of the Delray Beach Bicycle Pedestrian Task Team Report
MR. JIM CHARD addressed the Committee explaining the HPD Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

D. Palm Beach MPO Bicycle Suitability Map

MR. LAMBERT gave the members an update on the progress of the MPO 2015 Suitability Map.

E. Correspondence

FDOT Roadway Design Bulletin 14-17 dealing with Urban Arterial Lane Widths and Bicycle Lane Options was included in the agenda package.

F. The Summary Points from October 16, 2014 were included in the agenda package.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Member Comments

MR. KREJCAREK informed the Committee members that he will be resigning his membership on the BGPAC and will serve on the MPO Technical Advisory Committee. MR. ISAAC KOVNER will be replacing him on the BGPAC.

B. NEXT MEETING – February 5, 2015

C. MOTION TO ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

This signature is to attest that the undersigned is the Chairperson, or a designated nominee, of the Bicycle, Greenways, and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and that information provided herein is the true and correct Minutes for the December meeting of the Bicycle, Greenways, and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, dated this ___________ day of ____________________, 2015.

___________________________________
Chairperson

AUDIO FILES OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE PALM BEACH METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION WEBSITE: www.PalmBeachMPO.org
**EXHIBIT A**

Bicycle, Greenways and Pedestrian Committee
Attendance Record 2013 – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>Jan '14</th>
<th>Feb '14</th>
<th>Mar '14</th>
<th>Apr '14</th>
<th>May '14</th>
<th>Jun '14</th>
<th>Jul '14</th>
<th>Aug '14</th>
<th>Sept '14</th>
<th>Oct '14</th>
<th>Nov '14</th>
<th>Dec '14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORNELIA WANTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC – Traffic Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEAN MATTHEWS/John Wildner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC- Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL HOWE/David Wiloch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC – Planning Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ALEX HANSEN/Denise Malone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Palm Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL OWENS/Joyell Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOY PUERTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boca Raton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANALD KREJCAREK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Delray Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENDA ARNOLD/Jacquelyn Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alt</td>
<td>Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jupiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALLY CHANNON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC ERM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA PRIETO/Eitan Esan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt</td>
<td>Alt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNIFER FIERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT – Ex Officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARISSE LEJEUNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Alt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boynton Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB SABIN/Alan Friedberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton Bicycle Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUKE LAMBERT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim BGPAC Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 Chair **2014 Vice-Chair P = Member Present Alt = Alternate Present
E = Excused Absence A = Absent/No Attendance - = Member not assigned ***New Appointment

Shaded Column – Meeting not held
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS PRESENT</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Kovner</td>
<td>City of Delray Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Bojanowski</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Walton</td>
<td>Bike Friendly Jupiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morgan</td>
<td>City of Delray Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Majors</td>
<td>City of Boynton Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Ferraiolo</td>
<td>Village of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Juan</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn and Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Robertson</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn and Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Bastian</td>
<td>Human Powered Delray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Chard</td>
<td>Human Powered Delray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchesca Taylor</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malissa Booth</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellie Fernandez</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Uhren</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Lambert</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Transportation Alternatives Application Cycle
FY 2018/2019 Tentative Work Program
January 16, 2015

The Florida Department of Transportation is pleased to notify you of the upcoming Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for FY 2018/2019 Tentative Work Program. Projects programmed for this cycle will be funded in FY 18/19.

General Information:
The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) authorized under Section 1122 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 213(b), 101(a)(29)) provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; safe routes to school projects; and projects for the planning, design or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

Funding for this cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>TALU</th>
<th>TALT*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>$2,240,001.00</td>
<td>$2,177,539.48</td>
<td><strong>$4,417,540.48</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>$1,614,630.00</td>
<td>$1,573,415.11</td>
<td><strong>$3,188,045.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>$171,095.02</td>
<td>$191,096.64</td>
<td><strong>$362,191.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>$309,508.98</td>
<td>$344,642.87</td>
<td><strong>$654,151.85</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>$178,990.00</td>
<td>$101,289.00</td>
<td><strong>$464,936.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TALT fund distribution is at the District’s discretion
**TALL and TALN funding cannot be combined
Notes:
1. The funding is estimated allotment from FHWA, and is subject to change.
2. The program, and thus each project, must be “self sustaining” and as such, the following items must be accounted for in the total project funding:
   a) Phase 31 – FDOT project design support (all projects) - $5,000 or $7,000 for critical projects
   b) Phase 61 – FDOT project construction support (all projects) - $5,000 or $7,000 for critical projects
   c) Phase 62 – 3% of TOTAL construction estimate – FDOT Oversight CEI (all projects)
   d) Phase 58 – construction costs (FHWA/FDOT as well as local fund contribution)
   e) Phase 68 – Maximum of 12% of eligible FHWA/FDOT Phase 58 contribution to be used for CEI (optional)

All of these project phases are added to equal the amount of funding awarded for a project and are shown on the application and cost estimate.

Certified Agencies:
Two types of LAP certification are currently in use; Full and Project Specific.
The 5 County Engineering Offices carry the Full Certification. All other Local Agency Engineering Offices must pursue Project Specific Certification. More information on this topic can be found on our District Internet site. Project Specific Certification documents are not required at the time of application.

How to Apply:
The key to a successful project starts with a clear vision. Each application package consists of the following submittal items:
   1. Completed application checklist
   2. Completed application (one PDF file)
   3. Aerial Location Map depicting the project limits (one PDF file)
   4. Scope (one PDF file)
   5. Typical section (one PDF file)
   6. Right-of-Way ownership verification (one PDF file)
   7. Plats, deeds, prescriptions, certified surveys and/or easements (one PDF file)
   8. Completed cost estimate using the revised format (one Excel file) prepared and signed by a Professional Engineer from the Agency’s Engineering Office

Attached are the application tools and requirements. These files can be used, or they can be obtained from our District Internet site.

Applications are due to the Palm Beach MPO by noon February 27, 2015. Please submit one (1) electronic copy (PDF file) to Franchesca Taylor (FTaylor@PalmBeachMPO.org). Additionally, three (3) hard copies should be delivered to:

Palm Beach MPO
4th Floor East, #4E-13, 2300 N. Jog Road., West Palm Beach, FL 33411
Attn: Franchesca Taylor

www.dot.state.fl.us
2015 Transportation Alternatives Program – Application Checklist

Dear Applicant:

Thank you for your interest in the 2015 Transportation Alternatives Program cycle. Please use the following checklist to ensure you are including all information and attachments required to complete the application. All of the following must be filled out and/or included:

☐ General Application Information
☐ Location Map (Aerial)
☐ Scope of Work
☐ Typical Section
☐ Right-of-Way Ownership Verification
☐ Plats, deeds, prescriptions, certified surveys and/or easements
☐ Detailed Cost Estimate Spreadsheet prepared and signed by a Professional Engineer from the Agency’s Engineering Office
General Information:

Project Title: Click here to enter text
Project Sponsor (municipal, county, state, or federal agency, or tribal council): Click here to enter text
Contact Person: Click here to enter text          Title: Click here to enter text
Email: Click here to enter text
Sponsor Address: Click here to enter text
City: Click here to enter text          Zip: Click here to enter text
Priority (relative to other applications submitted by the Project Sponsor): Click here to enter text
Name of Applicant (If other than Project Sponsor): Click here to enter text

The applicant
☐ seeks project-specific LAP Certification         ☐ is currently LAP Certified
☐ has never been LAP Certified                 ☐ has been LAP certified in the last 5 years

1 Qualifying Activities:

Check the transportation alternatives activity that the proposed project will address. Please check one activity that represents the majority of the work proposed. (Note: Checking more activities does not ensure or increase eligibility.) Eligible activities must be consistent with details described under 23 U.S.C. 213(b).

☐ Construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

☐ Construction of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.

☐ Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users

☐ Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas

☐ Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising

☐ Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities

☐ Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control
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Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23

Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to:

- address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in sections 133(b)(11), 328(a), and 329 of title 23; or
- reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.

The safe routes to school program under section 1404 of the SAFETEA-LU note, Florida’s Safe Routes to School Infrastructure application must accompany this application to be considered for funding.

infrastructure-related projects on any public road or any bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail in the vicinity of schools that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, including sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction improvements, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, on-street bicycle facilities, off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, secure bicycle parking facilities, and traffic diversion improvements in the vicinity of schools.

Application is attached

Noninfrastructure-related activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school, including public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs.

Constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

2 Project Description: (all of the following items are required - applications without this information will not be reviewed)

Road Name: Click here to enter text
Road Number: Click here to enter text
Local Road
State Road
Project Limits: Begin: Click here to enter text End: Click here to enter text
Begin Project Mile Post (MP): Click here to enter text End Project MP: Click here to enter text

A location map with an aerial view is attached. (Location_Map.pdf)

(a) What is the scope of work for the project and where is the project located (what are the termini)?
A more detailed scope of work is attached. (Use attached Scope.doc)

Please type your description here}
(b) Summarize any special characteristics of project. Include a Typical Section depicting existing and proposed features and dimensions and right of way lines
☐ Typical section is attached (Typical_Section.pdf)

(Please describe your Typical Section here)

(c) Right-of-Way acquisition is NOT permitted for Transportation Alternatives projects. Describe the project's existing Right-of-Way ownerships. This description shall identify when the Right-of-Way was acquired and how ownership is documented (i.e. plats, deeds, prescriptions, certified surveys, easements).
☐ No Right-of-Way acquisition is proposed

(Please describe existing Right-of-Way ownerships here)

(d) Display the existing ownership with Right-of-Way maps to verify that all proposed work is within existing Right-of-Way currently owned by the Project Sponsor. Provide required right-of-way documentation (Right-of-Way.pdf):
☐ Right-of-Way maps are attached
☐ Plats, deeds, prescriptions, certified surveys, and/or easements are attached

(e) Describe any related project work phases that are already complete or currently underway.
☐ This is not a phased project
☐ Previous phases of this project were constructed as LAP projects or JPA using FM numbers

(Please type your description here)

(f) Provide detailed project cost estimate. Estimate shall be broken down to FDOT typical pay items to allow for verification of eligible project costs. Estimates are to be prepared and signed by a Professional Engineer from the Local Agency's Engineering office.

Use the following links to access the basis of estimates manual as well as historical cost information for your area:
   Basis of Estimates Manual
   Historical Cost Information

☐ A detailed cost estimate is attached (Use attached Estimate.xlsx)

(g) Other specific project information that should be considered.

(Please type your description here)
3 Project Implementation Information:

Attach documentation as exhibits to this application.

(a) Describe the proposed method of performing (i.e. contract or in-house) and administering (i.e. local or state) each work phase of the project. If it is proposed that the project be administered by a governmental entity other than the Department of Transportation, the Agency must be certified to administer Federal Aid projects in accordance with the Department’s Local Agency Program Manual (topic no. 525-010-300). Web site: www.dot.state.fl.us/projectmanagementoffice/lap/default.htm

- Design to be conducted by in-house staff
- Design to be conducted by FDOT pre-qualified consultant (1) (2)
- Design to be conducted by non-FDOT pre-qualified consultant (2)
- CEI to be conducted by in-house staff
- CEI to be conducted by FDOT pre-qualified consultant (1) (2)
- CEI to be conducted by non-FDOT pre-qualified consultant (2)

(1) FDOT pre-qualified consultants must be used on all design and CEI work for critical projects (a project is considered critical when it features a structure, has a budget greater than $10 million and/or is on the State Highway System (SHS))

(2) Design consultant and CEI consultant shall not be the same.

(b) Describe any public (and private, if applicable) support of the proposed project. (Examples include: written endorsement, formal declaration, resolution, financial donations or other appropriate means).

(Please type your description here)

(c) Describe the proposed ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the project when it is completed.

(Please type your description here)

(d) Describe source of matching funds and any restrictions on availability.

(Please type your description here)

(e) Other specific implementation information that should be considered.

(Please type your description here)
4 Cost Estimate:

The total amount of Transportation Alternative Program (TAP**) funds requested per projects (infrastructure) must be in excess of $250,000 with a maximum of $1,000,000 (though some T/MPO’s may choose to use a lesser upper limit). Transportation Alternative Program funds will be used to fund Construction, Construction Engineering and Inspection Activities (CEI), and FDOT In-House Support Activities. Local Funds (LF) will be used for all non-participating items, contingency activities, and any costs in excess of the awarded alternatives (TAP) allocation.

Total Construction Cost Estimate: This is the total project construction cost estimate including all alternatives related items and any additional scope of work being identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(A) Total Construction Cost Estimate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(B) Cost Estimate of Eligible (participating) items</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Breakdown</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(C) FDOT In-House Design Support (phase 31)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(D) (Critical projects only) FDOT In-House Design Support (phase 31)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(E) FDOT In-House Construction Support (phase 61)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(F) (Critical projects only) FDOT In-House Construction Support (phase 61)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(G) TAP funds requested for Construction</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(H) Local Funds for Construction and Contingency</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(I) Local Funds for Contingency</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(J) CEI (phase 68 - optional)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(K) Construction Engineering &amp; Inspection Activities</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(L) Transit Related projects FTA 10% administrative fees</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(M) FDOT Oversight CEI (3% of TOTAL Construction Cost)</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(N) Total TAP funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(O) Total LF funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(P) Total Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Letters before the descriptions in the cost estimate above relate to the detailed cost estimate spreadsheet (Cost_Estimate.xlsx) and should match the corresponding figures exactly.

** Use of the term TAP represents the actual funding codes of TALT, TALU and TALL.

Notes:

1. The Total Construction Cost Estimate in this field must be equal to the Total Construction Cost Estimate from the attached detailed project cost estimate.
2. Cost Estimate of Eligible (participating) items must be equal to the Subtotal FHWA Participating from the attached detailed project cost estimate.
3. FDOT In-House Design and Construction Support must be included in TAP funds for an amount no less than $5,000, an additional $2,000 is required for critical projects. This is a required item.
4. It is strongly recommended that the applicant allocates a nominal amount for CEI. In the event that the project is programmed without any request for Phase 68 funding, there is no opportunity to allocate CEI funds based on bid savings.
5. Any required Federal Transit Authority (FTA) administrative fees must be included in Local Funds.
6. FDOT Oversight CEI must be included in TAP funds and be equal to 3% of the Total Construction Cost Estimate.
5 Certification of Project Sponsor:

I hereby certify that the proposed project herein described is supported by ____________________________ (municipal, county, state or federal agency, or tribal council) and that said entity will: (1) provide any required funding match; (2) enter into a LAP and maintenance agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation; (3) comply with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Acquisition Policies Act for any Right of Way actions required for the project, (4) comply with NEPA process prior to construction, this may involve coordination with the State Historic and Preservation Office (SHPO) prior to construction. (Not at time of application) and (5) support other actions necessary to fully implement the proposed project. I further certify that the estimated costs and/or failure to follow through on the project once programmed in the Florida Department of Transportation’s Work program included herein are reasonable. I understand that significant increases in these costs could cause the project to be removed from the Work Program and/or significantly increase the local agency match required.

__________________________________________
Signature

__________________________________________
Name (please type or print)

__________________________________________
Title

__________________________________________
Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR FDOT USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include in Work Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ENGINEERS COST ESTIMATE**

**Project Description:** INSERT PROJECT TITLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Item Number</th>
<th>Pay Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Engineer's Cost</th>
<th>Engineer's Subtotal Cost</th>
<th>Total Quantity</th>
<th>Total Engineer's Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 3% -$</td>
<td>FDOT Overhead Design Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LS 12% -$</td>
<td>FDOT In-House Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Subtotal:** $5,000.00

*Projects on the State Highway System and Critical Projects SHALL utilize FDOT pay item numbers and descriptions.

- Non-participating Items:
  - Missing & Other materials
  - Engineering work (Optional services; Survey; Video Inspection; AIDT plans preparation; As-buils/record drawings)
  - Utility work—this includes, but is not limited to: valve adjustments, utility relocations, FPL power pole relocations, AT&T directional bore, etc...

Other elements are non-participating; the ones listed above are the commonly used pay items that are non-participating.

If you have any questions regarding an eligible or non-participating item, please contact us.
SCOPE OF WORK

Project Description:

Financial Project Id: 1T
Road Number: 1T
Local Road Name: 1T
Project Begins: 1T
Project Ends: 1T
Local Road
Western Limit
Eastern Limit
State Road
Southern Limit
Northern Limit

Agency Name: 1T
Contract Coordinator: 1T
Agency Project Manager: 1T
Design-in-house
Design by Consultant
Consultant Firm: 1T

Type of Project:

LAP
JPA
Department let

Project Funding Program:

Safety
Transportation Alternatives (TAP)
Safe Routes to School (must also select TAP)
CIGP
TRIP
SCOP
Local Funds (LF)
Other _________ (specify)

Work Mix: (note, this item represents the greatest amount of the construction cost)

Landscape
Bike Lane
Intersection Work
Sidewalk
Turn lane
Multi-use Path
Pedestrian Lighting
ITS/Traffic Management
Roadway Lighting
Resurfacing
Roadway Widening
Other

Initial Scope of Work:

Date: Click here to enter text.

(Please type the Proposed scope of work here; for example):

“Construction of 5’ concrete sidewalk on the east side of the road, construction of a 12’ northbound turn lane onto Maple Street, median and roadside landscaping.”

Proposed Typical Section

Description: Click here to enter text.

Right-of-Way:

All work proposed within existing Right-of-Way
Existing Right-of-Way width: XXX ft
Additional Right-of-Way required
Additional Right-of-Way width needed: XXX ft

Median:

No existing median
Existing median width: Click here to enter text.
SCOPE OF WORK

☐ Proposed median width:  

**Sidewalk:**
- Existing sidewalk: ☐ yes ☐ no
- Proposed sidewalk on: ☐ one side ☐ both sides
- Widen existing sidewalk: ☐ no
- Replace existing sidewalk: ☐ yes
- No sidewalk work proposed: ☐ no

Proposed total sidewalk width:  

Proposed sidewalk material: ☐ concrete ☐ asphalt ☐ paver

**Roadway:**
- Existing curb and gutter to remain: ☐ yes ☐ no
- Widen for bike-lane: ☐ yes ☐ no
- Re-stripe for bike lane: ☐ yes

**ADA**
- Check all crosswalks, sidewalks, ramps for compliance with ADA standards: ☐ yes
- No modifications proposed: ☐ no

**ACCESS MANAGEMENT**
- No access management revisions: ☐ yes

**LIGHTING**
- Pedestrian lighting proposed: ☐ yes
- No lighting proposed: ☐ no
- Roadway lighting proposed: ☐ yes

**LANDSCAPING**
- Median landscape: ☐ yes
- No landscape proposed: ☐ no
- Non-median landscape: ☐ yes

**SIGNALIZATION**
- Existing signalization to be replaced: ☐ yes
- New signalization location proposed: ☐ yes
- No changes to signalization proposed: ☐ no
SCOPE OF WORK

1T

TRANSPORTATION

☐ Jump queue might be possible
☐ Upgrade existing bus bay area
☐ Contact Transit providers to determine any new desired bus bay locations
☐ No new bus bay proposals

Click here to enter text.

SCHOOL ZONE

☐ Existing flashing school zone signal on state road, check if necessary or proper
☐ High emphasis cross walk at un-signalized crossing, determine if signal warranted
☐ No school zone within the project limits

Click here to enter text.

UTILITIES

☐ Sub-surface relocation is required
☐ Utility Coordination is required
☐ No utility relocation required

Click here to enter text.

DRAINAGE/PERMIT

☐ Existing closed drainage system to remain
☐ Existing open drainage system to remain
☐ No new drainage proposal

Click here to enter text.

RAILROAD

☐ Rail crossing within limits
☐ Replace all railroad signal equipment and gates
☐ There is no railroad within the project limits

Click here to enter text.

BRIDGES
SCOPE OF WORK

☐ Retrofit existing rails on bridges
☐ There is no bridge within the project limits
☐ No work to existing bridge is proposed

Click here to enter text.

NOISEWALLS

☐ Will determine need during study
☐ No noise barrier proposal

Click here to enter text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity and Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Program Kick-off.</strong> MPO distributes the procedure and application forms to potential applicants such as municipalities and local interest groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Applicant Workshop.</strong> FDOT and MPO staff to review application requirements, scoring criteria, schedule and project implementation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Applications Due to MPO.</strong> Completed applications to be submitted by project applicants to the MPOs/County Commissions. Prior to application submittal, project applicants are encouraged to have qualified staff conduct field reviews to ensure that potential projects are “constructible” and require no right-of-way acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27 - March 20, 2015</td>
<td><strong>MPO Application Screening.</strong> MPO screen applications for completeness and accuracy, and determine a pre-eligibility ranking for those projects that appear to be eligible and “constructible”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Submit Project List and Tentative Rankings to FDOT.</strong> MPO to submit applications and a summary list of candidate projects with tentative staff project rankings to the Program Management Office (Stacy Miller) for project feasibility assessment and eligibility determination. Note: the total dollars requested should not exceed twice the total funding limit for the respective MPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Joint TAC/CAC - TSM, Transit and Freight Local Initiatives presentations and review ranking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2015</td>
<td><strong>BGPAC - TA and non-motorized LI project presentations and review ranking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2015</td>
<td><strong>FDOT D4 returns Eligibility Determinations</strong> to MPO who select and approve the final priority ranking for eligible projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority List to Committees: July 1/2, 2015</td>
<td><strong>MPO Final Ranking.</strong> MPO begin final priority ranking for eligible projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Submit Final Rankings to FDOT.</strong> MPOs/County Commissions submit an adopted list of finalized priority Alternatives projects to the FDOT D4 Program Management Office (Stacy Miller) and notify sponsors of final priority rankings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Section 1 – School & Applicant Information

## Proposed Activity or Program

**Name of Proposed Activity or Program:**

**Brief Description of Proposed Activity or Program:**

## School Information

**County or Counties:**

**City or Cities:**

**Type of school(s) (check all that apply):**

- [ ] Public
- [ ] Private
- [ ] Elementary
- [ ] Middle
- [ ] High
- [ ] Other types of schools*

* **Explain Other schools below**

**Number of schools involved**

- [ ] 1-3 schools involved. Name(s) of school(s)
  
  **#1:**
  **#2:**
  **#3:**

- [ ] Multiple schools. Explain below how many schools will be involved, and their involvement.

## Applicant Information

- [ ] School Board
- [ ] Private School
- [ ] Governmental Agency
- [ ] Other

**Name of Agency/Organization:**

**Contact Person:**

**Title:**

**Daytime Phone:**

**E-mail:**

**Mailing Address:**

**City:**

**State:** Florida

**Zip:**

**Signature:**

**Typed Name:**

**Date:**

**Signature of School Board or school representative required when different from applicant:**

**Signature:**

**Typed Name:**

**Date:**
### Section 2 – General Program Information

1. **Data Collection:** Please review the data collection forms found at this link: [http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/resources/index.cfm](http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/resources/index.cfm). Baseline data collection is required at the beginning of your program and follow-up data collection is required at its completion. Do you agree to provide this data following the FDOT District’s schedule?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   Please describe how you plan to collect this data.

2. **Target population information:** Describe below the population targeted, including:
   - the demographics of your target population
   - the number of children in the school or schools
   - how many children you plan to target with your program
   - how many children currently walk or cycle to school
   - how many more children would be able to walk or cycle to school if your program is successful
   - if your program (or part of it) is directed toward adults, how many adults you plan to involve

3. **Problem identification:** Describe below what problem you are trying to address. Consider the current walking and cycling conditions in your project area, any problems or obstacles children encounter when they walk or cycle to school, educational needs, etc.
4. **Proposed solution**: Describe below your proposed solution is and how it will help solve the problems you have identified. Please write this in the form of a Scope of Services narrative. Include:
- what the program consists of
- what students you are targeting (the whole school or targeted groups)
- who your partners are and how they will help you with this program
- if there is personnel involved, explain who the personnel are, what they will be doing, and how compensation was figured
- whether the project addresses problems within two miles of the school
# Section 3 A– Background Information: Planning

**SRTS projects are most successful in the context of comprehensive planning**

Describe below your past school planning efforts:

- Has your school used the Florida Safe Ways to School Tool Kit, or a similar planning process to develop its proposals? (see [http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd/html_safe-ways.html](http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd/html_safe-ways.html))
- Who participated in the school planning efforts?
- Describe the planning process for accessibility to your school
- Does your school have approved walking maps? If so, how were these developed?
- Have you discussed school traffic, safety, or access problems with the Community Traffic Safety Team? If so, what were the results?

Describe below your future school planning efforts:

- What method do you plan to use?
- Who do you plan to involve?
- What is your timeline?
Section 3B– Background Information: The 5 E’s

Safe Routes to School is designed to be a comprehensive program, encompassing the Five E’s listed below. Describe what efforts your school has made to address the identified problem through each E so far, and what is planned in the future. Each box must be filled in. For more explanation of the Five E’s, the Florida’s Safe Routes to School Guidelines or [http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/](http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Engineering:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your school has taught or plans to teach the Florida Traffic and Bicycle Safety Education Program (FTBSEP) or a similar program, provide details in the “Past Education” box below. For more information on this program, see [http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd/](http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouragement:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Encouragement:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enforcement:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 4– Budget Detail & Narrative

Below each item, explain how the item will support the program, and other appropriate details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Requested Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Services</strong> <em>(List titles and totals in first boxes below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Narrative, include numbers of hours, hourly rates, who this person is, and whether it’s a new position or hours and duties added to an existing position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational items:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Items:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Capital Outlay:**

|                          |                 |
| Equipment:               |                 |
|                          |                 |
|                          |                 |
Total Request:
**Section 4B – Budget Narrative**

**Explain any voluntary local matches for your program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain in more detail below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What each requested budget item listed is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How each will be used in your activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personnel Services:**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:

**Expenses: Materials and Supplies**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:

**Expenses: Educational items**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:

**Expenses: Promotional Items**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:

**Expenses: Other Expenses**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:

**Operating Capital Outlay:**
1. Item detail:

2. Activity:
Florida's Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Application
2015 Call for Applications
For anticipated funds through FFY 2018/19
Note: fields will expand as needed

Section 1 – School, Applicant & Maintaining Agency Information

Notes: Signatures confirm the commitment of the Applicant and Maintaining Agency to follow the Guidelines of Florida’s Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program. The Maintaining Agency is generally responsible for entering into a Local Agency Program (LAP) agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to design, construct, &/or maintain the project. FDOT Districts have the option to design and/or construct the project, but the Maintaining Agency is always responsible for maintaining the project. Check with your District to see how they are handling these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County:</th>
<th>City:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

School Name: Congressional District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Check below which of the required agencies or organizations is the Applicant:

- School Board
- Private School
- Maintaining Agency

Name of Applicant Agency/Organization:
Contact Person:
Title:
Mailing Address:
City:
State: Florida
Zip:
Daytime Phone:
E-mail:
Signature:
Date:

Signature of School Board or school representative mandatory when different from applicant:
Signature:
Date:
Typed name:
Title:

Check below which of the required agencies is the Maintaining Agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Florida Department of Transportation:</th>
<th>District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name of Maintaining Agency:
DUNS Number:
Contact Person:
Title:
Mailing Address:
City:
State: Florida
Zip:
Daytime Phone:
E-mail:
Signature:
Date:

Note: your signature below indicates your agency’s willingness to enter into a LAP or other formal agreement with FDOT to complete the project if selected for funding.
Signature:
Date:

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Support: If the city or county is located within an MPO urban area boundary, the MPO representative must fill in the required information below, to indicate support for the proposed project:

Name of MPO:
Contact Person:
Title:
Mailing Address:
City:
State: Florida
Zip:
Daytime Phone:
E-mail:
Signature:
Date:

Designated Contact: Check below the primary contact (the one the District should coordinate with):

- Applicant
- Maintaining Agency
- MPO
### Section 2 – Eligibility and Feasibility Criteria

**Notes:** This section will help FDOT determine the eligibility and feasibility of the proposed project. **You must fulfill requirements in 2A-2C before applying!**

| A1. | Has a school-based SRTS Committee (including school representation) been formed? | Yes | No |
| A2. | Has at least one meeting of this committee been held? Attach sign in sheet & minutes | Yes | No |
| A3. | Public notification of SRTS meeting? | Yes | No |

**B1.** Does the school agree to provide required data before and after the project is built, using the NCSRTS Student In-Class Travel Tally form at [http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/resources/index.cfm](http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/resources/index.cfm) following the schedule provided by the District? | Yes | No |

**B2.** Have you attached the National Center’s data summary for the Travel Tally to this application? | Yes | No |

**C.** Have you provided either survey/as-builts or right of way documentation that provides detail to show that adequate right of way exists for proposed improvement? | Yes | No |

**D.** Is the Maintaining Agency Local Agency Program (LAP) Certified? (currently qualified & willing to enter into a State agreement requiring the agency to design, construct, and/or maintain the project, abiding by Federal, State, & local requirements?)

- **If No:**
  - Are they willing to become LAP Certified? | Yes | No |
  - If the agency is not willing to become LAP Certified, explain how this project could be built without this certification;

**E.** Who do you propose to be responsible for each phase of the project?

- Design: City | County | Other, Including FDOT (Explain below)
- Construction: City | County | Other, Including FDOT (Explain below)
- Maintenance: City | County | Other, Including FDOT (Explain below)

If you checked Other, including FDOT for any of the above, please explain the responsible party for each phase, including who you have been talking to about this:

**F.** Is the County/City willing to enter into an agreement with FDOT to do the following, if the District decides this is the best way to get the project completed:

- Install and/or maintain any traffic engineering equipment included in this project? | Yes | No |
- Construct and maintain the project on a state road? | Yes | No | N/A |

**G.** Public Support - Explain your public information or public involvement process below. You may attach up to six unique letters, on official letterhead, from groups indicated below. The letters should indicate why and how the authors can support the proposed project at the affected school.

- What neighborhood association or other neighborhood meetings have been held to inform neighbors directly affected by this proposed project and the reaction?
- What PTA/PTO/school meetings have been held to inform parents and school staff about this project and the reaction?
- Explain what other public meetings have been held, such as Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Planning Councils, Citizens’ Advisory Committees, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Councils and Community Traffic Safety Teams and the reaction?
- Explain what articles or letters to the editor have been written for newspapers, etc. and the reaction.

Please indicate whether you have attached letters of support from Law Enforcement or other individuals or groups not previously mentioned: Yes | No |

**H.** If the proposed project has been identified as a priority in a Bicycle/Pedestrian or other Plan, or is a missing link in a pedestrian or bicycle system, please explain:

**I.** OTHER INFORMATION: Describe below other relevant information that you believe further supports funding

1. Opportunity to resolve a documented hazardous walking condition and eliminate the resultant school busing. Include a discussion of public support for the project if busing were eliminated:
2. Opportunity to eliminate current courtesy busing being done for a perceived hazardous condition. Include a discussion of public support for the project if busing were eliminated:
### Section 3 – Background Information: Five E’s

**Notes:** SRTS is designed to be a comprehensive program. Describe the efforts your school and community have made to address the identified problem through each E so far, and what is planned in the future for each. Each box must be filled in. For more information on the E’s, see Florida’s SRTS Guidelines and the SRTS Guide: [http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/](http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Education: If your school has taught or plans to teach the Florida Traffic and Bicycle Safety Education Program (FTBSEP; see: <a href="http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd">http://www.dcp.ufl.edu/centers/trafficSafetyEd/</a>) or other education program, please provide details below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1. Encouragement Past:</th>
<th>C2. Encouragement Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1. Enforcement Past:</th>
<th>D2. Enforcement Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1. Evaluation Past:</th>
<th>E2. Evaluation Future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4 – Problem Identification

This section will help us understand your school’s situation. If the proposed project includes more than one school, please give the requested information for each school. For a successful SRTS project, we would expect applicants to answer Yes to A, B or both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Are many children already walking or bicycling to this school in less than ideal conditions?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Yes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain more about the number of children affected:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain more about the conditions/obstacles which prevent walking or bicycling to your school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Are enough students living near the school to allow many children to walk or bike to school if conditions were improved?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Yes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain more about the number of children living near the school and how this relates to the anticipated success of the proposed SRTS project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Write a brief history of the neighborhood traffic issues as background for the proposed project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. How do the demographics of the school population relate to the anticipated success of the proposed SRTS project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For instance, is there a population of students near the school from a culture which traditionally walks a lot?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Provide the percent of free or reduced lunch program at the affected school:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Have you included 5 years of crash data for the project location?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If no, then why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. STUDENT TRAVEL DATA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School data: based on the Student In-Class Travel Tally:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of students currently walking to school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of students currently biking to school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total currently walking or biking to school (add a &amp; b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of students in this school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children in school currently walking or biking to school: (c divided by d):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Route Data:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of students from the affected schools living along the proposed route:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Based on (mark all that apply): *Existing School Data:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of children currently walking or biking along this route:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of children who could walk or bike along the proposed route after improvements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 5: Current Conditions

A. LOCATION  Notes: the entire proposed project must be within 2 miles of the school and in the attendance area for the affected schools. You must attach maps illustrating the area.

Request #1 St. Name:  Maintaining Agency:  □ City  □ County  □ State
From:  To:
Project’s closest point to school:  □ 0 to ½ mile;  □ ½ to 1 mile;  □ 1 to 1 ½ miles;  □ 1 ½ miles+

Request #2 St. Name:  Maintaining Agency:  □ City  □ County  □ State
From:  To:
Project’s closest point to school:  □ 0 to ½ mile;  □ ½ to 1 mile;  □ 1 to 1 ½ miles;  □ 1 ½ miles+

See Attachment for additional project sites:  □

Discuss the projects’ proximity (within 2 miles) to other facilities which might also benefit from the project, such as other schools or colleges, parks, playgrounds, libraries, or other pedestrian destinations:

B. ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS

Roadway Type:  □ Urban (curb & gutter)  □ Rural

Shoulder Type:  □ Grass  □ Paved  □ Curb

Shoulder Grade:  □ Flat  □ Steep-Up  □ Steep-Down

Drainage:  □ Swale  □ Concrete Ditch  □ Curb/Gutter

Status of walking surface:  □ No walking surface, paved or unpaved  □ Unpaved surface  □ Paved surface with gaps  □ Continuous paved sidewalks

Describe the status of the current walking surface, or other existing facilities or signs and markings which affect this project (bike lanes, multi-use paths, school zone signs & markings, marked crosswalks, bike parking, etc):

Section 6 – Specific Infrastructure Improvements Requested

A. LOCATION  Notes: the entire proposed project must be within 2 miles of the school and in the attendance area for the affected schools.

Request #1 St. Name:  Maintaining Agency:  □ City  □ County  □ State
From:  To:
Project’s closest point to school:  □ 0 to ½ mile;  □ ½ to 1 mile;  □ 1 to 1 ½ miles;  □ 1 ½ miles+

Request #2 St. Name:  Maintaining Agency:  □ City  □ County  □ State
From:  To:
Project’s closest point to school:  □ 0 to ½ mile;  □ ½ to 1 mile;  □ 1 to 1 ½ miles;  □ 1 ½ miles+

See Attachment for additional project sites:  □

Discuss the projects’ proximity (within 2 miles) to other facilities which might also benefit from the project, such as other schools or colleges, parks, playgrounds, libraries, or other pedestrian destinations:

B. SIDEWALK, BIKE LANE, PAVED SHOULDER, OR SHARED USE PATH REQUESTED

□ Continuation of Existing Sidewalk  □ New Sidewalk
□ Continuation of Existing Bike Lane  □ New Bike Lane (includes re-striping or reconstruction)
□ Continuation of Paved Shoulder  □ New Paved Shoulder
□ Continuation of Shared Use Path  □ New Shared Use Path
Describe below your requests in detail, including location, length, side of road, etc.

Request #1: 
Request #2: 
See Attachment for additional project sites: 

C. OTHER REQUESTS (describe the location & project characteristics of other requests such as bike parking, traffic calming, or other improvements not listed above)

- Bike parking: include the current and potential numbers of K-8 students who could use the facilities:
- Traffic calming: describe the relevance of the request to school safety, traffic speed, whether a speed study has been done and your efforts to work with law enforcement and the community to solve the speeding problems:

Describe any other requests:

D. TRAFFIC CONTROLS Mark all that apply in regard to traffic control devices:

☐ We need pedestrian signals (features)
☐ We need traffic signs
☐ We need marked crosswalks

We need other school-related signals
We need other school-related signs
We need other roadway markings

Describe the existing and needed traffic controls:

E. TRAFFIC DATA Notes: Posted Speed Limit is required. AADT stands for Average Annual Daily Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St 1: Posted Speed Limit</th>
<th>Operating Speed</th>
<th>AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 2: Posted Speed Limit</td>
<td>Operating Speed</td>
<td>AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7 - Cost Estimate Summary

- Total TAP Funds for eligible items
- Total Local Funds for non-participating, ineligible items, or additional funds

Section 7 B– Cost Estimate Narrative

1. Refer to Cost_Estimate.xlsx for detailed cost information.

Section 8 - Submission Checklist

Notes: This checklist includes required attachments. These will be counted toward total application score.

Color project maps and/or aerial photos clearly identifying:

A. ☐ School location
B. ☐ 2 mile radius around school
C. ☐ School’s attendance area
D. ☐ Existing conditions
E. ☐ Proposed improvements
F. ☐ Adopted School Walking Map

G. ☐ Travel Survey Tally
H. ☐ Sign in sheets and minutes from all meetings
I. ☐ Letters of support
J. ☐ Map showing where students live
K. ☐ Color digital photos of existing conditions
L. ☐ Detailed Crash Data
M. ☐ Traffic/Engineering report evaluating the problem
N. ☐ Detailed Cost Estimate

For FDOT District Use Only

Notes: Please complete this information before sending to Central Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding type used:</th>
<th>__________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPID:</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this project fill in a gap or provide a continuous route/path to school?  

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No  

Once application is reviewed, please check the appropriate box. Both SRTS Coordinator and Liaison should review.  

Reviewed by:  

- [ ] Liaison  
- [ ] SRTS Coordinator  
- [ ] Other  

______________________________
2015 Transportation Alternatives Program
Scoring Sheets
### SCORING CRITERIA – BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

(Maximum of 100 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(0 to 10 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project is on the County’s Bicycle Facilities Plan or the local municipality’s bicycle or pedestrian plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The project connects to an existing bicycle/pedestrian or greenway facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project provides access to a regional park, natural area, public beach, municipal athletic field or local park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project provides access to one or more educational facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The project provides access to a regional shopping center or mall, a neighborhood center or an employment center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The project provides direct access to public transportation, including a Tri-Rail station, school bus stop, a Palm Tran route, or a Community Trolley route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The project is an integral part of a neighborhood or urban redevelopment plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The project incorporates design ideas that beautify the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The project is designed for multiple use (bicycle, pedestrian and/or equestrian) and enhances non-motorized transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The project exemplifies “project excellence” based on issues not adequately addressed by the above criteria, such as whether the proposed project exhibits strong community-based support, or possesses exemplary characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Score - 0 to 100 points**

**Total Points**
BICYCLE/GREENWAYS/PEDESTRIAN/ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Palm Beach MPO

SCORING CRITERIA – GREENWAY PROJECTS
(Maximum of 100 Points)

1. The project has a positive and significant regional accessibility, educational, or environmental impact. (0 to 10 points)

2. The project provides a direct link between publicly-accessible natural areas, parks, beaches, or open spaces. (0 to 10 points)

3. The project includes trailheads, signs, bicycle racks, seating, or other enhancements or support facilities. (0 to 10 points)

4. The project provides access to educational, cultural or historical resources and/or facilities, such as schools, museums, and/or points of interest. (0 to 10 points)

5. The project includes construction of a bridge, boardwalk, overpass, underpass, or other structure for safe passage across a road, canal, wetland or other barrier to connectivity. (0 to 10 points)

6. The project incorporates design ideas that beautify the area. (0 to 10 points)

7. The project is designed for multiple uses and enhances non-motorized transportation. (0 to 10 points)

8. The project is part of an adopted connector plan, greenway, or linked open space plan or will be an addition or link to an existing greenway. (0 to 10 points)

9. The project includes landscaping that consists of more than 50% native species. (0 to 10 points)

10. The project exemplifies “project excellence” based on issues not adequately addressed by the above criteria, such as whether the proposed project exhibits strong community-based support, or possesses exemplary characteristics. (0 to 10 points)

Greenway Project Score - 0 to 100 points
Total Points
BICYCLE/GREENWAYS/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Palm Beach MPO

SCORING CRITERIA – OTHER PROJECTS
(Maximum of 100 Points)

1. The project has a positive and significant regional historic, educational, or transportation-related impact. (0 to 10 points)

2. The project is part of a neighborhood or urban redevelopment plan or an adopted connector plan, greenway, or linked open space, or will enhance such a plan. (0 to 10 points)

3. The project includes trailheads, signs, bicycle racks, seating, or other enhancements or support facilities. (0 to 10 points)

4. The project provides access directly to a historic and/or educational site or facility. (0 to 10 points)

5. The project incorporates design ideas that beautify the area, including the use of native landscaping. (0 to 10 points)

6. The project provides transportation-related educational programs, information and/or activities. (0 to 10 points)

7. The project addresses a public safety problem/situation at a specific location or provides safety-related information and/or services to the public. (0 to 10 points)

8. The project includes mechanisms or actions to protect existing historic or transportation-related resources. (0 to 10 points)

9. The project is located in, or adjacent to, or directly enhances, an accessible public facility or resource. (0 to 10 points)

10. The project exemplifies “project excellence” based on issues not adequately addressed by the above criteria, such as whether the proposed project exhibits strong community-based support, or possesses exemplary characteristics. (0 to 10 points)

Other Enhancement Project Score - 0 to 100 points

Total Points
BICYCLE/GREENWAYS/PEDESTRIAN/ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Palm Beach MPO

SCORING CRITERIA – SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL:
INFRASTRUCTURE
(Maximum of 100 Points)

1. This project has demonstrated community based support. (0-10 Points) _______

2. The project has been identified in a bicycle/pedestrian or other plan or as a missing link in a pedestrian or bicycle system. (0-10 Points) _______

3. The project will increase the safety of students already walking or bicycling to school in hazardous conditions. (0-10 Points) _______

4. The project has the potential to eliminate hazardous or courtesy busing. (0-10 Points) _______

5. The project demonstrates potential to increase the number of children walking and bicycling to school. (0-10 Points) _______

6. The project provides direct access to public transportation, including a Tri-Rail station, school bus route, a Palm Tran route, or a Community Trolley route. (0-10 Points) _______

7. The project will provide connections to neighborhoods and public destinations such as other schools, colleges, parks, playgrounds, or libraries. (0-10 Points) _______

8. The demographics of the school population relate to the anticipated success of the project. (0-10 Points) _______

9. The project includes an education, encouragement, and/or enforcement component that would increase the likelihood of students using the new facilities properly. (0-10 Points) _______

10. The project exemplifies “project excellence” based on issues not adequately addressed by the above criteria. (0-10 Points) _______

Safe Routes to School: Infrastructure - 0 to 100 points Total Points _______
BICYCLE/GREENWAYS/PEDESTRIAN/ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Palm Beach MPO

SCORING CRITERIA – SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL:
NON-INFRASTRUCTURE
(Maximum of 100 Points)

1. The project recognizes a problem, identifies the behavior(s) that should be changed, and provides one or more mechanisms to accomplish that change. (0 to 10 points) __________

2. The project targets one or more audiences (bicycles, pedestrians, motorists, etc.), estimates the number of people who would be affected by the training program (both directly and indirectly), and identifies how the training will reach the target audience(s). (0 to 10 points) __________

3. The project includes an implementation plan that identifies the locations and timing of the training and the behavioral objectives to be achieved, including the impact(s) that the changed behavior of the participants may have on others. (0 to 10 points) __________

4. The project includes a description of how one or more appropriate training media will be selected and used to achieve these behavioral objectives. (0 to 10 points) __________

5. The project provides a mechanism for evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the program delivery methods. (0 to 10 points) __________

6. The project provides samples of lesson plans, delivery strategies, course materials, and course evaluation materials. (0 to 10 points) __________

7. The project includes pilot testing, methods to check the timing and accuracy of the exercises, and mechanisms for revision of the training during and after implementation. (0 to 10 points) __________

8. The project involves end users in the development of the program. (0 to 10 points) __________

9. The project incorporates observable and measurable performance criteria for determination of the success of the training program. (0 to 10 points) __________

10. The project exemplifies “project excellence” based on issues not adequately addressed by the above criteria, such as whether the proposed project exhibits strong community-based support, or possesses exemplary characteristics. (0 to 10 points) __________

Safe Routes to School: Non-Infrastructure - 0 to 100 points Total Points __________
United States Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations

Signed on March 11, 2010 and announced March 15, 2010

Purpose

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department's support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.

Policy Statement

The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide—including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life—transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

Authority

This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.

Recommended Actions

The DOT encourages States, local governments, professional associations, community organizations, public transportation agencies, and other government agencies, to adopt similar policy statements on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes: The primary goal of a transportation system is to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Walking and bicycling are efficient transportation modes for most short trips and, where convenient intermodal systems exist, these nonmotorized trips can easily be linked with transit to significantly increase trip distance. Because of the benefits they provide, transportation agencies should give the same priority to walking and bicycling as is given to other transportation modes. Walking and bicycling should not be an afterthought in roadway design.

- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation networks. For example, children should have safe and convenient options for
walking or bicycling to school and parks. People who cannot or prefer not to drive should have safe and efficient transportation choices.

- Going beyond minimum design standards: Transportation agencies are encouraged, when possible, to avoid designing walking and bicycling facilities to the minimum standards. For example, shared-use paths that have been designed to minimum width requirements will need retrofits as more people use them. It is more effective to plan for increased usage than to retrofit an older facility. Planning projects for the long-term should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements.

- Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges: DOT encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets or paths.

- Collecting data on walking and biking trips: The best way to improve transportation networks for any mode is to collect and analyze trip data to optimize investments. Walking and bicycling trip data for many communities are lacking. This data gap can be overcome by establishing routine collection of nonmotorized trip information. Communities that routinely collect walking and bicycling data are able to track trends and prioritize investments to ensure the success of new facilities. These data are also valuable in linking walking and bicycling with transit.

- Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time: A byproduct of improved data collection is that communities can establish targets for increasing the percentage of trips made by walking and bicycling.

- Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths: Current maintenance provisions require pedestrian facilities built with Federal funds to be maintained in the same manner as other roadway assets. State Agencies have generally established levels of service on various routes especially as related to snow and ice events.

- Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects: Many transportation agencies spend most of their transportation funding on maintenance rather than on constructing new facilities. Transportation agencies should find ways to make facility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists during resurfacing and other maintenance projects.

**Conclusion**

Increased commitment to and investment in bicycle facilities and walking networks can help meet goals for cleaner, healthier air; less congested roadways; and more livable, safe, cost-efficient communities. Walking and bicycling provide low-cost mobility options that place fewer demands on local roads and highways. DOT recognizes that safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities may look different depending on the context — appropriate facilities in a rural community may be different from a dense, urban area. However, regardless of regional, climate, and population density differences, it is important that pedestrian and bicycle facilities be integrated into transportation systems. While DOT leads the effort to provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, success will ultimately depend on transportation agencies across the country embracing and implementing this policy.

Ray LaHood, United States Secretary of Transportation
Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation

Florida Bicycle Month - March, 2015
Activity Guide

Opportunities to take a self-directed trail ride throughout Palm Beach County:

Palm Beach County parks with self-directed bicycle trails
- Dyer Park
- Riverbend Park
- Affron Park
- Haverhill Park
- John Prince Park
- Okeeheelee Park
- Santalucses Park
- American Homes Park
- Burt Aaronson South County Regional Park
- Caloosa Park
- Lake Ida (West) Park
- Glades Pioneer Park

Palm Beach County parks with self directed mountain bike trails
- Dyer Park
- Okeeheelee Park
- West Delray Regional Park

BMX facilities
- Okeeheelee Park
- Loggerhead Park

Bicycle rentals available
- Okeeheelee Park
- Riverbend Park

Planned activities in celebration of Florida Bicycle Month, 2015

March 5, 2015 - Riverbend Park (Jupiter)
Full Moon Bike Ride--- (6:30-8:30pm)
$5/per person...Reservations required
Bring family and friends and discover Riverbend under the full Wolf moon. A guided ride will lead participants through the majority of the parks trails with stops for water breaks and questions. Bicycles are available for rent (please call in advance) from Canoe Outfitters, (561) 746-7053.
Maximum/50 riders.
March 14, 2015 - Therapeutic Recreation, John Prince Park (Lake Worth)
Handcycling Clinic Partnership County & Achilles International (10:00am – 2:00pm)
Draft outline of Event:
Handcycles in Parking lot, will block off the last lane of parking lot & the entire back. We will also use the Fountains building
10-10:30 arrive, welcome reception, volunteers start educating and getting people into handcycles
10:30-Noon ride thru park & parking lot for individuals that can only do a short ride.
Small groups of 4-6 with a volunteer riding through park.

Lunch – Box lunches provided by Achilles or a sponsor. County will provide bottled water.
12:30-2pm more rides through park.

• Riding will be on-going. Everything will depend on number of participants & level of participation. We will schedule sign-ups.
• We will promote this as an awareness event to educate the general public both disabled & non disabled. Anyone that comes out will have the opportunity to ride.
• We will include a Bike Safety component.

March 21, 2015 – Burt Aaronson South County Regional Park - Daggerwing Nature Center (Boca Raton)
Geocaching by Bike--- (1:00pm) $5/ per person; Reservations required
Come integrate modern technology with the exploration of nature. This BYOB* activity provides a chance for families to get outside and ride together while participating in the world-wide scavenger hunt called geocaching. Learn how to use a GPS hand held unit or bring your own smart phone with the free Geocaching Intro app installed. Learn to navigate and find a geocache and even pick up some of the lingo used by seasoned geocachers. As part of the bike tour around the park, there will be short nature talks pertaining to the area and the caches.
Please call 561-629-8760 or visit our website for details.
*Bring your own bike

March 21, 2015 - Westgate Recreation Center (West Palm Beach)
Bike Rodeo with PBSO--- (10:00am – 1:00pm)
• Location:  Northeast Parking Lot
Activity detail for event still being worked out. Estimated number of participants: 65-85. Target ages: 6-15 and families. FREE EVENT

March 29, 2015 - Dyer Park (Riviera Beach)
Jack the Bike Man’s Dyer Challenge
Add details.

TBD        West Boynton Park Bicycle Event
TBD        West Jupiter Park Bicycle Event
Add        FORCE Programs/Times
Add        Okeeheelee BMX Events
Mr. Nick Uhren, P.E.
Executive Director
Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization
2300 North Jog Road
West Palm Beach, FL 33411-2749

Dear Mr. Uhren:

SUBJECT: FY 16-20 Draft Tentative Work Program

Thank you for transmitting the Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization’s approval of the Department’s Draft Tentative Work Program, FYs 16-20. Board action included several amendments which are addressed below.

The Department is required to submit a fiscally balanced draft tentative work program to the Governor’s Office and Florida Transportation Commission. As no additional funds are available for projects, the requested amendments could only be accomplished by rearranging current programming.

- **Object** to the postponement of the construction funding for SR 7 from 60th to Northlake Blvd from FY 16 to FY 20 and **request** construction funding for this project in FY 16-19 without delaying other MPO priority projects.
  - With the constraint noted above, District 4 is unable to reprogram FPID 229664-3 to FY 17. As noted at the MPO meeting, we will work to advance this project during the development of the next Draft Tentative Work Program, FYs 17-21.

- **Request** allocation of 100% of the Surface Transportation Revenue (SU) and 30% of Other Arterial Revenue to the newly created Local Initiatives Program starting in FY 20 in order to fund at least the initial phase of all Local Initiatives Projects and to box the remaining funds until the total project costs are known.
  - The District has set aside funds in FY 20 for the local initiatives program. The intent was to fund construction for the projects designed in earlier fiscal years and set up a stream of projects for subsequent years. To fund the initial phase of the remaining Local Initiative priorities, the only option is to expend the majority/if not all of the set aside and defer construction to FY 21 and beyond. The Department believes there are benefits to the current programming as it allows construction to start sooner. However, if the Board wishes to proceed with the remaining designs in FY 20, we can make the necessary programming changes during the development of the next Draft Tentative Work Program, FYs 17-21.
Mr. Uhren  
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- **Request** modifications to the funding of Palm Tran Maintenance Facilities to show design of the Delray Beach facility in FY 16 and construction in FY 17, design of West Palm Beach facility in FY 19 and construction in FY 20.
  - The District can advance the FY 18 programming ($150K) to FY 16 for the Palm Tran facility in Delray Beach. Construction funding was not provided per your previous direction. To fund this in FY 17 ($3m) the district will need to defer other priorities; this will be accomplished during the development of the next Draft Tentative Work Program, FYS 17-21. The District can defer the FY 18 programming ($150k) to FY 19 for the Palm Tran facility in West Palm Beach. Construction funding was not provided per your previous direction. To fund this in FY 20 ($3m), the district will need to defer other priorities; this will be accomplished during the development of the next Draft Tentative Work Program, FYS 17-21.

It would be helpful to understand the Board’s expectations regarding the various priority lists. Due to allocation limitations, it is unlikely all prioritized projects will receive funding during the development of a work program. In the instance of the requests above, we can either fund the remaining design/study phases for the local initiatives projects or fund the construction of the West Palm Beach facility. The WPB facility is ranked 8th on the ‘major’ list while the local initiatives are 14, 20, and 23-26. In addition, to accommodate the Delray Beach facility ($3m) in FY 17, other priorities will be deferred. This will impact the local initiative design phases and the West Palm Beach facility.

We look forward to resolving these outstanding issues. Please feel free to contact Gerry O’Reilly at (954) 777-4411 or Stacy Miller at (954) 777-4429 to discuss.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James A. Wolfe, P.E.  
District Secretary  
District 4

JAW/slm

cc: The Honorable Mayor Susan Haynie, MPO Chair  
    Gerry O’Reilly, FDOT  
    Amie Goddeau, FDOT  
    Steve Braun, FDOT

FDOTTracker 15-00122
Summary Points of the December 8, 2014 MPO Board Meeting

PDF versions of all presentations are available for review at: http://www.palmbeachmpo.org/committees/agenda.htm

1. REGULAR ITEMS

F. Comments from the Chair

The Chair made the following comments:

- This was the last Palm Beach MPO meeting for FDOT District Secretary James Wolfe as he will retire on April 1, 2015. This was also the last meeting for Port of Palm Beach Commissioner Ed Oppel who was also retiring at the end of this year.

G. Executive Directors Report

Mr. Uhren reported on the following activities:

- Vinod Sandanasamy, Senior Planner for the MPO resigned this month and has taken a position with the City of Boca Raton. Renee Benezra, MPO Secretary is retiring in January. The MPO has two new hires; Francesca Taylor is the new Bike/Ped/TDM Coordinator and Valerie Nielson is the new Transit Coordinator, both begin their employment on January 5, 2015.

- Florida Department of Transportation Secretary Ananth Prasad announced his resignation effective January 2, 2015. His successor has not yet been named.

- On October 21-24, City of West Palm Beach Commissioner Shanon Materio, Luke Lambert from the MPO and he attended the AMPO conference in the Buckhead region of Atlanta, GA. Mr. Uhren said his personal focus was on creating walkable communities and he was particularly impressed by the private investments and collaboration in creating wider sidewalks through perpetual easements along Peachtree Blvd.

- He will be attending the Florida Automated Vehicle Summit in Orlando on December 14-15 and hopes to gain a better understanding of the state of the practice and potential impacts on transportation infrastructure.

- MPO staff will be on Tri-Rail this year for the annual office lunch. Last year they rode Palm Tran to WPB and this year they will take the train down to Delray Beach and the City’s trolley to Atlantic Ave.
• He attended the Tri-Cities Annual BBQ on Friday, December 5th. He commended Mayor Wilson and the League of Cities for hosting a quality event in a beautiful setting on Torry Island.

• Work continues with the attorneys on the interlocal agreement to modify MPO Board membership to include a full-time seat for the City of Greenacres and a new seat for the Village of Palm Springs pursuant to Board action in July.

H. The Board unanimously approved the following consent agenda items
1. MPO Board member Travel to MPOAC Meetings and MPOAC Weekend Institute.
2. Appointments of Mr. Isaac Kovner and Mr. John Morgan to the Bicycle, Greenways, and Pedestrian Advisory Committee representing the City of Delray Beach.
3. Appoints of Mr. Randal Krejcarek and Mr. Dana Little to the Technical Advisory Committee representing the City of Delray Beach.

I. General Public Comments
No public comments were received.

2. ACTION ITEMS
A. Elected officers for the MPO Board
The MPO Board unanimously elected City of Boca Raton Mayor Haynie as the 2015 Chair and Palm Beach County Commissioner Valeche as the Vice Chair.

B. Approved representatives for the Southeast Florida Transportation Council
The MPO Board unanimously approved Chair Haynie as the representative and Commissioner James as the alternate representative for the Southeast Florida Transportation Council.

C. Approved appointments to the Florida MPO Advisory Council
The MPO Board unanimously approved the appointment of Chair Haynie as the representative and Councilor Harrison as the alternate representative for the Florida MPO Advisory Council.

D. Approved the FDOT FY 16-20 Draft Tentative Work Program with three separate amendments
Following the presentation and discussion, the MPO Board approved the Draft Tentative Work Program 10-1 with Commissioner James from the City of West Palm Beach in the minority and subject to the following:
1. Object to the postponement of construction funding for SR-7 from 60th to Northlake Blvd from FY-16 to FY-20 and request construction funding for this project in FY 16-19 without delaying other MPO Priority Projects.
2. Request allocation of 100% of Surface Transportation Revenue (SU) and 30% of Other Arterials Revenue to the newly created Local Initiatives Program starting in FY-20 in order to fund at least the initial phase of all Local Initiative Projects and to box the remaining funds until total project costs are known.
3. **Request** modifications to the funding of Palm Tran Maintenance Facilities to show design of the Delray Beach facility in FY-16 and construction in FY-17, design of the West Palm Beach facility in FY-19 and construction in FY-20.

**E. Approved the Southeast Florida Regional Planning Model (SERPM) Activities Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**

The MOU between the Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach MPOs, and the Florida Department of Transportation Districts 4 and 6 seeks to assign roles and responsibilities to various agencies and create a decision-making framework to advance a model development vision.

3. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. January 2015 MPO Board Retreat**

The draft schedule for the January retreat was presented for comment.

**B. I-95 at Central /PGA Blvd Update**

FDOT staff and consultants reviewed the alternatives considered for a new interchange on I-95 at Central Blvd. as well as the current status and next steps for the project.

**C. I-95 Master Plan Update**

FDOT staff and consultants presented a summary of the methodology to evaluate interchanges on the I-95 corridor between Linton Blvd. and Northlake Blvd. and a table of currently allocated and needed funding for each location.

**D. Southeast Florida Regional Long Range Transportation Plan**

Jessica Josselyn from Kittelson & Associates highlighted the development of the Southeast Florida 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

**E. 2015 MPOAC Legislative Policy Positions and Amendment 1 Impacts**

The MPOAC’s 2015 State Legislative Policy Positions were presented with focus on:

- More general revenue, surtax options, indexed fuel taxes and/or mileage based user fee.
- Restore funds for TRIP.
- Don’t divert funds for Amendment 1 from transportation.
- Make distracted driving a primary offense.

**F. Correspondence**

The following correspondence was received by the MPO.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Roadway Design Bulletin 14-17 mandates consideration of 11’ travel lanes and 6-7’ bike lanes on urban arterials where ROW permits.

**G. Palm Beach County Draft FY 15-19 Five Year Road Program- Add-on**

The document was provided to facilitate awareness of major transportation projects proposed throughout the County.
The Program will be adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. There are 20 projects scheduled for construction in FY 15 and 16. 10 New projects were added; mostly small intersection improvements and maintenance. Jog Road extension from Roebuck to 45th Street is deleted.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Member Comments

Council Member Willhite said landscaping along the turnpike and I-95 had been discussed at previous meetings and he was glad to see new landscaping along the turnpike at various interchanges. Enjoyed holding this meeting at the Vista Center where the MPO offices are located because of the ample parking and large conference room that provides a larger seating area for the public. He also stated he was pleased the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had voted to stay with the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC).

Councilor Harrison stated she too was pleased the BCC had voted to stay with the TCRPC. She suggested expanding the SEFTC meetings to include more people and encourage others to attend those meeting to get involved in SEFTC meetings. She also encouraged people to attend the SEFTC meetings.

Commissioner Valeche expressed his concern about the effect All Aboard Florida (AAF) may have on the Coastal Link project. He said there are a lot objections to the crossings with 32 AAF trains and thinks there may be a revolt if 50 more trains are added by the Coastal Link project.

Commissioner Burdick said she highly recommended the MPOAC Weekend Institute for those Board members who have not yet attended.

B. Next Meeting

The MPO Board Rolling Retreat will replace a formal meeting on Thursday, January 15, 2015. They will meet at 9:30 A.M. at the West Palm Beach Intermodal Center, 150 Clearwater Drive (Tri-Rail southbound Platform) in West Palm Beach.

The public is welcome to join us and learn how their transportation tax dollars are put to use.

Happy Holidays from the Palm Beach MPO Board and Staff
PARTNERS
The Palm Beach MPO partnered with SFRTA, Palm Tran, the City of West Palm Beach, the City of Boca Raton, the City of Delray Beach and the City of Lake Worth to provide the first ever rolling retreat for Board members and other participants.

1. **Arrival at West Palm Beach Intermodal Center**

Participants arrived at the West Palm Beach Intermodal Center at 9:30 a.m. and were given a backpack containing the agenda package, notepad and pen, rain poncho, Tri-Rail pass and audio headsets for enhanced hearing while various speakers made their presentations on the train, bus, trolleys and walking tours. Mr. Uhren, Palm Beach MPO executive director, highlighted the history of the intermodal center, its function as a mass transit hub, and the various modes of transportation provided at the center.

A. **Travel to Boca Raton Station on Tri-Rail**

Mr. William Cross, SFRTA director of planning and capital development, gave an overview of the Regional Tri-Rail System and Key SFRTA Projects and Initiatives.

B. **Arvida Park of Commerce Commuter Shuttle or El Rio Trail / I-95 at Spanish River Blvd. Interchange**

Participants chose from one of two short excursions.

1. **Commuter Shuttle** – Ms. Joy Puerta, transportation analyst for the City of Boca Raton discussed the development of routes, ridership and destinations served. She also highlighted other transit connections and transit infrastructure and technology needs at the Tri-Rail station.

2. **El Rio Trail / I-95 Interchange** – Mr. Rasem Awwad, transportation planning engineer for the City of Boca Raton, discussed the trail's history, funding, usage and connection to Tri-Rail. Mr. Ron Wallace, FDOT project manager, highlighted construction activity and the project schedule for the I-95 /Spanish River Interchange.

C. **Travel to Delray Beach Station on Tri-Rail**

Mr. Randal Krejcarek, environmental services director for the City of Delray Beach, discussed the City’s trolley services.

D. **Walking tour of Downtown Delray Beach**

Mr. Randal Krejcarek, environmental services director for the City of Delray Beach and Mr. Jeff Costello, CRA director highlighted publicly and privately funded
projects, AAF/FEC railroad crossing issues, and walkable street infrastructure along the Atlantic Ave. corridor.

E. **Bus ride to WPB Intermodal Center via Boynton Beach, Lake Worth on US1**

Palm Beach County assistant county administrator Ms. Shannon LaRocque and Palm Tran assistant director Mr. Charles Frazier provided an overview of the fixed route system including Operations & Maintenance funding obstacles, transit-oriented development patterns, infrastructure and transit amenity needs.

Mayor Palm Triolo and Mr. Michael Bornstein, city manager for the City of Lake Worth spoke on the growing commercial development investments within the City, infrastructure needs, Tri-Rail station area development opportunities, the Boutwell Road corridor and the Lake Worth Park of Commerce, and a feasibility analysis to connect the Intracoastal Waterway to inland water bodies via the WPB Canal.

F. **Arrive at WPB Intermodal Center**

Participants disembarked the Palm Tran bus at the West Palm Beach Intermodal Center.

G. **Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be held on Thursday, February 19, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the 12th Floor McEaddy Conference Room of the Palm Beach County Governmental Center in West Palm Beach. The public is always welcome to attend and learn how their transportation tax dollars are put to use.