TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION MEETINGS
PLEASE NOTE TPO, TCC AND CAC MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

**MONDAY, JULY 8, 2019**
Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) - 8:30 a.m.
Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida

**TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2019 **NEW DATE AND TIME
Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC) - 3:00 p.m.
Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida

**WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019**
Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Board-9:00 a.m.
Tiger Point Community Center, 1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze, Florida

A. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE / INVOCATION - Chairman Sam Parker

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Any new action items to be added to the agenda must be approved by a vote of two thirds (2/3) of the TPO members present.

C. PUBLIC FORUM:
Please obtain a speaker request form from ECRC staff. Speakers are asked to limit their remarks to five minutes.

D. FDOT/ALDOT UPDATES:
1. **FDOT UPDATE** Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, or Ms. Christy Johnson, AICP, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Urban Liaisons
2. **ALDOT UPDATE** Mr. Vincent Beebe, P.E., Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT)
E. CONSENT:
1. **ALL COMMITTEES** Approval of June 2019 Meeting Minutes
2. **ALL COMMITTEES** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-17 Adopting the Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan (CMP) from Locklin Technical College to Dogwood Drive (SR 89) and Endorsing Implementation of Transportation Strategies and Projects Identified in the Plan
3. **ALL COMMITTEES** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-14 Adopting the FY 2019 Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Scoring Criteria

F. ACTION:
1. **ENCLOSURE A- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO ROLL CALL VOTE)** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-18 Amending the FY 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program to Increase the Construction Cost for SR 87 from South of Clear Creek to North of SR 4, Resurfacing Project for Financial Project Identification (FPID) number 4397211 in FY 2019/2020 from $5,711,868 to $8,804,142 - Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, FDOT Urban Liaison
3. **ENCLOSURE C- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO ROLL CALL VOTE)** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-15 Adopting the FL-AL FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities - Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff
4. **ENCLOSURE D- ALL COMMITTEES** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-16 Adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives - Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff
5. **ENCLOSURE E-ALL COMMITTEES** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-13 Adopting the East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan (CMP) Scope of Services to Start After August 1, 2019 and Authorizing Execution of Consultant Task Order - Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC Staff

G. EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT- TPO ONLY-
Mr. Austin Mount, ECRC Chief Executive Officer

H. MULTI MODAL UPDATE

I. PRESENTATIONS (no action):
1. **ENCLOSURE F- ALL COMMITTEES** Update on State Road 10A (US 90) West Cervantes Street from Dominguez Street to “A” Street Pedestrian Safety Study - Mr. M. Brad Collins, P.E., HDR Project Manager
2. **ENCLOSURE G- ALL COMMITTEES** Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) Bus Stop Assessment Plan Progress Update- Mr. Brian Waterman, Senior Transportation/Transit Planner, HDR Inc.

3. **ENCLOSURE H- ALL COMMITTEES** Review of the 2019 Florida-Alabama Title VI Program Major Update- Ms. Brittany Ellers, ECRC Staff

J. **INFORMATION ITEMS** (no presentation necessary)

1. **ENCLOSURE I- ALL COMMITTEES**
   - TCC and CAC June Meeting Minutes
   - FL-AL June Actions Report
   - FDOT Joint Certification Statement
   - Regional Rural Transportation Plan Notice to Proceed
   - 2019 FL-AL TPO Schedule

K. **OTHER BUSINESS**
   The next Florida-Alabama TPO meeting will be **Wednesday, October 9, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.** at the West Florida Regional Library, 239 North Spring Street, Pensacola, Florida. **Advisory committee meetings** will be held at Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida 32502. TCC will meet on **Monday, October 7, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.** The CAC will meet on **Tuesday, October 8, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.**

L. **ADJOURNMENT**

   Stay up to date with TPO events and activities on Facebook at [www.Facebook.com/EmeraldCoastRegionalCouncil](http://www.Facebook.com/EmeraldCoastRegionalCouncil) or by subscribing to the Florida-Alabama TPO Interested Parties list: [http://eepurl.com/dlszQT](http://eepurl.com/dlszQT)

   Questions? Email Ms. Tiffany Bates, Transportation Program Coordinator, at Tiffany.Bates@ecrc.org

   Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability or family status. Reasonable accommodations for access will be made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and for languages other than English. Please notify Ms. Brittany Ellers of requirements at 850-332-7976, ext. 220 or 1-800-955-8771 for TTY-Florida at least 48 hours in advance.

   Introduzca la participación del público se solicita, sin distinción de raza, color, origen nacional, sexo, edad, religión, discapacidad o estado familiar. La OPC hará arreglos razonables para el acceso a esta reunión de acuerdo con el Americans with Disabilities Act, y para los requisitos de idioma que no sean inglés. Notifique a la Sr. Dan Deanda (dan.deanda@ecrc.org) de los requisitos de acceso o el idioma en el 850-332-7976 ext. 227 o 1-800-955-8771 para TTY-Florida al menos 48 horas de antelación.
CONSENT AGENDA
CONSENT AGENDA
ALL COMMITTEES

FOR APPROVAL UNDER CONSENT:

1) **ALL COMMITTEES**: Approval of June 2019 Meeting Minutes

2) **ALL COMMITTEES**: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-17 Adopting the Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan (CMP) from Locklin Technical College to Dogwood Drive (SR 89) and Endorsing Implementation of Transportation Strategies and Projects Identified in the Plan

3) **ALL COMMITTEES**: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-14 Adopting the Updated 2019 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Scoring Criteria
CONSENT AGENDA
ITEM #1
TPO JUNE MINUTES
## FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION MEETING MINUTES

**EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL (Designated staff)**

West Florida Regional Library, 239 North Spring Street, Pensacola, Florida

June 12, 2019

### Members in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bergosh, Chair</td>
<td>Escambia County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Parker, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gruber</td>
<td>Baldwin County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Fitch</td>
<td>Gulf Breeze Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggi Smith</td>
<td>Milton City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Barry</td>
<td>Escambia County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hill</td>
<td>Pensacola City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel Cannada-Wynn</td>
<td>Pensacola City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. C. WU</td>
<td>Pensacola City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Moore</td>
<td>Pensacola City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Salter</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Lynchard</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cole</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Members Not in Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Johnson</td>
<td>Orange Beach City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumon May</td>
<td>Escambia County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Underhill</td>
<td>Escambia County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bender</td>
<td>Escambia County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Piech</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Wingate</td>
<td>Pensacola City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Others in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Paulk</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Johnson</td>
<td>FDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Beebe</td>
<td>ALDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Wilkinson</td>
<td>HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Abel</td>
<td>City of Gulf Breeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Malone</td>
<td>Escambia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Forte</td>
<td>Escambia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Ward</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Statler</td>
<td>City of Pensacola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Ellis</td>
<td>ECAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Faust</td>
<td>DRMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Cooper</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Messick</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Messick</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Gulley</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie K. Nix</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren C. Drake</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Johnson</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Mayall</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE / INVOCATION - Chairman Jeff Bergosh
Chairman Bergosh led the pledge and there was a moment of silence held for the families involved in a fatal crash on Blue Angel Hwy.

Chairman Bergosh informed the board that Commissioner Piech was listening in on the meeting via telephone.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Washnock stated that ECRC staff would like to add a letter of support for the Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) BUILD application.

Commissioner Parker moved to include a consideration of a letter of support for the ATMS application in the agenda. Commissioner Lynchard seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.
Commissioner Salter moved to approve the June 2019 FL-AL agenda as amended. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

C. PUBLIC FORUM

Chairman Bergosh stated that he was aware that most of the speakers were there to speak on the widening of Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Chairman Bergosh clarified that this item was for discussion this month and would be on the agenda for action at the July meeting.

Mr. Ed Spears, Executive Director of Main Street Milton, spoke in opposition to FDOT’s Hwy. 90 widening project proposal. Mr. Spears stated that they had reviewed the project in depth and have listened to the public input. Mr. Spears stated that they were asking that this project be moved to the end of the TPO’s Project Priority list. He stated that the project would be detrimental to the historic urban core of the City of Milton and does not believe that it is conducive to an urban environment.

Ms. Gale Thames stated that she was there in support of the Hwy. 90 widening project. Ms. Thames stated that this subject had been an issue for many years and needed to be resolved.

Mr. Mike Folzman, owner of Southern Generator, spoke in favor of the Hwy. 90 widening project. Mr. Folzman stated that he was speaking on behalf of the Milton Merchant Association. Mr. Folzman explained that the Milton Merchant Association is a newly organized group of Brick and Water businesses located within the city limits of Milton, promoting growth and change. Mr. Folzman stated that many people own businesses within the city of Milton, but do not live within city limits and cannot vote on city matters. The Milton Merchant Association aims to give those business owners a voice that may not otherwise be heard. Mr. Folzman asked that members in the audience whom were in favor of keeping the project a high priority please stand. Mr. Folzman asked that the TPO keep the widening of Hwy. 90 a high priority. Mr. Folzman stated that he talked to commissioner Piech and that it is clear what the City Council thinks, and that they would like to know what the citizens thought. Mr. Folzman stated that a poll was taken last month that asked about the widening of Hwy. 90 and 56% percent of participants were in favor and 24% were opposed. Mr. Folzman stated that traffic can back up almost 3 miles. Mr. Folzman explained that Milton business owner Dave Phillips, has 60 employees and runs 12 to 15 trucks out of East Milton per day and loses one to two loads per day per truck, due to wait time in the backed-up traffic.

Commissioner Cole asked if the poll showed any clarification between those that want to get through downtown more rapidly and those who do not care about the historical significance and just want to be able to swiftly travel through. Mr. Folzman stated that it did not specify. Commissioner Cole stated that he would like to see a remedy to the traffic as well.

Milton City Councilman Jeff Snow spoke in opposition of widening Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Councilman Snow asked that the board support the city of Milton with the efforts to find a solution for Hwy. 90 capacity through the downtown area. Councilman Snow stated looking to neighboring cities such as Pensacola, who are now having to do road diets to make their streets more pedestrian friendly. Councilman Snow stated that the city of Milton desires the same and does not want to repeat mistakes seen in other areas. Councilman Snow said Milton would like
to work with Santa Rosa County and FDOT to find a needed solution that will move traffic more efficiently while helping continue the city's downtown revitalization efforts. Councilman Snow asked for the board's support in moving the Hwy. 87 Connector up in priority and moving only the downtown portion of Hwy. 90 expansion down on the priorities. Councilman Snow stated that they need to save and preserve Milton's historic downtown.

Mr. George Jordan, a Milton City Councilman, stated that he was there to speak as a citizen and not as an elected official. Mr. Jordan stated that he was in support of FDOT's PD&E finding to widen Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Mr. Jordan gave his letter of support to the board with a disclosure that stated he was not there to speak on behalf of the city. Mr. Jordan stated that a majority of the citizens affected by the traffic problems in downtown support the findings of the PD&E as presented by FDOT. Mr. Jordan stated that during the last campaign season he walked the city and went to around three thousand homes. He said he had the opportunity to meet and talk with most of the residents. Since that time, he has continued to network with citizens, residents, business owners, and officials daily. Mr. Jordan stated that those conversations revealed an overwhelming number of residents that believed the PD&E conducted by FDOT is the appropriate solution to the decades old problem. Mr. Jordan stated that he stands behind this plan and it being implemented as soon as possible. Mr. Jordan stated that the citizens wanted to thank FDOT for their hard work and willingness to let citizens participate in the project.

Mr. Jimmy Messick, a Milton city resident, spoke in favor of the PD&E study and the pursuing of widening Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Mr. Messick said that FDOT stated that by the time the 87 Bypass project was complete, the traffic going through downtown Milton would be backed up to the current level of traffic. Mr. Messick stated that FDOT has promised that they will move the Fisher Hamilton building, which is the only historic building in downtown that would have to be moved. Mr. Messick added that FDOT is willing to move it 60 feet to the south to make room for the four lane and the new bridge and that none of the other historic buildings would be damaged or moved. He said that there would be several buildings that will have to be moved, but they are not historic in nature. Mr. Messick stated that he would like to see the historic nature of Milton continued and that FDOT has committed to the complete streets concept that will continue to promote a pedestrian and bicycle friendly downtown. Mr. Messick recommended that the board move in favor of the PD&E study as presented by FDOT.

Councilman Wu wanted Mr. Messick to recognize his time serving on the Milton City Council. Mr. Messick stated that he served two years on Milton City Council and was a member of the TPO.

Ms. Julia Nix, a Milton resident, stated that she is an attorney and that while she resides outside the city, her office is within city limits. Ms. Nix stated that she is a lifelong resident of Milton and that she supports the PD&E study that includes the widening of Hwy. 90. Ms. Nix stated that her concern is the traffic safety in that area. Ms. Nix stated that she believed the widening of Hwy. 90 would alleviate a lot of issues and would allow for emergency vehicles to still get through even when there is traffic.

Ms. Lauren Drake informed the board that she was the first female police officer for the City of Milton and spoke in favor of widening Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Ms. Drake stated that she believed that the city council had been very disingenuous with their vote. Ms. Drake also
mentioned that Hwy. 90 was an evacuation route and that the current traffic conditions would make it difficult to get out of town. Ms. Drake requested that the board approve this project and keep it as a high priority.

Mr. Randy Jorgenson, City Manager of Milton, stated that he participated on the FL-AL TCC for a decade. Mr. Jorgenson stated that this particular subject was an issue for that entire period of time. Mr. Jorgenson explained that Hwy. 90 is scheduled to have six lanes between the Escambia Bay and Stewart Street and that it is scheduled to be widened to four lanes between 87 North and Ward Basin Road. Mr. Jorgenson stated that the segment everyone has been speaking on today includes the bridge over Blackwater river. Mr. Jorgenson stated that Milton City Council, thus the city, opposes the widening of Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Mr. Jorgenson explained that there needs to be a solution to the problem that will be faced in the future. Mr. Jorgenson stated that the lowest rated intersection in northern Santa Rosa County is in that segment at Willing St. and Caroline St. Mr. Jorgenson reported that the intersection was at a Level of Service “F” and would continue deteriorating. Mr. Jorgenson concluded by reiterating the fact that Milton City Council opposed widening through downtown Milton, but he asked that a solution be identified. He stated that this was a decades old problem that many are familiar with and that needed to be solved.

Ms. Casandra Sharp spoke in opposition to the widening of Hwy. 90 through downtown Milton. Ms. Sharp stated that there were numerous workshops held and that in every single workshop, citizens urged there be a bypass and to not widen through downtown. Ms. Sharp discussed the changes to the city's comprehensive plan over the years. Ms. Sharp stated that she was asking that the 87 Connector be advanced and that the Hwy. 90 expansion through downtown Milton move down on the priorities list. Ms. Sharp stated that the ATMS system will also be an alleviation of traffic in Milton. She stated that the system is meant to decrease infrastructure dollars being spent for widening projects and stated that road diets are where an urban core needs to be.

Commissioner Cole stated that he agreed that there needed to be a resolution to the traffic in downtown Milton. Commissioner Cole stated that this is just one alternative and that other ideas should be looked at. Commissioner Cole stated that he and Randy Jorgenson, City of Milton worked on another idea that they planned to present to FDOT District 3 Secretary Gainer to see what his thoughts are. Commissioner Cole added that he would like to see the 87 North - South connector accelerated.

D. FDOT/ALDOT UPDATES:

1. FDOT UPDATE: Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, or Ms. Christy Johnson, AICP, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Urban Liaisons.

Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold an Alternatives public meeting concerning SR 292 (Sorrento Rd./ Gulf Beach HWY) PD&E Study Alternatives meeting Tuesday, June 18, 2019 at First Baptist Church of Warrington. The meeting is from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. CDT. Mr. Paulk stated that the intent of the study is to evaluate the potential for improving the capacity of the existing State Road 292 (Sorrento Road/Gulf Beach Highway) corridor, from Blue Angel Parkway to Navy Boulevard.
Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold a public hearing regarding access management modifications associated with the U.S 98 widening project on Thursday, June 20, at the Tiger Point Community Center in Gulf Breeze. Mr. Paulk stated that the open house will start at 5:30 p.m., followed by a presentation at 6 p.m. and then a public comment period.

2. ALDOT Update

Mr. Beebe reported that the new roadway and bridge from the Foley Beach Express to SR-180 has been split into 2 parts, roadway from CR-4 to the Foley Beach Express and the roadway and bridge from SR-180 to CR-4.

Mr. Beebe reported that ALDOT is working to complete design plans, acquire remaining right-of-way, and relocate utilities. Mr. Beebe stated that construction letting dates could move based on progress.

Mr. Beebe stated that all required preliminary engineering is complete for the widening SR-180 from the Foley Beach Express to SR-161. He reported that utility relocations are in progress and construction letting is currently scheduled for June 28, 2019.

E. CONSENT:

1. ALL COMMITTEES: Approval of April 2019 Meeting Minutes

   Commissioner Cole moved to approve the April 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. ALL COMMITTEES: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-07 Adopting the Public participation Process (PPP) Plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)

   Commissioner Cole moved to authorize the TPO chairman sign Resolution FL-AL 19-07 adopting the Public participation Process (PPP) Plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). Councilwoman Smith seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

3. TPO ONLY: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-10 to Authorize Filing of the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund Planning Grant Agreement with the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged

   Commissioner Cole moved to authorize the TPO chairman sign Resolution FL-AL 19-10 to authorize Filing of the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund Planning Grant Agreement with the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

4. TPO ONLY: Consideration of the Membership Certification for the Escambia County and Santa Rosa County Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Boards
Commissioner Cole moved to approve the Membership Certification for the Escambia County and Santa Rosa County Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Boards. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

5. TPO ONLY (SEE ENCLOSURE F): Election of Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Chair and Vice Chair for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020)

Commissioner Cole moved to approve Mr. Griffin Powell as chairman and Ms. Teri Malone as vice chair for the FL-AL TCC. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

6. TPO ONLY (SEE ENCLOSURE G): Consideration of Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) Application from Mr. Mike Boltz.

Commissioner Cole moved to of Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) application from Mr. Mike Boltz. Commissioner Barry seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

F. ACTION:

1. ENCLOSURE A- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-08 Adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Authorizing the TPO to Administratively Amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to Include the Projects in FDOT's Variance Report -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

Mr. Kramer stated that the TIP was posted online, and the link was e-mailed to the TPO, advisory committees, and review agencies on April 5, 2019 with comments requested by April 26, 2019. Mr. Kramer stated that the comments received and TPO staff responses were included in the agenda.

Commissioner Gruber moved to authorize the TPO chairman sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 adopting the FY2020-2024 TIP as presented and authorize TPO staff to administratively amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to include the projects in FDOT's Variance Report. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bergosh</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Parker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gruber</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Fitch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggi Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Barry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel Cannada-Wynn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. C. WU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Salter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motion was unanimously approved.

2. **ENCLOSURE B- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to Amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Two Projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County Line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange-Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.**

Mr. Kramer presented and stated that this action is recommended to expedite funding for these projects.

Commissioner Cole moved to authorize the TPO chairman sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for two projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion.

**Roll Call Vote**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bergosh</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Parker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gruber</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Fitch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggi Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Barry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel Cannada-Wynn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. C. WU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Moore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Salter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Lynchard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cole</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion was unanimously approved.

3. **ENCLOSURE C- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-11 Approving the Selection of a Firm for Signalization Consultant Continuing Services and Authorizing the Chairman to Execute the Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) -Ms. Jill Lavender, ECRC Staff.**

Ms. Lavender stated the TPO, as the lead agency, published an RFQ on April 11, 2019 for a new professional services contract be created between the FL-AL TPO and a firm to provide general traffic engineering operation and management services for the entire Florida-Alabama TPO area, and redirect the box funds through the TPO to support the contract. A selection committee was also established to review and rank all proposals. Ms. Lavender
stated that four RFP packets were received by the deadline of May 17, 2019 and that the selection committee met on May 28, 2019 to rank all four proposals.

Ms. Lavender stated that DRMP’s fee proposal and scope were submitted and that other agencies opted out before another selection committee meeting was needed. Ms. Lavender stated that the selection committee’s recommendation is to move forward with DRMP for the new contract with the TPO.

Commissioner Cole moved to approve the top ranked firm for Signalization Consultant Continuing Services and to authorize the TPO chairman to execute the Joint Participation Agreement with Florida Department of Transportation. Councilwoman Cannada-Wynn seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

**ADD ON ITEM: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE ATMS BUILD APPLICATION**

Mr. Mount stated that over the last month, TPO staff went to each municipality to discuss advancing the ATMS project. Mr. Mount stated that it has been the top priority of the TPO for many years. Mr. Mount said that because of the recent efforts collectively made by the TPO, FDOT stated that they are going to support this project and for the TPO to submit a build application. Mr. Mount reported that it is a request for 20 million dollars to help advance the projects. If the grant is successful, Mr. Mount stated that the TPO could see the influx of money more quickly than expected.

Commissioner Parker moved to authorize the TPO chairman to sign a letter of support for the Advanced Traffic management System BUILD application. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

4. **ENCLOSURE D- TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-12 Approving the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan -Mr. Cory Wilkinson, AICP CEP, HDR.**

Mr. Wilkinson gave a brief presentation on the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan. Commissioner Barry requested that the scope be amended to include the Bluffs Industrial Complex, Rail USA, Alabama Gulf Coast Railway, Gulf Power and Ascend Performance Materials private ports, and International Paper as additional stakeholders.

Commissioner Barry moved to amend the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan with the inclusion of the Bluffs Industrial Complex, Rail USA, Alabama Gulf Coast Railway, the Gulf Power and Ascend Performance Materials private ports, and International Paper as additional stakeholders. Councilwoman Cannada-Wynn seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Commissioner Cole moved to approve the TPO chairman sign Resolution FL-AL 19-12 Approving the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan as amended in the previous motion. Commissioner Gruber seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.
5. **ENCLOSURE E- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Transportation Alternatives (TA)**

Program Management Task Order and Review of TA Scoring Criteria - Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC Staff.

Ms. Cerame stated that in anticipation of TA solicitation in the Fall of 2019, TPO staff provided an opportunity for TCC members to provide input on the current scoring criteria content and procedures at a public workshop on May 22, 2019. Ms. Cerame reported that no significant changes were made to the content of the criteria. Ms. Cerame stated that the minor changes included: use of an independent 3rd party (consultant) to review and rank TA applications; a maximum of two applications can be submitted per local jurisdiction with representation on the TPO board; each application will be supported through a resolution by the local jurisdiction; an application review workshop will be held following submittal deadline to review applications and preliminary scoring. Ms. Cerame stated that the criteria will be presented for approval in July. Ms. Cerame asked that all comments on the draft TA scoring criteria be provided by June 17, 2019.

Ms. Mayall, a FL-AL CAC member, asked why the CAC was not included on this item. Ms. Washnock stated that it was directed towards a technical committee and informed the board that any items not on the CAC agenda may be presented if requested by a committee member.

**Commissioner Gruber moved to authorize the TPO chairman to execute a task order for the TA program management scoring criteria. Councilwoman Cannada - Wynn seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.**

G. **EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT- TPO ONLY- Mr. Austin Mount, ECRC Executive Director**

Mr. Mount stated he had presented his items during the add-on for the BUILD grant letter.

H. **MULTI MODAL UPDATE**

No presentation.

I. **PRESENTATIONS (no action):**

1. **ENCLOSURE H- ALL COMMITTEES Review of Draft Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities - Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff**

Mr. Kramer presented a brief overview of the Project Priority process. Mr. Kramer also provided a link to an interactive map, which shows the location and the street view by category for the projects identified in the draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities. There were no further comments or questions.

2. **ENCLOSURE I- ALL COMMITTEES Review of the Draft FL-AL TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives - Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.**
Mr. Kramer presented and stated that a public workshop on the draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives will be held at the Marie Ella Davis Community Center @4:00 p.m. on June 13, 2019.


Ms. Lavender gave a presentation on the draft Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan. Ms. Lavender stated that the TPO adopted the scope of services for a CMP for Berryhill Road from Locklin Technical College to SR 89/Dogwood Drive on June 13, 2018. Ms. Lavender stated that all comments must be submitted by Wednesday, June 26, 2019. Commissioner Parker discussed working with the City of Milton to identify the projects wanted by the citizens.

J. INFORMATION ITEMS (no presentation necessary)

1. ENCLOSURE K-ALL COMMITTEES
   - TCC and CAC April Meeting Minutes
   - FL-AL April Actions Report
   - City of Milton Letters to TPO Board
   - 2019 FL-AL TPO Schedule

K. OTHER BUSINESS- The next Florida-Alabama TPO meeting will be Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the Tiger Point Community Center, 1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze, Florida. Advisory committee meetings are to be held at Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida 32502. TCC will meet on Monday, July 8, 2019 at 8:30 a.m. The CAC will meet on Tuesday, July 9, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 AM
CONSENT ITEM #2
ALL COMMITTEES

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-17 Adopting the Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan (CMP) from Locklin Technical College to Dogwood Drive (SR 89) and Endorsing Implementation of Transportation Strategies and Projects Identified in the Plan

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: Task D.1 of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: The UPWP, which describes the planning work tasks and budget for each TPO fiscal year, includes Task D.1, Corridor Management Planning. The purpose of corridor management planning is to identify low cost strategies and projects to improve traffic flow and safety for all modes of travel.

The TPO adopted the scope of services for a CMP for Berryhill Road from Locklin Technical College to SR 89/Dogwood Drive on June 13, 2018.

The scope of services outlined the purpose of the CMP to be identification of operational and safety improvements and priorities needed to support all modes of transportation, including roadway capacity and bicycle and pedestrian movements.

The draft Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan (CMP) can be found at: https://www.ecrc.org/programs/transportation_planning/plans_and_documents/index.php under the Corridor Management Plan heading. Paper copies of the draft document will be available upon request.

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-17
- Map of Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan (CMP) Project Limits
- Comment Cards Received from Public Workshops

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion authorizing the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-17 adopting the Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan from Locklin Technical College to Dogwood Drive (SR 89) and endorsing the implementation of transportation strategies and projects identified in the plan. This action is recommended to allow the endorsement and implementation of transportation strategies and projects identified in the plan. Please contact Ms. Jill Lavender, ECRC staff, at 850-332-7976, Extension 212 or jill.lavender@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-17

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
ADOPTING THE BERRYHILL ROAD CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama TPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes tasks for development of a Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for each fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the TPO selected Berryhill Road, from Locklin Technical College to Dogwood Drive (SR 89) for a CMP; and

WHEREAS, the TPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) includes $1,500,000 per year for implementation of projects identified in CMPs, which are plans for low cost strategies and projects to improve traffic flow and safety for all modes of travel along a corridor; and

WHEREAS, Berryhill Road CMP identifies strategies and projects to improve traffic flow and safety for all modes of travel along the corridor, based on a study process that included an analysis of existing and future safety and travel capacity needs, and local stakeholder review and recommendations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The TPO adopts the Berryhill Road CMP and endorses implementation of transportation strategies and projects identified in the plan.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA- ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: __________________________
Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: _____________________
Legend

Berryhill Road from west of Anderson Lane to SR 89 (Dogwood Drive)

City of Milton
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The traffic signal loop on Anderson activates immediately when a vehicle enters the loop. Traffic on Byrdhill traveling eastbound turning left onto Anderson cut the corner and travel across the loops on Anderson immediately activating the signal and stopping traffic on Byrdhill when there is no traffic on Anderson. Moving the loops would make traffic flow better at this intersection.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lighting especially at intersections</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Comment Card

Public input is crucial to the transportation planning process. Please write your comments below as legibly as possible. Your name and contact information are optional.

Thank you!

Name: 
Email: 

Comments:

- Turn lanes left & right

- [Handwritten notes:]
  - 1. Two lanes
  - 2. Red light at Berryhill After School & Oak Meadows
**Comment Card**

Public input is crucial to the transportation planning process. Please write your comments below as legibly as possible. Your name and contact information are optional. Thank you!

| Name: |  
| Email: |  
| ZIP Code: | 32570  
| 5844 Berryhill Road |  
| Comments: | Not in favor of any of this. |

---

**Comment Card**

Public input is crucial to the transportation planning process. Please write your comments below as legibly as possible. Your name and contact information are optional. Thank you!

| Name: |  
| Email: |  
| ZIP Code: | 32570  
| Comments: | One bike lane and a center turn lane |
Comment Card
Public input is crucial to the transportation planning process. Please write your comments below as legibly as possible. Your name and contact information are optional. Thank you!

Name: [redacted]  Email: [redacted]
ZIP Code: 32570
Comments: Like center turn lane & shared use

Name: [redacted]  Email: [redacted]
ZIP Code: 32570
Comments: Option 3 but with center turn lane and sidewalk.
Name: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
ZIP Code: 32570
Comments:
Need to put center turn lane and one side walk.

Name: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
ZIP Code: 32570
Comments: Option not shown on proposal. Implement a center low turn lane. for distance from George Lane to Anderson. Side walk on one side.
CONSENT ITEM #3
ALL COMMITTEES

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-14 Adopting the Updated 2019 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Scoring Criteria

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: Task C.4 of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: The Florida Department of Transportation TA Set-Aside provides funding for a variety of small-scale transportation projects such as pedestrian and bicycle facilities, recreational trails, safe routes to school projects, community improvements such as historic preservation and vegetation management, and environmental mitigation related to stormwater and habitat connectivity. There is approximately $3 million available for District Three, with solicitation expected in the Fall of 2019.

In anticipation of TA solicitation in the Fall of 2019, ECRC staff provided an opportunity for TCC members to provide input on the current scoring criteria content and procedures at a public workshop on May 22, 2019. Public comment was collected until June 17, 2019. No significant changes were made to the content of the criteria. Procedural clarifications are provided below:

- Use of an independent 3rd party (consultant) to review and rank TA applications.
- A maximum of two applications can be submitted per local jurisdiction with representation on the TPO board.
- Each application is required to be supported through a resolution by the local jurisdiction.
- An application review workshop will be held following submittal deadline to review applications and preliminary scoring.

The TA scoring criteria can be found at: 
https://www.ecrc.org/programs/transportation_planning/plans_and_documents/index.php#outer-152

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-14
- TA Scoring Criteria

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion to authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-14 adopting the updated 2019 Transportation Alternatives scoring criteria. This action is recommended in order for the criteria to be in place for the next group of applications for consideration. Please contact Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC staff, at (850) 332-7976, Ext 203 or caitlin.cerame@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-14

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION ADOPTING THE FY 2019 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET ASIDE SCORING CRITERIA

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO Planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Alternatives Program is consistent with Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act under 23 U.S.C. 133(h); and

WHEREAS, TA Set Aside provides funding for projects in the following areas: on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation, community improvement activities, environmental mitigation and projects for planning, designing or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of formerly divided highways; and

WHEREAS, according to 23 U.S.C. 213(c)(5), each TPO area is required to select TA Set-Aside projects through a competitive process in consultation with the state; and

WHEREAS, the TPO has established accepted scoring criteria to rank projects in the competitive process; and

WHEREAS, each local jurisdiction with representation on the TPO board will be limited to two projects submittals;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The 2019 Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Scoring Criteria is hereby adopted.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: ______________________
    Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: ______________________

Sam Parker, Chairman
Transportation Alternatives Program

Project Scoring Criteria
Project Scoring Criteria Background

The Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project Scoring Criteria has been written to assist the Florida-Alabama TPO and advisory committees with the review and ranking of the submitted TAP applications. The purpose of the FLORIDA-ALABAMA TPO TAP Project Scoring Criteria is to convey the FLORIDA-ALABAMA TPO’s evaluation criteria in a quantified and logically organized fashion. The Project Scoring Criteria has been designed to be used in conjunction with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) TAP Application. This allows potential applicants and project sponsors to internally score and evaluate their projects prior to the final submission.

The Project Scoring Criteria addresses the state regulations, local considerations and generally supports the transportation goals of the Florida-Alabama TPO. The Project Scoring Criteria developed specific quantifiable criteria that addresses each of the larger evaluation criterion. These criteria were selected and developed with a focus on the details while maintaining an understanding of the embedded Transportation Alternatives Program.
**Project Scoring Criteria Requirements**

The Florida-Alabama Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project Scoring Criteria must be completed and submitted with the FDOT TAP Application and the FDOT Checklist to the TPO for project review and ranking.

**General Guidelines for Supplemental Data**

The Project Scoring Criteria is structured to enable the TAP application process at the Florida-Alabama TPO to be intuitive and easily interpreted for the applicant, the TPO staff, and TPO Board and advisory committees. The Scoring Criteria is written with a focus to logically quantify physical attributes of the project, safety, connectivity, location efficiency, proximity to school, design quality, and environmental/archeological/historic preservation issues.

Supplemental data is requested and noted for certain criteria. Please note the following guidelines for supplemental data:

- Supplemental data that includes mapping, document references, and quantitative data must be included as an attachment/addendum to the Project Scoring Criteria.

- State Traffic Counts/AADTs must include the FDOT/ALDOT County Code and Site Number.

- Local Traffic Counts must include a brief summary of the methodology; this includes the machine type, axle detection, vehicle classifications, the dates and the times that the traffic was counted. A traffic count of 48 hours is the minimum that will be accepted.

- References to planning documents must include the document title, year of adoption/publication and the section-chapter-page location of the referenced project. Where applicable, links to the referenced documents are encouraged.

- When asked to provide a brief description of a claimed criterion, please limit the description to one short paragraph.

- If a claimed criterion is mapped, please note that it is mapped in the Criterion Category.
**Eligible Projects for the Transportation Alternatives Program:**

TAP funds are available for specific project types. These project types are determined by FHWA, and generally include planning, design, or construction of projects previously eligible under the Safe Routes to School and Transportation Enhancements programs. Specific eligible project types include, but are not limited to:

- Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles;
- Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists;
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;
- Scenic or historic highway programs;
- Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities;
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors;
- Archaeological planning and research; and
- Environmental mitigation.

For a complete and detailed list of eligible project types, please reference FHWA’s on-line guidance:

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/transportationalternativesfs.cfm

**Who May Apply?**

Eligible project sponsors are determined by the FHWA. LAP certification is required for selected projects, but not required for submittal.

- Local governments;
- Regional transportation authorities;
- Transit agencies;
- Natural resource or public land agencies;
- School districts, local education agencies, or schools;
- Tribal governments; and
- Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or State agency).

**TPOs are not able to directly sponsor projects.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Scoring (Maximum Points Possible)</th>
<th>Project Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>Location Efficiency</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>Proximity to School</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>Design Quality</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td>Environmental/Archeological Projects/ Historic Preservation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Points</td>
<td>Local Contribution and Public Support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Points Possible</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 1: Safety - The project is scored for making significant safety improvements to the existing and proposed transportation network. Please submit crash data to verify your selection for crashes within the project area.

Crash data reports must use the Signal Four Analytics data. Please contact TPO staff if your application claims accidents that are not reported in the Signal Four database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Data for Project - Scored crashes are car accidents that involve pedestrians and/or cyclists.</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low crash corridor = &lt; 3 car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents from the past 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate crash corridor = 3-10 car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents from the past 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High crash corridor = &gt;10 car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents from the past 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project is Designed to Avoid Moderate and High Crash Corridors</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The maximum radius for exposure is ¼ mile. Scored crashes are car accidents that involve pedestrians and/or cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate crash corridor = 3-10 car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents from past 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High crash corridor = &gt;10 car/pedestrian/cyclist incidents from past 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Issue</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief descriptions for each claimed criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted speed limit over 30 mph in project area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves mobility for disabled, elderly or youth populations – (Please provide an address and note location on map for the affected facility)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves access to areas within or adjacent to an area/zone with 50% of households below poverty rate- as defined by the Census</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design encourages traffic calming or vehicle lane narrowing (road diet)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces traffic volume in tourist/commercial areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reduce Human Exposure** – Project reduces exposure between motor vehicles and vulnerable pedestrians and bicyclists by employing a “physical barrier” or “defined space” into the project design.

*Provide a brief description for each claimed criterion – notate on map where applicable.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Separation Barrier</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A physical barrier includes but is not limited to a pedestrian island, buffered sidewalk, protected bike lane, buffered curb, landscaping divide, or green way between road and proposed facility.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defined Space</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A “defined space” includes but is not limited to crosswalks, green lanes, striped bike lanes and a minimum 4 foot wide shoulder.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Traffic**

The current AADT for the affected roadway facilities within the project area – from which exposure would be reduced by the project. The maximum radius for exposure is ¼ mile. Documented traffic counts at the county and city level will be accepted once the source and methodology is verified by TPO staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Count</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,001+</td>
<td>12 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,001-40,000</td>
<td>11 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-35,000</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001-30,000</td>
<td>9 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-25,000</td>
<td>8 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>7 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>6 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-5,000</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001-4,000</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 – 3,000</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points for Safety Criteria**

---
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**Criterion 2: Connectivity** - Project improves the existing transportation network. This may include but is not limited to filling existing gaps in the current multi-modal network and/or creating new access points to public transit and pedestrian/cyclist amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Connectivity</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a brief description for each claimed criterion – notate on map where applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves access to commercial areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves access to parks and recreational areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides pedestrian/bicycle facilities where none exist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project conforms to any TPO, Local Government, Regional or State Plan for current or future connectivity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fills a documented gap in an existing transportation network</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Connectivity (select one)</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit stops must be noted on an attached project map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to existing bike/ped facility &amp; does not connect to a transit stop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to existing bike/ped facility &amp; &lt;1/2 mile from transit stop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to existing bike/ped facility &amp; &lt;1/4 mile from transit stop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points for Connectivity Criteria**
**Criterion 3: Location Efficiency** - Project makes significant improvements to a facility in proximity to a medium-to-high density or intensity land use; project is in a municipal city center, historic pedestrian-scaled neighborhood, or otherwise important commercial corridor; project serves multiple destinations, allowing residents and/or tourists to access essential and leisure goods and services without using an automobile. Destinations can include retail stores, restaurants, pharmacies, churches, community centers, libraries, bars, employment centers, or any establishment where commercial or social activity occurs.

*Please provide brief description of proximity location in relationship to destination of interest.*

**Maximum Points Allowed: 15**

**Does the project provide access to destinations of interest?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Interest Select One (7 pts total)</th>
<th>Moderate Interest Select One (5 pts total)</th>
<th>Low Interest Select One (3pts total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Center – Square</td>
<td>Multi-Family Development</td>
<td>Low Density Single Family (detached single family developments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Center</td>
<td>Park n Ride Lot</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Employment Center (Office Park, Big Box Retail)</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center/Station (hub that serves as central location for multiple routes and network )</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Bus Stop (a bench or 5-15 person shelter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (within 2 miles)</td>
<td>Retail Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/College (direct connection)</td>
<td>Religious/Civic Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Unique Destination (Tourist Destinations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Center Combination of Restaurants/ Theaters/Music Venues</td>
<td>Health Care Clinic (multiple doctors on staff &lt; 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility (sport fields, gymnasium, etc)</td>
<td>Grocery Store/Farmers Market/ Stationary Food Providers/Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Road Bike Routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points for Location Efficiency Criteria**
**Criterion 4: Proximity to School** - Projects within 0-2 mile radius of a school receive special preference, as they combine safety goals with connectivity and educational goals. Projects that focus on the pedestrian/cyclist access to schools are strongly encouraged to submit an application through the Safe Routes to Schools program. Schools are defined as a K-12 facility; or a public or private university, college or community college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to School (select one)</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the name and address of schools within the 2-mile project radius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project &gt;2 Mile from a school</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project within 1-2 mile of a school</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project within 1 mile of a school</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Points for Proximity to School Criteria           |     |
**Criterion 5: Design Quality** - Points awarded based on the quality of the facility, and based on non-motorized transportation facility design standards as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Design</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a brief description for each claimed criterion – notate on map where applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses both walking and biking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered/Protected bicycle lane, separated multiuse path &gt; 5’, or sidewalk &gt; 5’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides bike parking or seating for pedestrian areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides trailheads, staging areas and parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides desirable amenities such as fitness stations, public art, pedestrian scale lighting, unique way finding, repair stands, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Phases of this project are under construction or have been completed. Prior documentation for the prior phases.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Right of Way has been secured or none is needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points Design Quality Criteria**
### Criterion 6: Environmental/Archaeological Projects/
#### Historic Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental/Archaeological Projects/Historic Preservation</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a brief description for each claimed criterion – notate on map where applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project includes elements that use renewable energy sources, semi permeable materials, recycled materials or other green technologies and LEED standards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restores or preserves environmentally sensitive lands, cultural resources or agricultural lands; or conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes an environmental mitigation plan - project is in proximity to environmentally sensitive lands, cultural resources or agricultural lands and there is a plan to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes community partnership between governmental and non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieves a threat to an existing historic resource; or historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project enhances access to an existing or planned activity center. <em>(Planned activity centers must be defined in a Capital Improvement Plan or similar document. Please reference and attach information in addendum.)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes existing visual blighting influence; or substantially enhances visual environment; inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides bike-ped access to deter automobile access to environmentally sensitive areas; or other pollution abatement activities as described in 23 U.S.C. 133 (h) (3) (FAST Act § 1109)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points for Environmental/Archaeological Projects/Historic Preservation Criteria**
**Bonus Points:**

### Local Contributions and Public Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Contribution: monetary and non-monetary, to include drainage, right-of-way, and professional services.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support: submit 4 or more letters of support. This must include 2 letters from a private source and 2 from a public source. *</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supporting letters can be gathered from public officials, municipalities, neighborhood associations, homeowners associations, non-profit agencies, or other community-based organizations; businesses and residents located within the project limits.*

*Letters of support must be dated within the past 3 years*

### Total Bonus Points

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information below will aid the TPO in ranking projects for the TPO TAP Priority List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Only — The following answers are for the TPO project review and will not be scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the submitted budget include contributions from the sponsor and involved municipalities? Define the amount of local contributions, which may include in-kind services or ROW donation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total length of the project (miles)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many intersections are located within the project boundaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project address a unique safety issue not detailed in the Safety Criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness – Project Phase as submitted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions for Criterion 3

**High Interest Destinations:** These are common, highly-trafficked destinations within a particular city, town, or region.

**Town Center/Square:** Downtown or central business district of a city or town.

**Mixed Use Center:** An integrated development project which combines multiple uses within individual buildings or sites. Example: A retail development with residential units above or adjacent.

**Major Employment Center:** A dense collection of retail or non-retail employment locations, where the percentage of employers is significantly higher than that of surrounding areas. Typically total employment will exceed 150 employees. Example: An office park or big box retail

**Transit Center:** A station or hub which serves as the central location for multiple routes or networks.

**School:** Any K-12 school facility located within 1/2 mile of project/facility.

**University/College:** Any public or private university, college, or community college.

**Entertainment Center:** A combination of restaurants, theaters, music venues or other entertainment venues within a centralized location.

**Marinas:** A specially designed harbor with moorings for pleasure craft and small boats.

**Recreation Facility:** A public facility that provides infrastructure and amenities for organized sports. Example: a sports complex with multiple soccer fields, gymnasiums or other leisure sports.

**Moderate Interest Destinations** These are common, moderately-trafficked destinations, typically found in many cities and towns.

**Multi-family Development:** Multiple residential housing units located in one building/structure, or multiple buildings within one complex. Example: Apartment complex.

**Park-n-Ride Lot:** A designated parking location which allows drivers to park private automobiles, bicycles, or other vehicles, and access public transportation or transit.

**Park:** Regional, local, or neighborhood space for passive or active recreation.

**Greenway:** A natural or paved path, typically located outside of vehicular rights-of-way, intended for non-motorized active transportation.

**Retail Center:** A collection of retail locations where the percentage of retailers is significantly higher than that of surrounding areas.
**Religious/Civic Center:** A private or public venue which offers religious or civic services to the general public.

**Unique Destination / Tourist Destination:** A specific destination of civic or cultural value which attracts visitors, is unique to a particular city, town, or county, and may not satisfy other destination descriptions

**Health Care Clinic:** These can include facilities with less than 10 doctors on staff.

**Libraries:** A physical location which provides access to reading materials such as books, periodicals, and newspapers, and often other forms of video or audio media.

**Rural Road Bike Routes Rural:** Suburban roads which typically do not include prescribed bicycle facilities, but may be signed as state, historic, scenic, or recreational bicycle routes.

**Food Options:** Large and small grocery stores, farmer's markets, or fresh foods. Other local, stationary food providers will be considered.

**Hotels:** Hotels, motels, and other commercial establishments offering lodging, meals, and other guest services

**Low Interest Destinations** - These are common destinations, which typically experience less human traffic.

**Low Density Single Family Development:** Detached single family developments which can be found in rural, suburban, and urban environments.

**Bus Stop (Neighborhood Scale):** Typically a bench or 5 to 15 person shelter located adjacent to a sidewalk or roadway.
ENCLOSURE A
ENCLOSURE A
ALL COMMITTEES
(TPO ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED)

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-18 Amending the FY 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program to Increase the Construction Cost for SR 87 from South of Clear Creek to North of SR 4, Resurfacing Project for Financial Project Identification (FPID) number 4397211 in FY 2019/2020 from $5,711,868 to $8,804,142

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: FDOT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: Annually, the TPO adopts a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which lists the projects scheduled throughout the five years of the FDOT Work Program for various phases such as project development and environmental study, design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. To receive federal funding, the projects must be in the TPO’s adopted TIP. This TIP amendment amends Project ID 4397211, construction cost increase for SR 87 from south of Clear Creek to north of SR 4 in FY 2019/2020 from $5,711,868 to $8,804,142.

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-18
- Request for Amendment
- Page of the FY 2019 - FY 2023 TIP as Amended

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion to authorize the TPO Chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-18 to amend the FY 2019-2023 TIP. This action is recommended to ensure FDOT can authorize funding for this project. Please contact Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC staff, at (800) 226-8914, Ext. 219 or gary.kramer@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-18

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 – FISCAL YEAR 2023 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is adopted annually by the TPO and submitted to the governor of the State of Florida and the governor of the State of Alabama, to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and through the State of Alabama and State of Florida to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and

WHEREAS, the TIP is periodically amended to maintain consistency with the Florida and Alabama Departments of Transportation Work Programs; and

WHEREAS, authorization for federal funding of projects within an urbanized area cannot be obtained unless the projects are included in the TPO’s TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) believes that the amendment listed below will support the performance targets established by the states and supported by the TPO.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The TPO amends the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 – FY 2023 Transportation Improvement Program increasing the construction cost for SR 87 from south of Clear Creek to north of SR 4 resurfacing project for Financial Project Identification (FPID) number 4397211 in FY 2019/2020 from $5,711,868 to $8,804,142.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: ____________________________
    Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: ______________________
### TPO Transportation Improvement Program

**ID #** Project Name/Location

**Santa Rosa County**

**4397211** SR 87  
from South of Clear Creek to North of SR 4  
Resurfacing  
14.059 Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,082,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,082,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,724,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,724,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$936,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$936,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,804,142</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,804,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resurfacing North of Milton.*
**4397211**  SR 87  Non-SIS

**Work Summary:** RESURFACING  **From:** S OF CLEAR CREEK

**Lead Agency:** FDOT  **To:** N OF SR 4

**Length:** 14.059 MI  **LRTP #:** Final Report p. 7-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>DIH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,724,491</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,724,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI</td>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>936,898</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>936,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>ACSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,082,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,082,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,804,142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,804,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Cost < 2018/19:** 1,012,130  
**Future Cost > 2022/23:** 0  
**Total Project Cost:** 9,816,272

**Project Description:**
On July 10, 2019 TPO meeting for approval
Please note the segment from Springhill Road to N. of SR 4 is NOT within the TPO Planning area. That segment is included fro Rural Work Program reference.
Resurfacing of SR 87 from south of Clear Creek to north of SR 4.
ENCLOSURE B

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: FDOT

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: Annually, the TPO adopts a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which lists the projects scheduled throughout the five years of the FDOT Work Program for various phases such as project development and environmental study, design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. To receive federal funding, the projects must be in the TPO’s adopted TIP. This TIP amendment amends Project ID 4393212, to show all federal funds being used by the TPO for planning purposes which in FY 2018/19 is $2,004,132 and in FY 2019/2020 is $749,236.

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-19
- Request for Amendment
- Page of the FY 2019 - FY 2023 TIP as amended
- Page of the FY 2020 - FY 2024 TIP as amended

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion to authorize the TPO Chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-19 to amend the FY 2019-2023 TIP and the FY 2020-2024 TIP. This action is recommended to ensure FDOT can authorize funding for this project. Please contact Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC staff, at (800) 226-8914, Ext. 219 or gary.kramer@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-19

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 – FISCAL YEAR 2023
AND THE FISCAL YEAR 2020– FISCAL YEAR 2024 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is adopted annually by the TPO and submitted to the governor of the State of Florida and the governor of the State of Alabama, to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and through the State of Alabama and State of Florida to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and

WHEREAS, the TIP is periodically amended to maintain consistency with the Florida and Alabama Departments of Transportation Work Programs; and

WHEREAS, authorization for federal funding of projects within an urbanized area cannot be obtained unless the projects are included in the TPO’s TIP; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) believes that the amendment listed below will support the performance targets established by the states and supported by the TPO.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:


Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA- ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: ____________________________
Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: ______________________
Funding for the FY 19-20 UPWP for the Florida-Alabama TPO
4393212

FLORIDA-ALABAMA TPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>2,004,132</td>
<td>749,236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,753,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,753,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior Cost < 2018/19: 0
Future Cost > 2022/23: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,753,368

Project Description: On July 10, 2019 TPO agenda for approval.
Funding for the FY 19-20 UPWP for the Florida-Alabama TPO.
## FLORIDA-ALABAMA TPO

**Work Summary:** TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

**From:** FY 19-20 UPWP

**To:**

**Lead Agency:** TPO

**LRTP #:** Final Report p. 7-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>2023/24</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>641,854</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>641,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>ACSU</td>
<td>107,382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>749,236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>749,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Cost < 2019/20:** 2,004,132

**Future Cost > 2023/24:** 0

**Total Project Cost:** 2,753,368

**Project Description:** On July 10, 2019 TPO agenda for approval.
Funding for the FY 19-20 UPWP for the Florida-Alabama TPO.
ENCLOSURE C
ALL COMMITTEES
(TPO ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED)

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-15 Adopting the FL-AL FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: 23 Code of Federal Regulations Section 134(j), Chapter 339.175 (8)(b) Florida Statutes, Florida-Alabama TPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Task C.1

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: Annually, the TPO reviews and adopts transportation project priorities in July for submittal to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) by August 1st. This document is part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process. Its purpose is to ensure that transportation projects programmed by FDOT in the Five-Year Work Program are consistent with local needs and plans for the TPO planning area.

As stated in the TPO Public Participation Process Plan dated April 2016, the Project Priorities result from the Long Range Transportation Plan's Cost Feasible Plan and are reviewed with the public and the TPO’s advisory committees. Once approved by the TPO, the priorities are given to FDOT for creation of the Five-Year Work Program. From the Five-Year Work Program, the TPO develops the TIP which contains all transportation programs and projects scheduled during the next five years. The TIP is revised annually in June and is available in interactive format on the TPO’s website.

The Project Priorities and TIP must be developed by the TPO in consultation with all interested parties and, at a minimum, describe procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for the following, as outlined by the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR 450.316) and the MPO Handbook:

- Providing reasonable public access to technical and policy information used;
- Providing adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment at key decisions, such as but not limited to the approval of the TIP/Project Priorities;
- Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during plan development process;
- Making the TIP and Project Priorities drafts and final documents available on the TPO website;
- Holding public meetings at convenient times and accessible locations;
- Seeking out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, including but not limited to, low-income and minority households;
- Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under 23 C.F.R. Subpart B;
- Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan;
- When significant written and oral comments are received on a draft TIP or Project Priorities as a result of public involvement, a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made part of the final documents;
- If the final Project Priorities/TIP differ significantly from the one made available for public comment or raises new material issues, an additional opportunity for public comment must be made available;
- When the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) includes Indian tribal lands, the TPO shall appropriately involve the Indian tribal government(s); and
- When the MPA includes federal public lands, the TPO shall appropriately involve the federal government.
General methods proven effective in previous Project Priorities and TIP public involvement efforts include:

- Providing the public with a sufficient opportunity to review the draft Project Priorities and TIP documents online;
- Promoting development of the Project Priorities and TIP through news releases, social media outlets and email blasts to TPO and advisory committee members as well as interested parties;
- Holding at least two public workshops for Project Priorities and TIP across the FL-AL TPO area unless an LRTP update is underway, in which case the Project Priorities and TIP would be discussed in conjunction with LRTP presentations;
- Coordinating public outreach to at least two additional community groups (with emphasis on the underserved) unless an LRTP update is underway, in which case the Project Priorities and TIP would be discussed in conjunction with LRTP presentations;
- Providing the public with a sufficient opportunity to review the draft Project Priorities and TIP documents online;
- Including public input collected at workshops in the draft Project Priorities and TIP;
- Including Project Priorities and TIP review in the advertisement of the TPO meeting when the draft Project Priorities and TIP are to be presented;
- Providing public with an opportunity to comment during public forum when the draft Project Priorities and TIP are presented for review to the TPO and advisory committees;
- Including adoption in the advertisement of the TPO meeting when final draft Project Priorities and TIP are to be presented;
- Providing public with an opportunity to comment during public forum when the draft Project Priorities and TIP are presented for adoption to the TPO and advisory committees; and
- Publishing adopted TIP interactive site and final Project Priorities document on website.

TPO responsibilities require that all modes of transportation be addressed in the Project Priorities. The following categories of projects are included in the Project Priorities:

1. Long Range Transportation Plan Capacity Projects
2. Transportation Systems Management Projects
3. Transportation Alternative Program Projects
4. Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects – Alabama
5. Public Transportation Projects
6. Aviation Projects
7. Seaport Projects

The draft Project Priorities for FY 2021-2025 project schedule is listed below:

- April 8, 2019- TCC meeting to present Project Priorities schedule (Pensacola City Hall) (Completed)
- April 9, 2019- CAC meeting to present Project Priorities schedule (Pensacola City Hall) (Completed)
- April 10, 2019- TPO meeting to present Project Priorities schedule (Tiger Point Community Center) (Completed)
- May 9, 2019- Public outreach event (Santa Rosa County Board of County Commissioners (Tiger Point Community Center) (Completed, see attachment)
- May 15, 2019- Public outreach event (Lillian-Perdido Bay Library) (Completed, see attachment)
- May 16, 2019- Public outreach event (Escambia Board of County Commissioners (Escambia County Government Complex) (Completed, see attachment)
• May 22, 2019- Public workshop (Pensacola City Hall) (*Completed, see attachment*)
• May 22, 2019- TPO/TCC/CAC workshop (Pensacola City Hall) (*Completed, see attachment*)
• June 10, 2019- TCC meeting to present draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities (Pensacola City Hall) (*Completed*)
• June 11, 2019- CAC meeting to present draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities (Pensacola City Hall) (*Completed*)
• June 12, 2019- TPO meeting to present draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities (West Florida Regional Library) (*Completed*)
• June 17, 2019- TPO/TCC/CAC workshop (Pensacola City Hall) (*Completed, see attachment*)
• June 17, 2019- Project Priorities public workshop (Bagdad Community Center) (*Completed, see attachment*)
• July 8, 2019- TCC meeting to recommend approval of FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities (Pensacola City Hall)
• July 9, 2019- CAC meeting to recommend approval of FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities (Pensacola City Hall)
• July 10, 2019- TPO meeting to recommend approval of FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities Tiger Point Community Center

The draft Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities document presented at the June 2019 TPO and advisory committees is accessible at the following link: https://www.ecrc.org/programs/transportation_planning/plans_and_documents/index.php#outer-149. In addition, an interactive map which shows the location and the street view by category for the projects identified in the draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities may be viewed at: www.tinyurl.com/TPOPriorities2021-2025.

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-15
- Draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities Tables
- May 9, 15, and 16, 2019 Public Outreach Comments
- May 22, 2019 Public Workshop Comments
- June 17, 2019 Public Workshop Comments
- May 22, 2019 TPO/TCC/TPO Comments
- June 17, 2019 TPO/TCC/TPO Comments

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion to authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-15 to adopt the FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities with any changes. This motion is recommended to maintain the August 1, 2019 submittal deadline to FDOT/ALDOT. Please contact Mr. Gary Kramer gary.kramer@ecrc.org at (850) 332-7976 Ext. 219 if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-15

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION ADOPTING THE FY 2021-2025 PROJECT PRIORITIES

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is adopted annually by the TPO and submitted to the governor of the state of Florida and the governor of the state of Alabama, to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and through the state of Alabama and state of Florida to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and

WHEREAS, public outreach events were held on May 9, 15 and 26, 2019, public workshops were held on May 22 and June 17, 2019, and TPO and advisory committee public workshops were held on May 22 and June 17, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the initial step in the development of the TIP is for the TPO to submit its transportation project priorities for all modes of travel to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) prior to August 1st; and

WHEREAS, the project priorities document is also submitted annually to the Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) even though it is considered part of the Transportation Improvement Program which ALDOT only requires every four years;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The TPO adopts the FY2021 - FY 2025 Project Priorities with any changes that may have been presented.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida- Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA- ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: ____________________________
   Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: ________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>FDOT WP#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Project/Strategy</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Regional ITS Plan Projects</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Obligate up to 90% of the Federal Urbanized (SU) funds in FY 2023-2024 and FY 2024-2025 towards the development of the RTMC and on-system Regional Advanced Traffic Management System improvements, $28,000,000 in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for ITS</td>
<td>ESC./SRC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Regional ITS Plan Projects</td>
<td>4125452</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Annual Maintenance for ITS</td>
<td>ESC./SRC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chemstrand Road</td>
<td>421731</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Flex Funds</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>4218055</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Complete Streets Program</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public Transportation Capital Improvements</td>
<td>4217331</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Regional Trail Program</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>4.263</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US 90 Escambia County Line to Bell Lane</td>
<td>4389081</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>US 90 Willing Street to Stewart Street</td>
<td>4218055</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New 4 Lane Facility</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 292 (Perdido Key Drive) West State Park Boundary to Gongora</td>
<td>4224929</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New 4 Lane Facility</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nine Mile Road Mobile Highway to Beulah Road</td>
<td>4224929</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burgess Road US 29 to Hiburn Road</td>
<td>4224929</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>1.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>US 29 Connector Nine Mile Road to US 29</td>
<td>4224929</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New 4 Lane Facility</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>US 90 Glover Lane/Old US 90 to SR 87N Stewart St.</td>
<td>4409151</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>US 90 SR 87N Stewart St. to CR 89/Ward Basin Rd.</td>
<td>4409152</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>US 90 CR 89/Ward Basin Rd. to SR 875</td>
<td>4409153</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>US 90 Escambia Co. Line to Glover Lane/Old US 90</td>
<td>2204363</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Rank</td>
<td>Project Name/Limits</td>
<td>FDOT WPI#</td>
<td>Programmed Funding</td>
<td>Project/Strategy</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Length (miles)</td>
<td>Funding Sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pine Forest Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gulf Beach Highway</td>
<td>2184932</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sorrento Road/Gulf Beach Highway</td>
<td>2184933</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bayfront Parkway</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>2 Lane Improvement</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>2 Lane Improvement</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Express Bus Route</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New Express Bus Route</td>
<td>ESC./SRC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Capital Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Blue Angel Parkway</td>
<td>4210121</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>ROW with State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sorrento Road</td>
<td>4210112</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>5.116</td>
<td>PD&amp;E on Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Langley Av./Tippin Av./9th Av.</td>
<td>2186202</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Major Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>30% Design until more funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fairfield Drive</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>US 90</td>
<td>2204362</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>US 98</td>
<td>2204265</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>US 98</td>
<td>2204266</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SR 292 (Perdido Key Drive)</td>
<td>4210111</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Provide Multimodal Improvement</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>6.956</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>US 98</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Major Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>US 98</td>
<td>2204263</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>5.473</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>US 98</td>
<td>2204264</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>4.578</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Rank</td>
<td>Project Name/Limits</td>
<td>FDOT WP#</td>
<td>Programmed Funding</td>
<td>Project/Strategy</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Length (miles)</td>
<td>Funding Sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Express Bus Route</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024</td>
<td>New Express Bus Route</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mobile Highway</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Navarre Community Access Road</td>
<td>4369021</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024</td>
<td>Construction 2 Lane Connectivity</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Berryhill Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 3 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Woodbine Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>East Bay Boulevard</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024</td>
<td>Enhanced 2 Lane Facility</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nine Mile Road</td>
<td>2185192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>1.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FULLY FUNDED PROJECTS NOT YET CONSTRUCTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>FDOT WP#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
- PD&E - Project Development and Environment Study
- PE - Preliminary Engineering (Design)
- ROW - Right-of-Way
- CST - Construction
- SIS - Strategic Intermodal System (FDOT roadway designation)
- DSB - Design Build
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>FDOT WPI#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Project/Strategy</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-10 at US 29</td>
<td>2224761</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>5.816</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW $3,935,700 $7,738,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CST $131,526,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-10 at Beulah Road</td>
<td>43331131</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New Interchange</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-10 Alabama Line to West of SR 95 (US 29)</td>
<td>4379051</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>9.569</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US 29 Connector</td>
<td>433113-2</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>New 4 Lane Facility</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nine Mile to US 29</td>
<td>433113-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR 87 North</td>
<td>4167482</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR 87A (Langley Street) to Neal Kinngton Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blue Angel Parkway</td>
<td>4210121</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>ROW with State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorrento Road to US 98</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW LF $5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 87 Connector</td>
<td>4167488</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 10 (US 90) to CR 191 (Munson Highway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR 87 Connector</td>
<td>4167489</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR 191 (Munson Highway) to SR 87 North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blue Angel Parkway</td>
<td>4210122</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>7.077</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 98 to Saufley Field Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>US 98 East of Ortega Street to Okaloosa Co. Line</td>
<td>2204265</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE $3,850,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>US 98 E. of Ramble Bay Lane to E. of Ortega Street</td>
<td>2204266</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>US 98 FL-AL State Line to Blue Angel Parkway</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 4 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>US 98 At SR 399</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Major Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>US 98 Portside Drive to Bergren Road</td>
<td>2204263</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>5.473</td>
<td>ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE $4,950,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>US 98 Bergren Road to East of Ramble Bay Lane</td>
<td>2204264</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>4.578</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I-10 US 29 to Davis Highway</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 8 Lanes</td>
<td>ESC.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I-10 Avalon Boulevard to Okaloosa County Line</td>
<td>4130624</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 6 Lanes</td>
<td>SRC.</td>
<td>20.969</td>
<td>PD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>FDOT WPI#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Project/Strategy</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 30 (US 98) Bayshore Road to Portside Drive</td>
<td>2204401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Rank</td>
<td>Project Name/Limits</td>
<td>ALDOT WPI#</td>
<td>Programmed Funding</td>
<td>Project/Strategy</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Length (miles)</td>
<td>Funding Sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR 180 (Canal Road)</td>
<td>100040566</td>
<td>Phase 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024</td>
<td>Widen to 5 Lanes</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 59 to Foley Beach Express</td>
<td>100040567 100040568</td>
<td>ROW UT CST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,239,194 $1,397,149 $13,347,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PD&E - Project Development and Environment Study  
PE - Preliminary Engineering (Design)  
ROW - Right-of-Way  
CST - Construction
### Table 4 - FY 21-25 Transportation System Management (TSM) Project Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Rank</th>
<th>Previous Rank</th>
<th>Major Street</th>
<th>Minor Street</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 30 (US 98) (ESC)</td>
<td>Little Creek Lane</td>
<td>1- Add northbound right turn lane</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FDOT Comments: No comments provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2                | 5             | SR 10 (US 90) (SRC)            | West Spencer Field Road | 1- Upgrade signals to mast arm configuration  
2- Dual Southbound Left Turn Lane  
3- Realign Crosswalks                  | NA         | $250,000 for Construction       |
|                  |               |                               |               | FDOT Comments: Right of Way for signal poles and borings.                              |            |                                     |
| 3                | NA            | SR 30 (US 98) (SRC)            | Soundside Drive | 1- Signalize intersection                                                              | 02/28/16   | $463,147 for Construction  
$100,000 for ROW | $463,147 for Construction  
$100,000 for ROW |
|                  |               |                               |               | FDOT Comments: Maintain Right of Way phase for potential driveway tie-in issues and ditch system issues. |            |                                     |
| 4                | 6             | State System Wide (ESC/SRC)    |               | 1- Uninterrupted Power Supply Upgrades to Intersections                                 | NA         | In Progress                         |
|                  |               |                               |               | FDOT Comments: Requested by Ryan Navota. List of intersections not provided to-date. Request removal and implement through ATMS deployment. |            |                                     |
| 5                | NA            | SR 292 (Sorrento Road) (ESC)   | CR 292A Innerarity Point | 1- Construct Southbound Left Turn Lane, Construct East Bound Right Turn Lane, and Extend West Bound Left Turn Lane. | NA         | Fully Funded                        |
### Table 4 - FY 21-25 Transportation System Management (TSM) Project Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Rank</th>
<th>Previous Rank</th>
<th>Major Street</th>
<th>Minor Street</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SR 292 (Gulf Beach Highway) (ESC)</td>
<td>Sunset Avenue</td>
<td>1- Signalize Patton Drive and Sunset Avenue. Access Management to intersection turn lanes. Widen road to facilitate turn lane improvements.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDOT Comments:** Construction funded FY 20/21. Project ID 4399641.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Rank</th>
<th>Previous Rank</th>
<th>Major Street</th>
<th>Minor Street</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SR 10 (US 90A) E Nine Mile Road (ESC)</td>
<td>North Palafox Street</td>
<td>1- Upgrade Traffic Signals, Modify Medians, Remove Acceleration Tapers, and Left Turn Lanes at Unsignalized Intersections.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDOT Comments:** Construction funded FY 19/20. Project ID 4406581.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Rank</th>
<th>Previous Rank</th>
<th>Major Street</th>
<th>Minor Street</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SR 292 (Sorrento Road) (ESC)</td>
<td>CR 293 (Bauer Road)</td>
<td>1- Construct East Bound Right Turn Lane, Construct North Bound Right Turn Lane, Extend West Bound Left Turn Lane, Extend West Bound Right Turn Lane, and Reconfigure Signal Hardware.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDOT Comments:** Construction funded FY 21/22. Project ID 4418821.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Rank</th>
<th>Previous Rank</th>
<th>Major Street</th>
<th>Minor Street</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Study Date</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 10 (US 90) Mobile Highway (ESC)</td>
<td>Klondike Road</td>
<td>1-Add Traffic Signal at Intersection and Right Turn Lanes in all Quadrants.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fully Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FDOT Comments:** Construction funded FY 21/22. Project ID 4440991.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FDOT WP#</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Multi-Modal Connectivity to Legion Field Park &amp; Global Learning Academy (Pensacola CRA)</td>
<td>North L Street from Cervantes Street to Gregory Street West Gregory Street from Pace Boulevard to North I Street West Wright Street from Pace Boulevard to North P Street Pace Boulevard at Jackson Street Pace Boulevard at Wright Street</td>
<td>The proposed project will interconnect L Street and Gregory Street. Additional safety features are proposed with a traffic signal on Pace Boulevard at Wright Street and a pedestrian phase for the signal on Pace Boulevard at Jackson Street. The include features of a Yield Street on L Street, a multimodal sidepath along the south side of Gregory Street, and new sidewalks on Wright Street. 0.88 miles.</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Multi-Modal Connectivity to Downtown Pensacola via W. Main Street (Pensacola CRA)</td>
<td>West Main Street from B Street to Clubbs Street</td>
<td>The proposed project will include a 10 foot multimodal bike/ped sidepath located approximately 6 to 8 feet from the edge of pavement to West Main Street. The green strip between the edge of pavement and the path will be used as a stormwater management rain garden and traffic calming element. The project will serve as west extension to the Main Street road diet east of the project limits, and will provide for the conversion and reuse of an unutilized segment of railway corridor for trails for pedestrians and bicyclists. 0.16 miles.</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Multi-Modal Connector - Phase 1 (Milton) CR 191 (Murson Highway) from SR 87 (Stewart Street) to Carpenter's Park</td>
<td>CR 191 (Murson Highway) from SR 87 (Stewart Street) to Carpenter's Park</td>
<td>This project will provide a safe walking/bicycle route that will interconnect local residential areas as well as the nearby schools (Milton High School and Rhodes Elementary School).</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Chemstrand Road #2 (ESC)</td>
<td>Lowell Lane to Ten Mile Road</td>
<td>Install sidewalks along both sides of Chemstrand Rd from Lowell Lane to 440’ south of Ten Mile Road. The project length is approximately 0.754 miles.</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Olive Road Phases I and II (ESC)</td>
<td>Old Palafox to Davis Highway</td>
<td>This project will install sidewalks on the north side of Olive Rd (CR-290) in Escambia County. The project length is approximately 2.18 miles and begins at Old Palafox and ends at Davis Hwy (SR-291). Escambia County has recently completed construction on Olive Rd which included resurfacing, miscellaneous drainage and water main upgrades. Sidewalks were not included in the project due to budget constraints.</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Dog Track Road (ESC)</td>
<td>Blue Angel Parkway to SR 30 (US 98)</td>
<td>This project will install paved shoulders along both sides of Dog Track Rd (CR-297) in Escambia County.</td>
<td>PE and CST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 - FY 21-25 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project Priorities

**Draft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FDOT WPIS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Chemstrand Road #1 (ESC)</td>
<td>Johnson Avenue to Nine Mile Road</td>
<td>PD&amp;E - Project Development and Environment Study: This project will install sidewalks along Chemstrand Rd in Escambia County. The project length is approximately 1.0 miles and begins at Johnson Ave and ends at Nine Mile Rd (SR-10). This project will provide a connection to sidewalks on Johnson Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Perdido Key Drive (ESC)</td>
<td>West State Park Boundary to Gongora Drive</td>
<td>PE and CST: This project will provide for construction of a 10' wide multi-use path on the north side of Perdido Key Dr. (SR 292) along with 5’ concrete sidewalks on the south side connecting heavily developed areas on Perdido Key: 4.263 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Stefani Road and Nine ½ Mile Road (ESC)</td>
<td>Pine Forest Road and Stefani Road to Stefani Road and Nine Mile Road</td>
<td>PE and CST: This project will install sidewalks on the east side of Stefani Rd between Nine Mile Rd and Nine &amp; ½ Mile Rd (0.5 miles). Sidewalks are also proposed along the north side of Nine &amp; ½ Mile Rd between Pine Forest Rd and Stefani Rd: 0.75 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4424381</td>
<td>Multi-use Pathway (Gulf Breeze)</td>
<td>Fairpoint Drive to Shoreline Drive</td>
<td>CST: Project will form a collected loop for multi-use pathway and boardwalk trail on Shoreline Drive, Fairpoint Drive, and wetlands boardwalk trial south of Shoreline Drive in Gulf Breeze: 3.93 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Panhandle Trail (SRC)</td>
<td>US 98 to East River Drive</td>
<td>PE and CST: This project will install 5,350 ft bike trail lanes on Panhandle Trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FULLY FUNDED PROJECTS NOT YET CONSTRUCTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>SRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 191A (Old Bagdad Highway)</td>
<td>4381142</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 281 (Avalon Blvd.) to Parkmore Plaza Dr.</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$282,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 296 (Saufley Field Road)</td>
<td>4335772</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Entrance to Mobile Highway</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$3,351,677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 399 (East Bay Boulevard)</td>
<td>4407411</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Tom King Bayou</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$1,082,455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PD&E - Project Development and Environment Study
PE - Preliminary Engineering (Design)
ROW - Right-of-Way
CST - Construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rank</th>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>ALDOT WPI#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Project/Strategy</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CR 99, Carrier Drive to Spanish Cove Drive</td>
<td>100063403, 100063404</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td>$509,952</td>
<td>Add Paved Shoulders (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR 99, CR 91 to Carrier Drive</td>
<td>100063634, 100063640</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Add Paved Shoulders (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 42 (Alabama US 98), Hillcrest Road to Barclay Avenue</td>
<td>100063635, 100063641</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Add Paved Shoulders (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 42 (Alabama US 98), Barclay Avenue to Alabama State Line</td>
<td>100068456</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Add Sidewalks (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CR 99, Carrier Drive to Spanish Cove Drive</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Sidewalks (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 42 (Alabama US 98), SR 91 Syacamore to Hillcrest Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Paved Shoulders (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 42 (Alabama US 98), Hillcrest Road to Barclay Avenue</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Sidewalks (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR 42 Alabama US 98, SR 91 Syacamore to Hillcrest Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Phase 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Sidewalks (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fully Funded Projects Not Yet Constructed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name/Limits</th>
<th>ALDOT WPI#</th>
<th>Programmed Funding</th>
<th>Project/Strategy</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Funding Sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 42 (Alabama US 98), Barclay Avenue to Alabama State Line</td>
<td>100060029</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>$331,476</td>
<td>Add Paved Shoulders (Major Regrading)</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PD&E - Project Development and Environment Study
PE - Preliminary Engineering (Design)
ROW - Right-of-Way
CST - Construction
May 9, 2019 - Santa Rosa County Board of County Commissioners--Tiger Point Community Center

1. Publix in Gulf Breeze at McClure Drive needs a traffic signal light for left turn to go East. 
   *This request has been forwarded to the FDOT Urban Liaison.*

2. 3-mile bridge exiting to Gulf Breeze traffic flow 
   *FDOT has maintained a Maintenance of Traffic Plan for the 3 Mile Bridge Replacement.*

3. Soundside Drive & US 98 needs a traffic signal - no more U-turns lanes. People are crazy once there no one pays attention and everyone in a hurry - No Courtesy - no one follows the rules of the road. HELP US! Thank you
   *This is #3 Transportation Systems Management Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities.*

4. Do not four lane 90 thru Milton! Ten years later, you'll want a road to return it to its walkable state. Consider a fly over (Essentially, I-110 to downtown Pensacola is a flyover, allowing for people to walk underneath.
   *This is #12 Non-SIS Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities. FDOT has completed the Project Development and Environmental Study and Design is funded in FY 2022/23. City of Milton City Council has passed a resolution not supporting the 4-laning of this project.*

5. Soundside Drive needs a light NOW. It will only get worse with each passing day.
   *This is #3 Transportation Systems Management Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities.*

6. We ask to prioritize 98 & Soundside for a traffic light. We've had several accidents, very serious. Cars traveling westbound clog the median turning left on soundside and making U-turns creating a complete cluster. Needs to be addressed.
   *This is #3 Transportation Systems Management Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities.*

May 15, 2019 - Lillian-Perdido Bay Library

1. I am President of the Perdido Key Association (PKA) and am concerned about an erosion of support for the Perdido Key multi-use path along Perdido Key Drive. It needs to be fully funded for conservation which is currently only true for the portion from the west end of the Perdido Key State Park to the Alabama State Line. The path must remain only for non-motorists, pedestrian & bicycle use traffic.
   *This is #8 Transportation Alternatives Project Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities.*

2. Need paved shoulders for bikes or pedestrians use on HWY 98 #3 priority-for safety of pedestrians / bikes. Unable or difficult on Hwy 98 to ride bikes on side of road due to alert drivers when cars get off roadway. It is prohibitive for bikes being able to ride to side of the road instead of in the roadway. With speed of the cars and amount of traffic it is difficult for cars to move out to pass bike traffic.
3. **Great concerns over Pedestrian/ Bicycle Safety on Sorrento Road (SR292) from Bauer Road to Innerarity Point. 2 sections, BSU park, 3 major neighborhoods (possible candidate for safe routes to schools)**
Comment noted.

4. **Need to De-Prioritize widening of Sorrento Road from Blue Angel to Innerarity until Theo Baars Bridge is widened! Priority # 22 (Delete)**
   
   *FDOT is currently conducting a Safety Study on Theo Baars Bridge. The need for widening for widening Sorrento Road was established in the Long Range Transportation Plan. However, this project is currently the #22 Non-SIS Priority in the Draft TPO’s FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities. Therefore, there are 21 projects ranked higher.*

5. **Need to Expedite construction of Wolf Bay Bridge Connector to So. Baldwin with 4-lane connector to Lillian Bridge (to take congestion off Perdido Key Drive Now designated as Mater inter-state corridor by FDOT.**
   
   *This project is funded by the City of Orange Beach. The 4-laning of US 98 in the TPO area is a needed project in the Long Range Transportation Plan. However, the widening of US 98 has not been funded by ALDOT.*

---

May 16, 2019- Escambia County Board of County Commissioners—Escambia County Government Complex

1. **Fully support Public Transportation - very crucial to the community.**
Comment noted.

2. **I support ECAT!**
Comment noted.

3. **Although I do not live in Pensacola, I visit on a regular basis and I think public transportation is very important!**
Comment noted.

4. **I support ECAT - Keep public transportation.**
Comment noted.

5. **Keep growing & spreading out!**
   
   *Land use regulations are implemented by the local governments. As the population of Florida continues to grow, transportation infrastructure will need to be accommodated as well.*

6. **We need bus transportation across the panhandle.**
   
   *This has been recognized a need in our Long Transportation Plans. However, funding remains the critical obstacle for implementing this request.*

7. **I support ECAT!**
Comment noted.
1. **How did the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan comment about?**
The Long Range Transportation Plan is required to be adopted by the Florida-Alabama TPO every five years and maintain a twenty year planning horizon. The 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan was adopted on November 3, 2015. The 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan needs to be adopted by November 3, 2020.

2. **What data sources are used to develop projections?**
The Florida Department of Transportation develops and maintains the Northwest Florida Regional Transportation Model. Base Year and Horizon Socio-Economic projection are developed by Traffic Analysis Zone where used as input to run the Transportation Model. The output from the Transportation Model is used a guide to determine what transportation improvement are needed for the Long Range Transportation Plan.

3. **Highway 98 in west Escambia County is a concern. How do the projections take into account rapid growth?**
   Population is one of the inputs of the Socio-Economic Data for the Northwest Florida Regional Transportation Model.

4. **What is the difference between the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and the Non-SIS?**
The SIS roadways are the major roadways in the area such as but not limited to I-10, I-110, US 29, US 98, and SR 87 which the Florida Department of Transportation has devoted a major source of their funds for improvements. The Non-SIS are the other roadways in the region that do not meet the criteria of the SIS.

5. **Why is Blue Angel Parkway on both SIS and Non-SIS tables?**
When the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan was developed, it was anticipated that military connector would be part of the SIS in the future but were not yet part of the SIS. Therefore, it was decided to include Blue Angel Parkway on both lists. Military connectors are now included on the SIS.

6. **Do military installations get more consideration for transportation funding?**
SIS roadways received more funding than Non-SIS roadways.

7. **Where did the $5,000,000 come from for Blue Angel Parkway?**
Blue Angel Parkway from Sorrento Road to US 98 (Non-SIS Priority #21 and SIS Priority #6 has $5,000,000 for Right-of-Way in FY 2020-2021 as local funds.

8. **What involvement does the Federal Government have on Blue Angel Parkway?**
   If Federal funds are used on Blue Angel Parkway, the roadway would have to be designed and constructed to the standards of the Federal Highway Administration.

9. **Is there a Federal contact for our region?**
The Federal Highway Administration in Tallahassee, Florida and Montgomery, Alabama assign contacts for our region.

10. **Highway 98 should be higher than #12 priority on the SIS. Urgency is for three lanes not four lanes.**
    Comment noted.
11. **#3 priority on the Non-SIS.** Does Escambia County need to provide more information than “To Be Determined”? When will the $1,500,000 be available?

   *It is recommended that Escambia County and the City of Pensacola review the completed Corridor Management Plans and determined which Corridor Management Plan should be included as the #3 Non-SIS Priority for implementation. The $1,500,000 will likely be funded in FY 2024/2025 when the Florida Department of Transportation presents the FY 2021-2025 Tentative Work Program in October 2019.*

12. **Why are the Committed Tables not listed in the priority document?**

   *At a meeting with the Florida Department of Transportation, it was recommended that the TPO Staff condense its Project Priorities Document and include projects funded for construction in the first three years of the work program at the end of each of the sections.*

13. **Where are the traffic signal improvements?**

   *Table 4 lists the priorities for Transportation System Management Projects which are short-term operational improvements such as turn lanes, signal timing, median modification, etc. If a traffic signal improvement is warranted and has been included in the Florida Department of Transportation’s Candidate List, it will be included in Table 4.*

14. **What is FDOT’s policy on replacing wired traffic lights?**

   *FDOT Policy is to replace wired traffic lights with mast arms within 10 miles of the coast of Gulf of Mexico when funds are available.*

15. **Why are the Bicycle/Pedestrian projects for Florida no longer listed?**

   *At a meeting with the Florida Department of Transportation, it was recommended that the TPO Staff condense its Project Priorities Document and not include the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities from the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan. The reason for the not including the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities is there were 75 Bicycle-Pedestrian Priorities last year and the Non-SIS Priority #5 is the only funding source for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities and contains one priority annually in the amount of $350,000.*
1. **Regarding comments from the May 15, 2019 Public Outreach at the Lillian-Perdido Bay Library.**

   TPO Member Doug Hill indicated his support for Multi-Use Path on Perdido Key. The growth of area supports the roadway capacity need for Sorrento Road from Blue Angel Parkway to Innerarity Point Road. The Wolf Bay Bridge project would relieve traffic off of Perdido Key Drive. Bicyclists and Pedestrian improvements need to be focused on Gulf Beach Highway instead of Sorrento Road which has been expressed to the Office of Greenways and Trails.

2. **Public comment.** What can be done to two-way Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Davis Highway instead of the current one-way pairs?

   The City of Pensacola should send a letter to FDOT to determine if Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Davis Highway can be restriped for two-way traffic instead of the existing one-way traffic on both roadways since they are both state roadways.

3. **Public comment.** Where would the public give input regarding the proposed roadway swap between FDOT and Escambia County for Perdido Key Drive and Beulah Road?

   Input regarding the proposed roadway swap between FDOT and Escambia County for Perdido Key Drive and Beulah Road needs to occur at a public meeting hosted by Escambia County.

4. **#1 Non-SIS Priority ITS.** Large amount of money which is not in Escambia County’s budget. Need to have conversations on what can be done to fund it. If cannot be funded, need to make a decision going forward.

   Presentations to the City Council and County Commission meetings regarding this topic are being arranged over the next few months.

5. **#3 Non-SIS Priority.** What year would the Mobility Management Program projects be funded?

   The Mobility Management Program Project identified in this priority will likely be funded in FY 2024/2025 when the Florida Department of Transportation presents the FY 2021-2025 Tentative Work Program in October 2019.

6. **#15 Non-SIS Priority Pine Forest Road.** With growth in this area, this project needs to be completed sooner rather than later.

   Comment noted.

7. **#16 Non-SIS Priority Gulf Beach Highway.** The Escambia County Community Redevelopment Agency supports this project.

   Comment noted.

8. **#25 Non-SIS Priority US 90.** Should be 6 lanes instead of 4 lanes. What is the status of the PD&E?

   US 90 should be 6 lanes instead of 4 lanes. The status of US 90 PD&E from Scenic Highway to the Santa Rosa County Line is complete.

9. **#28 Non-SIS Priority Perdido Key Drive.** What are the multi-modal improvements?

   The multimodal improvements for Perdido Key for this Priority are funded with Design money that was programmed for when the PD&E was funded. The multi-modal improvements are for Design of the multi-use path on Perdido Key Drive.
8. **#35 Non-SIS Priority Pinestead-Longleaf Connector.** Is this project still feasible?

   Escambia County staff mentioned the portion from Pineforest Road to Kemp has 60 percent Design Plans complete. The portion from Kemp to US 29 is currently not a focus for Escambia County.

9. **Should West Cervantes Street Project be on the Fully funded table?**

   No, Project ID #4437691 for West Cervantes Street from Dominguez Street to A Street is for construction of pedestrian safety improvements and was not a previous Non-SIS Project Priority. However, since the Design money for Complete Streets for Project ID #4409041 for West Main Street from Barrancas to S. Clubbs Street is funded in FY 2021-2022, it will be included in the fully funded table as it was a Non-SIS Project Priority for FY 2020-2024.

10. **#12 SIS Priority.** US 98 in Western Escambia County. Should this project be on the Non-SIS instead of the SIS?

    This portion of US 98 is not currently on this SIS. When the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan was developed, it was anticipated that US 98 would be part of the SIS in the future but was not yet part of the SIS. Therefore, it was decided to include this portion of US 98 in the SIS Cost Feasible Plan.

11. **What year does the Bicycle/Pedestrian money go back to Escambia County?**

    The Bicycle/Pedestrian money goes to Santa Rosa County from FY 2021/2022 to FY 2025/2026. Therefore, the Bicycle/Pedestrian money goes back to Escambia in FY 2026/2027.

12. **The Bicycle/Pedestrian Table for Florida should be included in the Project Priorities—just like in previous years.**

    At a meeting with the Florida Department of Transportation, it was recommended that the TPO Staff condense its Project Priorities Document and not include the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities from the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan. The reason for the not including the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities is there were 75 Bicycle-Pedestrian Priorities last year and the Non-SIS Priority #5 is the only funding source for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Priorities and contains one priority annually in the amount of $350,000.

13. **Public Transportation Priorities (Table 7).** Escambia County Area Transit should have a priority for conversion to alternative fuel vehicles.

    The comment has been forwarded to the Escambia County Area Transit.

14. **Port of Pensacola Priorities (Table 11).** Is there any funding for the ferries in the Port Pensacola Priorities?

    No, the ferries were funded from BP Oil Spill money and a Federal Grant. The ferries are operated by the Gulf Islands National Seashore.
1. **What is the reason funding amounts are missing?**
   The Project Priorities are listed in priority order and the funding sought is the funding phase that is requested to be funded. The funding identified in FY 2020 through FY 2024 is the funding amount that is identified in FY 2020-2024 Work Program. Not all five years have funds listed for a project.

2. **#1B Non-SIS Priority Regional ITS Projects. Will the funding requested in FY 2022 be funded?** Currently no funding is identified.
   It is anticipated that the funding request will be programmed in FY 2022. If it does not appear in the FY 2021-2025 Work Program, expect to see the funding request funded in the FY 2022-2026 Work Program.

3. **#6 Non-SIS Priority US 90. What is a Complete Street?**
   Complete Streets are streets that are designed to accommodate different transportation modes in a safe manner for people and vehicles. Examples are parking, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, landscaping, and lane widths.

4. **#12 Non-SIS Priority US 90. Two comment cards were received that did not support the widening of US 90 from SR 87N (Stewart Street) to CR 89 (Ward Basin Ward).**
   FDOT has completed the Project Development and Environmental Study and Design is funded in FY 2022/23. City of Milton City Council has passed a resolution not supporting the 4-laning of this project.

5. **#14 Non-SIS Priority US 90. Is the Project Development and Environmental Study complete?**
   Yes, the Project Development and Environmental Study is complete for US 90 from Escambia County Line to Glover Lane/US 90? The requested priority is for the Design, or Preliminary Engineering Phase, to be funded.

6. **#26, #27, #30, #31, and Fully Funded Non-SIS Priorities US 98. Remove these priorities for the Non-SIS Priorities since US 98 has been added to the SIS and these priorities appear in the SIS Project Priorities.**
   When the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan was developed, it was anticipated that US 98 would eventually be added to the SIS. Therefore, US 98 is included on both the Non-SIS and SIS Project Priority lists.

7. **#28 Non-SIS Priority Perdido Key Drive. What are multimodal Improvements and what is planned for safety improvements at the Florida/Alabama State Line?**
   Multimodal improvements on Perdido non-motorized improvements such as crosswalks multi-use paths. The Priority is to spend the Preliminary Engineering or Design funds that were programmed when Perdido Key Drive was a priority for 4-laning. Additional information will be provided.

8. **#32 Non-SIS Priority Express Bus Route. What is meant by Express Bus Route?**
   Express Bus Route is a bus route with limited stops from the origin to the destination.

9. **Non-SIS Fully Funded Projects. Should West Cervantes Street Safety Project be included in the non-SIS Fully Funded list?**
   No. The West Cervantes Street Safety Project was not funded with the Non-SIS capacity funds. It was funded with safety money. West Main Street Complete Streets Project #4409041 from
Barrancas to S. Clubbs Street will be added to the Non-SIS Fully Funded List. It is funded for Design or Preliminary Engineering in FY 2022 and was a Non-SIS Priority in FY 2020-2024.

10. **#1 SIS Priority I-10/US 29 Interchange. Is this project complete?**
    Phase 1 improvement, removing an access lane for merging of I-10 westbound and US 29 southbound and an installation of a traffic signal on US 29 north of I-10 is complete. This priority is for an interchange improvement, phase II, not an at-grade intersection improvement.

11. **#1 Capacity Projects—Alabama Priority Canal Road.** Widening Canal Road will make it this roadway unsafe for vehicle and pedestrians and at the intersection of the Foley Beach Express
    Canal Road will be designed and constructed in the safest manner possible for vehicles and pedestrians as well as at existing and future intersections with the Bridges along the corridor not just the Foley Beach Express.

12. **#2 and #3 TSM Priorities US 90 and West Spencer Field Road and US 98 and Soundside Drive.** It was recommended to switch these two priorities. If US 98 and Soundside Drive is funded, an advance funding request with local funds maybe requested.
    Comment noted.

13. **#4 TSM Priority State System Wide.** A row labeled “Fully Funded Projects Not Yet Constructed” should be inserted after this priority.
    Comment noted.

14. **Transportation Alternatives Priority #8 Perdido Key Drive.** In the Project Description, replace “10 feet” with “8 feet” and delete the words “(SR 292) along with 5 feet concrete sidewalks on the south side connecting heavily developed areas on Perdido Key.”
    Comment noted.

15. **Fully Funded Transportation Alternatives Priority East Bay Boulevard.** Replace the words “Pedestrian Wildlife” with the word “Multimodal.”
    If this change is made in the FDOT Work Program, this change will be made in the TPO’s Project Priorities.
Public Workshop Comments

1. Supports FDOT’s Project US 90 PD&E alternative
   Comment noted.
2. Milton City Council voted 6-2 against widening US 90. Glover Lane intersection is dangerous. A lot of accidents have occurred at this intersection.
   Comment noted.
3. Does not want US 90 widened to 4 lanes.
   Comment noted.
4. Supports US 90 widening but truck traffic should be diverted from downtown Milton.
   Comment noted.
5. Opposes US 90 widening. Wishes other alternatives can be explored.
   Comment noted.
6. Supports US 90 widening. It has been a priority for many years. Concerned about business outside of downtown as well as emergency vehicles.
   Comment noted.
7. Supports US 90 widening and does not want it moved down on the Priority List. Four routes were studied during the PD&E. SR 87 bypass is not the answer.
   Comment noted.
   Comment noted.
   Comment noted.
    Comment noted.
11. Opposes US 90 widening. More signal coordination is needed. Moving the courthouse will alleviate traffic.
    Comment noted.
    Comment noted.
    Comment noted.
    Comment noted.
Comment noted.

16. Preliminary Engineering or Design is funded in FY 2023 in amount of $2,750,000. Need to find a solution to the problem. Milton City Council passed a resolution opposing the widening of US 90 through downtown.  
Comment noted.

Comment Cards

1. It is not my intention to represent the official position of the Milton City Council or the official position of the City of Milton as mandated by City Council. I am speaking as a Citizen of Milton. The City of Milton doesn't accept the results of the PD&E study made by FDOT as a creditable solution for traffic problems on Highway 90 through Milton but regular communications with my constituents have provided me with firsthand knowledge that the majority of the Citizens affected by the traffic problems in Santa Rosa County, who call the City of Milton home, support the findings of the PD&E study on the widening of Highway 90 as presented by FDOT. During this last campaign season, I personally walked our City and went to some 3,000 homes. had the opportunity to meet and talk with a large percentage of our residents. Since that time, I have continued to network with citizens, residents, business owners and officials on a daily basis. These conversations have revealed an overwhelming number of the residents believe the result of the PD&E is the appropriate solution to this decades old problem. In a spirit of cooperation with the State of Florida and FDOT many of my constituents and I stand behind this plan and look forward to it being implemented as soon as possible. The survey FDOT introduced at the hearing held at the Santa Rosa County Municipal Auditorium building has been used repeatedly as proof the majority of Milton's citizens want to stop the four-lane. That survey should be considered invalid. The good names of the Milton Historical Society and of Main Street Milton were used to solicit no votes throughout our area as well nation-wide - not just in our county. At the Milton Executive meeting of Feb. 4th 2019 Mr. Sandborn admitted he front loaded the survey that he had placed on the internet. Front loaded means once you put your name and email address your vote was automatically registered as a keep Hwy 90 two lanes. There was no option to vote for the four-lane. We have a few people in our area that are using intimidation and threats in meetings and through social media to keep people in line with their thinking. These same people have had a large impact in our elections by campaign support and contributions. These people believe the direction they want our city to go in is more important than that of the majority of our citizens. The majority of Milton's citizens want a solution to this problem as soon as possible and support the study by FDOT.  
Comment noted.

2. Save historic Milton opposed to the four lane thru downtown. The highway 87 connector will help eliminate the need for the four lane. Also other less expensive options including a bridge at Berryhill. This would require no acquisition of right of way. With Perdido Key stopping the four lane and many Florida cities going on road diet, there is precedent to not
four lane thru out quaint city. Check out Gainesville Fla road diet on Main Street diet Orlando Road diet on Orange Blossom Trail.

Comment noted.

3. I am against the 4 way downtown. Keep all our historic buildings-I think it’s a shame to take our historic downtown. I am still against the courthouse issue. I am into keep Milton beautiful and not corrupt it with 4 lanes this is shameful. I have lived here for 40 years come from a small town where all the historic buildings are still standing and need to try to think about doing over passes included of water and today our town.

Comment noted.

4. I would like to see the widening of 90 through Milton lower on the priority list and 87 North extender moved higher. The widening of 90 will negatively effect the walkability of Milton and reduce the North/South traffic movement creating more bottle necks. Widening of 90 does not create alternatives it is still a bottleneck.

Comment noted.

5. I am against the four laning of Hwy 90 in downtown Milton. Don't have time to speak.

Comment noted.

6. Opposed to widening Highway 90 thru Milton. Solution - bridge over existing bridge. We chose Milton because of the charm. If we wanted to live in Pace, FL or anywhere else we would have moved there and not to Milton, FL.

Comment noted.

7. US 90 project - In 2015 FDOT moved the APD&E study from 2035 to 2015. -Ask that 90 project not be moved from its current ranking.

Comment noted.

8. I do not accept the solution provided by FDOT to resolve the traffic issue on highway 90/Caroline Street in historic home in this area and I want to assist with the preservation of our area. This should include a walkable area and not a four lane highway. There are other options available that will have no impact on downtown

Comment noted.

9. Milton Merchants Association. Survey Results???

Comment noted.

10. Build it now.

Comment noted.

11. Build the 4-Lane ASAP!!.

Comment noted.

12. Build the 4 lane please - ASAP!

Comment noted.

13. I think it's important to look at other alternative us a by-pass around Milton (downtown area) our downtown Milton are is very important to the citizens of Milton. Also, it's important to consider making the HWY 87 connector a higher priority. This important connector will take off ALOT of pressure on the HWY 90 through the downtown area. There's a better way to help with the traffic issues through the downtown area. Thank you.

Comment noted.
14. I am in favor of the compromise re-routing through Berryhill as are the majority of people I have discussed this with
   Comment noted.

15. I am opposed to the 4-laning of Hwy 90 through downtown Milton. I feel this will have a negative impact on businesses in the downtown area. Please work with the City of Milton to develop an alternative route, especially for the big trucks that may want to avoid the downtown area.
   Comment noted.

16. I am the owner of Cooper Plumbing & Company, Inc. 5919 Stewart St., Milton, FL in business for 49 years. This bottleneck at the 2-lane running from Stewart St to Hwy 87 South hinders the traveling of our trucks through this area coming and going out of downtown Milton, FL. I believe the P&E study recognizes all the problems and has found the proper solution. The widening of Hwy 90 - Please don't listen to a few people who stand to profit from a Southern Route to ease the traffic thru downtown Milton - you can look on the SRC Tax appraiser and easily see who will stand to profit from this route.
   Comment noted.

17. The cheapest way to build. Existing Businesses Hwy 90 should go through downtown Milton. The industrial park is at a disadvantage because of backup traffic going and coming to work. New companies will not locate there because of traffic. Prison employees are having a bad time going and coming to work. Emergency vehicles cannot go.
   Comment noted.

18. Bring Hwy 90 four-lane thru downtown.
   Comment noted.

19. I am strongly opposed to the 4-laning of highway 90 through downtown Milton. It would be extremely detrimental to the historical buildings, structures and the historical look of downtown Milton.
   Comment noted.

20. I am in favor of 4-laning Hwy 90 through downtown Milton. FDOT gas found this most favorable. To start over or reassess this project at this point would be an enormous financial burden for all of Florida's Taxpayers. It would be a travesty in fact! FOUR LANE 90 THOUGH MILTON
   Comment noted.

21. I do not support the widening of Hwy 90 though downtown Milton. Please move the 87 connect project to a higher priority on the project list and move the widening of Hwy 90 (downtown) lower on the priorities list.
   Comment noted.

22. I support the PD&E study by FDOT and want the traffic problem solved.
   Comment noted.

23. Hwy 90 & Glover lane intersection status and ask that you pursue a fix. Please request updated stats on accidents & red light camera for this intersection.
FDOT Urban Liaison has indicated the Highway 90 and Glover Lane realignment was not part of the preferred alternative for the US 90. Accident Statistics and the Red Light Camera data can be requested the Florida Highway Patrol and the City of Milton, respectively.

24. I own property and a business in the city limits of Milton. I am a lifelong Milton resident, and I strongly feel we need to widen highway 90 in order to avoid traffic backup and accidents. Comment noted.

25. This issue affects all citizens of Santa Rosa I work with history every day what point do we welcome progress and too many people put out by bottle neck. Comment noted.
Emailed Comments

From: Andrea Sutrick <asutrick3@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2019 8:23 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Comment Card - NOT in support of 4 laning of Hwy 90 in Downtown Milton

Good evening Mr. Kramer,

I do not support the four laning of Highway 90 in the downtown Milton section of the project and ask instead that FDOT work with the City of Milton on finding another solution that will not be detrimental to the downtown business and residential district. Moving all other sections of Highway 90 in Santa Rosa County higher in the project ranking list will better allow the FDOT to do so. I also support moving the Highway 87 Connector Project higher in project ranking, as completing this project will allow truck traffic and others traveling north and not wishing to travel through the downtown Milton section to do so, while providing for a much more effective and efficient hurricane evacuation route.

As a resident in downtown Milton, I also do not support the four laning of Highway 90 since it would destroy the most significant example of history and economic opportunity in Santa Rosa County. Downtown Milton’s historical charm would attract arts and culture, pedestrians, outdoor enthusiasts, heritage tourism and more. A four lane highway does not embrace traffic calming practices to slow traffic for pedestrian/bike safety and encourage passersby to stop, walk, and shop our downtown area. Cutting the downtown Milton area into two halves would not embrace bringing communities of people together and does not fit in with the City of Milton’s master plan for a future expanded Riverwalk area and sidewalk projects to connect Carpenter’s Park in the north and the historic Bagdad Village to our south to the heart of downtown Milton.

Thank you for considering my comments in preserving and protecting our Milton Historic District.

Sincerely,

Andrea Sutrick
5343 Conecuh St.
Milton, FL 32570

From: Brandi Whitehurst <brandiwhitehurst@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 10:26 AM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Comments on 90 widening

Hi Gary,

I wanted to submit some additional info to clarify my public forum comments last night.

As the courthouse is a traffic generator that will be relocated soon, the 87 connector should reduce truck traffic on 90 downtown and ridesharing/autonomous vehicles should reduce the number of vehicles on the road everywhere, I still feel 90 should not be widened in historic Milton and, if congestion remains an issue, alternatives including a downtown flyover should have more careful consideration.
That being said, if this is a basically done deal considering the PD&E has already been completed and there is no option FDOT will consider besides widening 90 to four lanes, I would like to see every possible option for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as landscaping beautification to ensure all has been considered to retain the charm of the downtown area and keep at least some of the walkability. Connecting the bike path along 90 east of Ward Basin to the Blackwater bike path, lighted pedestrian crossovers at at least every block (not two blocks) and traffic calming by design as well as parking areas to replace those lost by widening are but a few amenities that would make this easier for affected businesses and residents to bear. As someone who loves living on Willing Street, I still don't think this is the best option for Milton to move towards an mixed-use residential-retail neighborhood that would attract young people (like Pensacola has) but it would be unfortunate to see downtown Milton shorted in possible bike/ped and beautification enhancements by not considering some compromise.

Thank you,

Brandi Bates Whitehurst

From: jo lynn wiley <jlwobqueen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 2:25 PM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Opposition to the four lane through downtown Milton, Florida

Good Afternoon Mr. Kramer,

I was in attendance at the TPO meeting held at the Bagdad Recreation Center on June 17, 2019. I chose not to speak at the meeting but instead email you in regards to the proposed four lane of Highway 90 through downtown Milton.

My family came to Milton in 1993 as the result of my husband's duty station assignment as an Active Duty Member of the United States Navy. Our daughter started kindergarten in August of 1993 and we chose to reside in Milton over Pensacola due to the charm of this small bur wonderful city. We purchased a home, my husband retired from the Navy several years later, and we made the decision to stay. We were drawn the wonderful community and the small town feel of the community. I am a member of the Historical Society and value the downtown area as it stands currently. I feel the four lane through Milton would destroy the charm of our wonderful city and there are other options. While an alternate option to relieve the traffic situation may be a little more costly in construction and completion at the onset, in the long run it will be a savings that is priceless. The saving and preservation of the small town appeal of downtown Milton.
From: Jennifer Chapman <chapmanrx@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 2:47 PM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Downtown Milton

Please don't put four lanes through downtown Milton. I love that I live in a city with some visible history and an easily walkable family friendly area. The river walk area, imogene theatre are irreplaceable and important to me and my family.
I hope that there is an alternative that preserves our city's history and liveability.
Thank you.

Jennifer Chapman

From: Debbie Peaden <debcrn0120@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 4:16 PM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Historic Milton

Sir, as a member of one of the founding families in this area who settled in Milton in 1832 and still occupies the homestead here, I would like to voice my opinion regarding the four-lane plans through downtown Milton.
I can only think of a few scenarios that would have as devastating an effect on our small town. Constructing a four lane highway through our historic district (all of downtown) would effectively kill Milton and leave only a smattering of strip malls in the area. Any sense of pride in our local heritage and the very atmosphere of Milton would be gone.
I freely admit that I have not been as active as I should have been in local issues lately, but this plan has piqued my interest and a need to be more involved. This idea is abhorrent to me and I fully intend to fight its implementation and construction. Surely there is another potential route to alleviate congestion and smooth traffic flow through this area.
Therefore, at this time, please accept my vehement objection to this plan. Thank you for the opportunity to have the local population voice their concerns and opinions.
Sincerely,

Deborah J. Peaden

From: Carrie Neff <nursecarrie75@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 4:38 PM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Four lane

What exactly do I need to say. Other than I don't want our town to change and become some big place like Pensacola. I love where I live and historical downtown Milton Florida.
From: Sally Flowers <mustangsally_89@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Downtown Milton

I am asking you to reconsider 4 laning downtown Milton. Putting a 4 lane Hwy through downtown Milton would be horrible for our beautiful historic district
Sincerely,

From: Ware-Ehlers <wareehlersnwfl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 5:33 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: No 4 lane through milton

Please do not 4 lane hwy 90 through downtown Milton. If they want they need to leave existing bridge make it 2 lanes 1 way, and then run another 2 lanes the other way at the end of Berryhill, like they did years ago with the temp bridge they installed there when the existing 90 bridge was being built.
Thank you.

From: Bessie Bohannon <bessieb49@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 6:55 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: No 4 lane!

Please consider NOT to four lane down town Milton! I have lived in Milton all my life.
Thank you,

From: Mary Bohannon <mebohan32570@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 8:06:22 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Milton, florida

I have been to many historic main streets around the nation. 4laning is not the way. Cities are looking to implement more greenspaces and environmentally friendly spaces to live work and play. Please seek alternative solutions. I still believe that better timing of lights can help with congestion during peak hours.
From: Patricia Sunday <sundayrp1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 8:33 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: 4lanes

Please do not put a 4 lanes in our historic Milton, Thank you, [Redacted]
Sent from my iPhone

From: Ryan Bohannon <theryanbohannon@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 9:05 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Hwy 90 and Downtown Milton

Mr. Kramer,

Please help us preserve our historic downtown. Don't 4 lane us into a pavement hell. There are alternatives. We can work together for a cure. The people of Crestview have a chance to bypass and didn't... now they can't get a by-pass fast enough. Let's think beyond the here and now and look toward the future where a preserved historic district exists and traffic can still find their way to the west.

Thank you

From: Gailyn Brock <gailyn48@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 9:32 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: DON'T 4-lane highway 90 thru Milton!!

#1 The construction of the new bridge over Blackwater River was just recently complete.

#2 Preserve our historic downtown Milton, including and especially the Imogene Theatre!

#3 Change timing of stoplights in the courthouse area, especially late afternoon, to move traffic quicker across the bridge and into Milton.

#4 Eliminate the stoplight at Elmira. Traffic can either turn with the flow of traffic on 90, or wait to make a turn across traffic, OR turn and go away from highway 90.

Please, do not waste taxpayers dollars and RUIN our Milton historic downtown!!
From: Hannah Quinn <88blondie@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 5:52 AM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Downtown Milton

I’m writing in concern of the proposed four lane project of downtown Milton. Turning downtown into four lanes will damage what’s left of historic Milton. The parking alone that will be loss is tremendous. There is never enough parking as it is at big events and festivals. Milton is one of few old towns left and should be preserved as such. I don’t want to lose my home to four lanes.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dale Macarthy <kimmacarthy@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 8:50 AM
To: Gary Kramer <gary.kramer@ECRC.org>
Subject: Project Priorities Public Meeting

Mr. Kramer:

I was unable to attend the Project Priorities Public meeting held Monday, June 17, 2019.

Please add my comments to the public feedback received at that meeting:

FY21-25 Non-Strategic Intermodal System Project Priorities

Proj#12. I DO NOT support widening Hwy 90 through downtown Milton.

I urge DOT to work with the City of Milton to explore alternatives, and respect the City Council position to do no harm to the Historic structures along that route.

I feel the Hwy 87 connector project(s) will provide some relief to the traffic issue as will the moving of the courthouse to its new location (that project is underway).

FY21-25 Strategic Intermodal System Project Priorities

Proj#7&8 I DO SUPPORT moving these two projects as high as possible on priorities list.

This project will provide some relief to the congestion of Hwy 90 in downtown Milton.
Whatever it takes, please don’t allow Historical Downtown Milton to be destroyed by modern day progress. There are different routes that can be taken to deal with traffic that will still preserve the history of our small town. And on top of that, more historical markers & possibly a museum honoring our small town’s history needs to be installed. With all the hustle and bustle of modern day life it is so important to preserve our past so that people can see what & where we came from & inspire pride in our small town.

Debby Burdick
Marc and Debby Burdick
Don’t destroy our heritage for a four lane road!!

George Wilson
I am opposed to the plan to increase the number of lanes of traffic on Highway 90 through downtown Milton. I feel this would provide a very real barrier to the potential development of the historic area that this will sever. This plan virtually isolates the northern and southern halves of the district by the
elimination of several pedestrian crosswalks. I feel that this is a very shortsighted solution to the goal of increasing the flow of east west traffic through the adjoining counties.

From: georgedw@att.net
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 1:15 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Four Laning of Highway 90

As a professional historian, I am very concerned that the historic integrity of downtown Milton's historic district will be seriously compromised by plans to four-lane through the downtown area. With the potential inherent in downtown Milton due to its historic buildings and neighborhoods and its proximity to a scenic river, Milton is poised to exploit its natural heritage and scenery for the future. Fifty years from now no one is going to have nostalgic feelings for a four lane highway that guts out a community. We need foresight for the future, and that means planning alternate routes (like a second bridge to Berryhill and have east and west routes converge back at Stewart Street, similar to the town of Robertsdale in Baldwin County, AL which successfully split up Highway 59 through their heritage district downtown.) And, as we have all seen from recent events at Pensacola Beach, even four lanes can become bottlenecked and clogged just as easily as 2 lanes. Future generations will depend on us to balance preserving the identity and character of our community and practical transportation alternatives. Let’s not let them down.

Thank you for your time.

From: paulettegainus@rocketmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 1:30 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: 4 lane downtown Milton

Please DO NOT four lane downtown Milton. This will only worsen traffic plus make it unsafe for walking around downtown. Also it will destroy our beautiful historic downtown. I moved here to milton because it was a nice area and not to busy. Four laneing downtown will ruin all the reasons I moved here and not to Pensacola.
Mr. Kramer,

I was unable to attend the public hearing on Monday evening, however I would like my opinion to be noted on the widening project of HWY 90 through downtown Milton.

I am against the proposal to four lane HWY 90 through downtown Milton. I respectfully request that FDOT work with the City of Milton on finding an alternate solution that will not be detrimental to the downtown businesses and the Imogene Theater. It is my belief moving all other projects pertaining to sections of HWY 90 in Santa Rosa County to a higher ranking will better allow new traffic studies to be done at their completion, for the congestion issues that face downtown Milton. I understand the need for more effective and efficient hurricane evacuation routes, but I believe the completion of the other projects will show vast improvement for this issue, as well save our vital downtown area.

It may not be known to the FDOT that the Milton Courthouse is being moved in the coming years. This will immediately reduce some traffic issues facing downtown Milton. What this also allows, is for the downtown buildings to be freed of lawyers and opens up the ability for re-purposing the older buildings. The City of Milton has already changed zoning to allow to be more business friendly, it would be a travesty to hinder their progression without looking at the other projects' results.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

---

Mr. Kramer,

I strongly oppose the four laneing of Highway 90 through the downtown Milton business and residential district. I request your consideration of moving the Highway 87 Connector project up in the SIS priorities list due to the important role it will play in hurricane evacuation, improvement of access to NAS-Whiting Field and the Santa Rosa County Industrial Park, and
providing an alternative truck route for those traveling north and not desiring to travel through downtown Milton. For Non-SIS projects, I ask that you move all Highway 90 sections higher in the rankings than the downtown Milton section to allow the City of Milton an opportunity to work with FDOT to find transportation solutions that better protect the Milton business and residential district and the ongoing revitalization efforts occurring. Doing so would align with the City of Milton Comprehensive Plan, a requirement of the transportation planning process per Florida Statute.

I am encouraged by traffic calming projects, and other improvements centered on pedestrians and bicyclists, occurring within our TPO area, particularly in the City of Pensacola. Similar projects are occurring across our country, especially in downtowns. I hope that we can learn lessons from previous projects that were very damaging to other downtowns and not repeat those mistakes in our TPO area. Doing so will allow for better use of limited transportation funds and ensure that those funds best meet the future transportation needs of our communities.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the transportation project priorities.

Sincerely,

Vernon Compton
Milton, FL 32570

---

From: Rand Hicks <randhicks@me.com>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2019 2:56 PM
To: Gary Kramer
Subject: Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization's 2021-2025 Transportation Project Priorities

Gary,

I stand opposed to four-laying Highway 90 in Milton. It would destroy the integrity of the city’s primary cultural district just when it’s going through a renaissance, and would degrade business and residential interests throughout the area. Downtown is a lynchpin to its comeback.

Milton will benefit by maintaining, further developing, and encouraging a coherent downtown with multimodal capabilities that allows automobile traffic to coexist with pedestrians and bicyclists. It’s easy to demonstrate the financial boon that such development would promote in downtown Milton. Four lanes would bring virtual freeway speeds to the area, threaten civic use, and in no way benefit Milton’s culture and citizens.

One suggestion: by elevating all the other sections of Highway 90 in the project ranking for Santa Rosa County, you might persuade FDOT to relent.

The Highway 87 Connector Project deserves a higher ranking, too, and would offer better truck-flow
traffic in the northward direction and allow them to avoid a deflection into downtown Milton. It is reasonable to presume it would also be an effective evacuation route.

Please forward these comments, simple though they are, to whomever is responsible within FDOT’s chain of command. Thanks for that.

Sincerely,
ENCLOSURE D
SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-16 Adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: 23 Code of Federal Regulations Section 134(i), Chapter 339.175 (7) Florida Statutes, Florida–Alabama TPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Task C.2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: The TPO updates the Long Range Transportation Plan every 5 years. The current LRTP was adopted on November 3, 2015. The 2045 Florida-Alabama LRTP scope of services was approved by the TPO on February 13, 2015. Some of the tasks identified in the LRTP scope of services are: Public Participation, Congestion Management Process Update, Evaluation Criteria, Financial Resources, 2040 Needs Plan, 2040 Cost Feasible Plan, and Goals and Objectives.

The Goals and Objectives are the guiding principles for the development of the LRTP. They will help determine the projects that are ultimately adopted into the 2045 Needs Plan. A consultant task in the scope of services is to update the Goals and Objectives from the previous plan as well as to review federal, state, local, and regional plans to determine if any updates/changes are needed. A steering committee met at Pensacola City Hall on March 26, 2019 and April 23, 2019 to develop the draft 2045 LRTP Goals and Objectives document.

A public workshop on the draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives was held at the Marie Ella Davis Community Center on June 13, 2019.

The Goals and Objectives will be used to establish evaluation criteria to rank the adopted 2045 Needs Plan projects. Once this ranking is established, it will be used to create a draft 2045 Cost Feasible Plan.

Attached are the following:
- Resolution FL-AL 19-16
- Steering Committee Meeting #1 Summary
- Steering Committee Meeting #2 Summary
- Public Workshop Summary
- Mike Hamlin, ECUA Comment
- Draft Goals and Objectives

RECOMMENDED ACTION Approval of a motion to authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-16 to adopt the Florida-Alabama TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives with any changes that may have been presented. This alternative is recommended to maintain the adoption date of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan by November 3, 2020. Please contact Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC staff, if additional information is needed at gary.kramer@ecrc.org or (850) 332-7976 Ext. 219.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-16

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
APPROVING THE 2045 FLORIDA-ALABAMA LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO Planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Long Range Transportation Plan 2045 Update, developed pursuant to Part 23 Section 134(i), Code of Federal Regulations and Chapter 339.175 (7) Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approved the Long Range Transportation Plan 2045 Update Scope of Services on February 13, 2019; and

WHEREAS, a task in the Long Range Transportation Plan 2045 Update Scope of Services is Goals and Objectives; and

WHEREAS, Goals and Objectives were recommended by a steering committee consisting of members of the TPO's Technical Coordinating Committee, Citizens' Advisory Committee, and other members of the transportation industry, and

WHEREAS the steering committee considered and incorporated the ten FAST Act planning factors, performance measures, and other federal, state, and local transportation related documents in the development of the Goals and Objectives;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

The Florida-Alabama TPO approves the Goals and Objectives for its 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan update.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama TPO on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: __________________________
    Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: _______________________

FL-AL TPO Agenda
July 2019
A. **Introductions and Welcome**

- Gary Kramer welcomed the participants to the Steering Committee Meeting for the 2045 Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Long Range Transportation Plan and did a roll call to determine the Steering Committee members present.
B. **Overview of the Long Range Transportation Plan Process and Steering Committee**

- Gary Kramer explained the Long Range Transportation Plan is updated every five years and must maintain a 20-year planning horizon. The 2040 Long Range Transportation was adopted by the TPO on November 3, 2015. The 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan must be adopted by the TPO prior to November 3, 2020.
- Gary Kramer mentioned the members of the Steering Committee were approved by the TPO on December 12, 2018 and will be meeting frequently before the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan is adopted. The reason for the frequent meetings is because many products will be discussed prior to presentations at Public Workshops and the TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings.
- Brittany Ellers briefed the Steering Committee on the proposed public involvement task for the 2045 Long Transportation Plan.
- Gary Kramer mentioned the Chairman of the TPO's Technical Coordinating Committee was the Chairman of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Committee. The current Chairman of the Technical Coordinating Committee mentioned he would be willing to be the Chairman of the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Committee.
- The Steering Committee members approved Griffin Powell, current TCC Chairman, to be the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Committee Chairman.

C. **Project Schedule**

- Cory Wilkinson discussed the proposed project schedule by task, months for public meetings, and months the Long Range Transportation Plan products are tentatively to be presented to the TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings.

D. **Review of Supporting Documents and Goals and Objectives**

- Cory Wilkinson presented a PowerPoint for supporting documents, the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives, and recommended changes/additions to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives for the initial Draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives.
- Members suggested the following plans should also be reviewed for consideration when developing the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives:
  - Santa Rosa Island Authority Master Plan Traffic Study
  - South Santa Rosa Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
  - Pace/Pea Ridge Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
  - Complete Streets Concept in Pensacola
  - Milton Comprehensive Plan
  - Escambia County Sector Plan
  - 9th Avenue/Langley/Tippin Transportation Plan that Baskerville-Donovan completed for Escambia County
- Members recommended the following changes to the Draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives.
  - Objective B.1: Obtain public input using targeted outreach efforts and track results by ZIP code in accordance with goals of the 2045 FL-AL LRTF Public Involvement Plan
  - Goal E: A transportation system that supports and sustains economic vitality
  - Objective E.4: Develop a transportation network that provides access to and from residential areas, job centers, small businesses, schools, health care facilities and tourist destinations
  - Objective E.5: Plan for and coordinate with rural government entities both within their planning boundaries as well as those areas outside of the current boundaries that are impacted by transportation movements between regions. **Move to a new Objective D.7**
E. **Comments from the Committee Members and Public**

- Members asked when is the deadline to submit comments?
- Gary Kramer stated additional comments on the Draft 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives be e-mailed to him by April 12, 2019.
- Members asked what is the date and time for the next meeting?
- Gary Kramer provided April 23, 2019 and 10:00 a.m. at the Pensacola City Hall Whibbs Room as a tentative date, time, and location. This information will need to be verified with the Pensacola City Hall contact. An e-mail will be sent to the Steering Committee members either confirming this date, time, and location or with a new day, time, and/or location. The time was changed to 8:00 a.m.

F. **Next Steps**

- Gary Kramer iterated that the next steps for the Draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives, once the Steering Committee confirms them, is to present a draft at the June TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings, have public outreach/meeting after the June TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings, and recommended for approval at the July TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings.

G. **Adjournment**

- The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Powell.
Members Attending
Griffin Powell, Chairman, Technical Coordinating Committee
Christy Johnson FDOT Urban Liaison
Andrea Levitt Kvech, Pensacola International Airport
Terri Malone, Technical Coordinating Committee
Leslie Statler, Technical Coordinating Committee
Shawn Ward, Technical Coordinating Committee
Barbara Mayall, Citizens’ Advisory Committee (late because of a prior appointment)

Members Not Attending
Rickey Fitzgerald, FDOT (Freight)
Bryant Paulk FDOT Urban Liaison
Vince Beebe, ALDOT Urban Liaison
Steve Opalenik, Pensacola Naval Air Station
Randy Roy, Whiting Field
Amy Miller, Port of Pensacola
Tonya Ellis, Escambia County Area Transit
Taylor Rider, Baldwin Regional Area Transit System
David Mayo, West Florida Wheelmen
Sean Bullington, Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Vernon Compton, Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Jim Roberts, Citizens’ Advisory Committee

Others Attending
Ann Hill, Pensacola City Council
Jenny Cook, City of Milton
Austin Mount, Emerald Coast Regional Council (via conference call)
Tiffany Bates, Emerald Coast Regional Council
Cameron Smith, Emerald Coast Regional Council
Jill Lavender, Emerald Coast Regional Council
Brittany Ellers, Emerald Coast Regional Council
Cory Wilkinson, HDR
Gary Kramer, Emerald Coast Regional Council

A. Introductions and Welcome

- Gary Kramer welcomed the participants to the Steering Committee Meeting for the 2045 Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Long Range Transportation Plan. Each of the participants stated their names and the organization they represented.
- Chairman Powell requested Gary Kramer and Cory Wilkinson to present the items on the agenda.
B. Summary of Steering Committee 1

- Gary Kramer distributed a summary of the first Steering Committee Meeting. He explained the documents that were reviewed and selection of the Chairman for the 2045 Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization Long Range Transportation Plan Steering Committee.
- Shawn Ward iterated the Steering Committee Meeting process is flowing much better for the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan compared to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

C. Review of Changes from Steering Committee 1

- Cory Wilkinson mentioned the following changes were agreed upon at the first Steering Committee Meeting.
  - Objective B.1: Obtain public input using targeted outreach efforts and track results by ZIP code in accordance with the goals of the 2045 FL-AL LRTP Public Involvement Plan.
  - Objective C.4: Employ corridor management techniques that do not require additional travel lanes (such as the addition of turn lanes, roundabouts, TSM, and ITS). Identify recommendations for new Corridor Management Plans and incorporate results from previous Corridor Management Plans.
  - Objective D.3: Develop a multimodal transportation system that affords users modal choices (such as mass transit, transit circulation, park-n-ride lots, rail, bus, rapid transit, automobile, bicycle facilities, trails (paddling, land, and greenways), ferry service and pedestrian facilities). Identify both long-range and short-range strategies that provide for an integrated multimodal transportation system, with a forward-looking approach to Mobility on Demand [Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Automated Driving Systems (ADS)].
  - Objective D.7: Seek opportunities to provide a passenger rail system (former Objective E.5).
  - Goal E: A transportation system that supports and sustains economic vitality.
  - Objective E.4: Develop a transportation network that provides access to and from residential areas, job centers, small businesses, schools, health care facilities and tourism destinations.
  - Objective F.5: Promote healthy lifestyles, economic benefits of outdoor recreation and ecotourism, the integration of recreation, physical activity and other elements of active living by incorporating outdoor trails, trail connectivity, and providing for the safety of trail users, into transportation systems.
- Cory Wilkinson stated the following additional plans were obtained and reviewed:
  - Escambia County Mid-West Sector Plan
  - South Santa Rosa Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan
  - Pensacola Beach Master Plan
  - Pensacola Beach Congestion Management Plan
  - Milton Riverfront Master Plan
  - Pace-Pea Ridge Bicycle / Pedestrian Plan
  - Florida Greenways and Trails System Plan
  - FDOT Shared Use Non-Motorized (SUN) Trail Plan

D. Comments from Committee Members and Public

- Members recommended the following changes to the Draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives:
  - Goal D: A transportation system that is multimodal, integrated, and connected, and innovative.
  - Goal E: A transportation system that supports and promotes economic vitality.
  - Objective E.4: Develop a transportation network that provides access to and from residential areas, job centers, local small businesses, schools, health care facilities and tourism destinations.
  - Matrix tables need to remove Objective E.5 and add Objective D.7.
  - City of Pensacola Councilwoman Ann Hill mentioned if “fiscally-constrained” should remain in Objective G.7. After discussion, the Steering Committees agreed to leave “fiscally-constrained” in Objective G.7.
  - Update MPO Handbook to most current version.
  - Include the City of Orange Beach Comprehensive Plan in the list of plans reviewed.
E. **Next Steps**

- Gary Kramer iterated that the next steps for the Draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives is to present a draft at the June TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings, have public outreach/meetings after the June TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings, and recommended for approval at the July TPO and Advisory Committee Meetings.

F. **Adjournment**

- The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Powell.
1. Are the draft goals and objectives based on workshops and public input?
Yes. The draft 2045 goals and objectives began with the 2040 goals and objectives as modified to incorporate new federal and state guidance and incorporate the results of two steering committee reviews.

2. Are alternative fuels considered?
Yes. Alternative fuels are incorporated in Objective B.5 which originates from the Emerald Coast Regional Council (ECRC) Northwest FL Clean Cities Coalition.

3. Objective D.3. Clarify that ferry service should include both recreational and commuter options. Add water taxis and trolleys as options. Additional trolley service is requested for Perdido Key.
Specific routes such as provision of trolley service to Perdido Key are not appropriate for Goals and Objectives which are more broad. However, Objective D.3 can be modified to incorporate trolleys, and to clarify that ferry service and water taxi service may include both recreational and commuter options.

4. Need additional emphasis on expanding bus service to the beaches, additional park and ride lots, and shuttles for beach employees.
Staff believes the proposed revisions in Objective D.5 are sufficient to emphasize the need for coordination with Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) in Escambia County, FL; and Baldwin Rural Area Transit System (BRATS) in Baldwin County, AL. Specific route changes are not appropriate for Goals and Objectives which are more broad. Objective D.3 currently identifies the need for park and ride lots. Objective D.5 currently identifies the need to improve transit services.

5. Objective D.5. Consider adding RideOn as an option.
Objective D.5 can be modified to incorporate RideOn.

6. Do all ECAT busses have bicycle racks?
Yes.

7. Should the Goals and Objectives include Amtrak® passenger rail?
Objective D.7 includes opportunities for passenger rail system.

8. Are greenways and trails included?
Objective D.3 and Objective F.5 incorporate trails.

9. What is paratransit service?
It provides transportation services for people with disabilities as a supplement to fixed-route bus systems by public transit agencies.

Based on the above comments, the following two objectives were modified as illustrated in the red font.

- **Objective D.3:** Develop a multimodal transportation system that affords users modal choices (such as mass transit, transit circulation, park-n-ride lots, rail, bus rapid transit, trolleys, automobile, bicycle facilities, trails (paddling, land, and greenways), ferry and water taxi service [recreational and commuter], and pedestrian facilities). Identify both long-range and short-range strategies that provide for an integrated multimodal transportation system, with a forward-looking approach to Mobility on Demand (Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)), and Automated Driving Systems (ADS) [1].

- **Objective D.5:** Expand transit services to improve accessibility, availability and desirability of transit travel options. Include coordination with both Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) in Escambia County, FL; and Baldwin Rural Area Transit System (BRATS) in Baldwin County, AL; and the Emerald Coast Regional Council RideOn program.

---

Mike Hamlin, ECUA Comment

Objective G.5: Involve regulatory agencies (including but not limited to Transportation, Environmental, Tribal, and Utilities) and interested citizens groups early in the planning process so any issues among these agencies and groups can be addressed sooner rather than later.

1. Please add this wording the when 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Final Report when it is drafted “The public needs and requires utility upgrades and expansions that coincide with the needs, scope, and timing of roadway upgrades. TPO’s and roadway agencies are encouraged to recognize the value of providing ROW space and roadway contract time to accommodate utility relocations, upgrades, and expansions. Holistic planning that incorporates the utility industry as a partner from initial project concept through construction will help deliver a more comprehensive, successful, and timely project to the public.”

This language will be included in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Final Report.
Vision

The Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) envisions a multi-modal transportation system that improves quality of life, increases the region’s economic competitiveness, and protects the environment.

Mission

The Florida-Alabama TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) promotes the safe, secure, and efficient movement of people and goods by providing a transportation system that offers mobility options for all.

Goal A: A transportation system that is safe and secure.

Objective A.1: Develop projects that increase safety for all motorized and non-motorized users (such as improved access management to reduce crashes, variable message signs to warn motorists of unsafe conditions, provision of sidewalks, transit, and bicycle facilities), in accordance with the Florida Department of Transportation “Vision Zero” and the Alabama Department of Transportation “Towards Zero Deaths Initiative” standards, and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan / Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Identify performance targets for each performance measures. Identify methods to monitor and evaluate performance. Include a System Performance Report.

Objective A.2: Implement techniques and road design to achieve an acceptable level of performance, reduce congestion, and reduce fatalities and serious injuries from common intersection crashes and lane departures.

Objective A.3: Ensure that the regional transportation system can support emergency response and recovery efforts.

Objective A.4: Include projects that increase security for all users of transit (such as adequate lighting at bus stops, equipment on buses and transit facilities to monitor/prevent harmful activity, and adequate bicycle parking facilities).

Objective A.5: Consider clearance times on roads that function as evacuation routes when establishing roadway improvement priorities.

Objective A.6: Reduce the probability of service interruption during a natural disaster by identifying alternative routes before, during and after an incident.

Objective A.7: Decrease the duration of interruptions in service by having assets prepositioned to deal with events.

Objective A.8: Work with federal, state and local agencies, the private sector and other stakeholders in order to mitigate potential threats and vulnerabilities in the multi-modal transportation system.

Objective A.9: Coordinate and cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, and other federal and state agencies to enhance the security of the transportation system.
**Goal B: A transportation system that meets user needs.**

Objective B.1: Obtain public input using targeted outreach efforts and track results by ZIP code in accordance with the goals of the 2045 FL-AL LRTP Public Involvement Plan.

Objective B.2: Develop and maintain a coordinated traffic signal system that is efficient and provides predictable travel times.

Objective B.3: Improve the level of service for roads using transportation system management strategies and transportation demand management strategies (such as alternative transportation modes and flexible work schedules).

Objective B.4: Develop a Congestion Management Process to: 1) provide for the safe and effective integrated management and operations of the transportation network; 2) identify the acceptable level of performance; 3) identify methods to monitor and evaluate performance; 4) define objectives; 5) establish a coordinated data collection program; 6) identify and evaluate strategy benefits; 7) identity an implementation schedule; and 8) periodically assess the effectiveness of the strategies. The congestion management process should result in multimodal system measures and strategies that are reflected in the LRTP and TIP.

Objective B.5: Identify corridors, infrastructure needs, and planning / transition implementation needs to accommodate Mobility on Demand [Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Automated Driving Systems (ADS)\(^1\)]. Introduce and expand the use of alternative fuels and alternatively fueled vehicles (AFV) and related technologies.

**Goal C: A transportation system that is maintained and operated efficiently.**

Objective C.1: Direct sufficient resources to preserve the existing transportation infrastructures including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure.

Objective C.2: Replace structurally deficient facilities (such as, roads, bridges, buses, and shelters) that emphasize preservation of the existing system.

Objective C.3: Ensure that appropriate stormwater measures are included in all roadway projects.

Objective C.4: Employ corridor management techniques that do not require additional travel lanes (such as the addition of turn lanes, roundabouts, TSM, and ITS). Identify recommendations for new Corridor Management Studies, and incorporate results from previous Corridor Management Studies.

---

\(^1\) Includes Automated and Connected Vehicles, and Autonomous Vehicles.
Goal D: A transportation system that is multimodal, integrated, connected, and innovative.

Objective D.1: Interconnect land uses and transportation facilities.

Objective D.2: Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and goods.

Objective D.3: Develop a multimodal transportation system that affords users modal choices (such as mass transit, transit circulation, park-n-ride lots, rail, bus rapid transit, trolleys, automobile, bicycle facilities, trails (paddling, land, and greenways), ferry and water taxi service [recreational and commuter], and pedestrian facilities). Identify both long-range and short-range strategies that provide for an integrated multimodal transportation system, with a forward-looking approach to Mobility on Demand [Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and Automated Driving Systems (ADS)²].

Objective D.4: Integrate transportation modes to increase accessibility and connectivity of the transportation system across and between modes for people and goods.

Objective D.5: Expand transit services to improve accessibility, availability and desirability of transit travel options. Include coordination with both Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) in Escambia County, FL; and Baldwin Rural Area Transit System (BRATS) in Baldwin County, AL; and the Emerald Coast Regional Council RideOn Program.

Objective D.6: Advance the flow of traveler information (such as innovative technology).

Objective D.7: Seek opportunities to provide a passenger rail system.

Goal E: A transportation system that supports and promotes economic vitality.

Objective E.1: Maintain an acceptable roadway level of service on all major facilities including the Strategic Intermodal System facilities (highway, airport, seaport, and STRAHNET) to ensure efficient movement of people and goods.

Objective E.2: Identify existing and future Highways of Commerce, assigning priority to those deemed deficient.

Objective E.3: Implement projects that will support the military’s ability to carry out its missions at the region’s installations.

Objective E.4: Develop a transportation network that provides access to and from residential areas, job centers, local businesses, schools, health care facilities and tourism destinations.

Objective E.5: Plan for and coordinate with rural governmental entities both within their planning boundaries as well as those areas outside of the current boundaries that are impacted by transportation movements between regions.

² Includes Automated and Connected Vehicles, and Autonomous Vehicles.
Goal F: A transportation system that supports a high quality of life respectful of the environment, public health and vulnerable users.

Objective F.1: Consider the health impacts of projects and policies for transportation investments.

Objective F.2: Reduce adverse impacts of transportation on the environment (such as habitat and ecosystem fragmentation, wildlife collisions and non-point source pollution) and identify potential environmental mitigation.

Objective F.3: Implement complete street and/or context sensitive design into projects.

Objective F.4: Improve para-transit services.

Objective F.5: Promote healthy lifestyles, economic benefits of outdoor recreation and ecotourism, the integration of recreation, physical activity and other elements of active living by incorporating outdoor trails, trail connectivity, and providing for the safety of trail users, into transportation systems.

Objective F.6: Maintain air quality attainment status for ground level ozone.

Goal G: A transportation system that includes consistent, continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning processes.

Objective G.1: Coordinate transportation and future land use decisions to promote efficient development patterns and a choice of transportation modes, consistent with local government comprehensive plans.

Objective G.2: Continue regional cooperation and coordination at the local, state, Tribal, and federal levels. Expand coordination with the Baldwin Rural Area Transit System (BRATS) in Baldwin County, Alabama and other stakeholders, such as Orange Beach, to include long-term project development.

Objective G.3: Ensure consistency with the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) developed by the Emerald Coast Regional Council (ECRC).

Objective G.4: Continue to reach out to the traditionally underserved populations during the planning process to ensure access. Incorporate public participation plan measures of effectiveness to evaluate and improve outreach. Measure public involvement activities for effectiveness, reporting the outcome of involvement efforts and how they shaped or influenced the LRTP.

Objective G.5: Involve regulatory agencies (including, but not limited to, Transportation, Environmental, Tribal, and Utilities) and interested citizens groups early in the planning process so any issues among these agencies and groups can be addressed sooner rather than later.

Objective G.6: Coordinate with health and education planning efforts to ensure holistic community planning (economic, health, education, etc.).

Objective G.7: Develop projects in sufficient detail to prepare fiscally-constrained cost estimates to show how the projects will be implemented, based on the FDOT Revenue Forecast.
ENCLOSURE E
ALL COMMITTEES

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-13 Adopting the East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan (CMP) Scope of Services to Start After August 1, 2019 and Authorizing Execution of Consultant Task Order

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: Task D.1 of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: The UPWP, which describes the planning work tasks and budget for each TPO fiscal year, includes Task D.1 (Corridor Management). The purpose of corridor management planning is to identify low cost strategies and projects to improve traffic flow and safety for all modes of travel within the designated corridor.

The draft scope of services for the East Bay Boulevard CMP was provided to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Florida Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

The draft scope of services may be found on the website at: https://www.ecrc.org/programs/transportation_planning/plans_and_documents/index.php#outer-147

Attached are the following:

- Resolution FL-AL 19-13
- Map of Project Limits
- Scope of Services

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval of a motion authorizing the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-13 adopting the scope of services for the East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan (CMP) to start after August 1, 2019 and authorizing execution of Consultant Task Order. The action is recommended so that the project may proceed. Please contact Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC staff, at 850-332-7976, Extension 203 or at caitlin.cerame@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
RESOLUTION FL-AL 19-13

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
ADOPTING THE SCOPE OF SERVICES FOR THE EAST
BAY BOULEVARD CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN
AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF CONSULTANT
TASK ORDER

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the organization designated by the governors of Florida and Alabama as being responsible, together with the states of Florida and Alabama, for carrying out the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO planning area; and

WHEREAS, the Florida-Alabama TPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes tasks for development of a Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for each fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the TPO selected East Bay Boulevard from US 98 to SR 87; and

WHEREAS, the East Bay CMP Scope of Services has been reviewed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Florida Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FLORIDA-ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION THAT:

1. The TPO adopts the East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan Scope of Services for East Bay Boulevard from US 98 to SR 87, to be completed by the TPO's General Planning Consultant and Emerald Coast Regional Council (ECRC) staff to begin after August 1, 2019.

2. The TPO authorizes the ECRC staff to negotiate a final scope of services with the TPO's General Planning Consultant and issue a task order to complete the Corridor Management Plan.

Passed and duly adopted by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization on this 10th day of July 2019.

FLORIDA- ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING ORGANIZATION

BY: __________________________
Sam Parker, Chairman

ATTEST: ______________________
East Bay Blvd. Corridor Management Plan Project Limits

Source: FDOT, ESRI, 2019
# East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan

## Scope of Services

**Project Name:** East Bay Boulevard from US98 (SR30) to SR87 Corridor Management Plan (CMP)

**Purpose:** To identify operational, and safety improvements needed to support all modes of transportation including roadway capacity, and bicycle and pedestrian movements

## Consultant Contract Manager

Wiley Page, AICP, Atkins

## Consultant Team Task Manager

Philip Shad, AICP, PTP, Atkins

## Consultant Staff:

- Philip Shad, AICP, Atkins
- Wiley Page, AICP, Atkins
- Kent Blunt, PE, Atkins
- Rebecca Dennis, AICP Atkins
- Chris Russo, PE, PTOE, Atkins

## Assistance From Others:

- TPO Staff (Caitlin Cerame, Project Manager)
- Santa Rosa County Public Works Staff
- Santa Rosa County Planning Staff
- Santa Rosa County School Board Transportation Staff
- Santa Rosa County Sheriff’s Department
- Florida Highway Patrol Staff
- Local Fire Department
- June Coates (FDOT District Traffic Operations)
- Bryant Paulk (FDOT Planning)

## Deliverable(s):

- Corridor Management Plan that outlines proposed improvements to the corridor
- Presentations to local agencies and officials

## Information Needed From Client:

Project description in TPO Unified Planning Work Program and the Task Scope of Service

## Proposed Fee

$101,117.00

## Proposed Schedule

The CONSULTANT has twelve (12) months from the Notice to Proceed Date to complete the Corridor Management Plan
A. GENERAL CORRIDOR INFORMATION

Easy Bay Boulevard is functionally classified as an urban collector. The study corridor, from US 98 (SR 30) to SR 87 is approximately 9.8 miles long. The local jurisdiction is Santa Rosa County and it is located in County Commission Districts 4 and 5. The study segment is a 2-lane rural design with no on road bicycle facilities. A multi-use path is present on the north side of the roadway but has limited connections to the south side of East Bay Boulevard. The 2018 Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) count on East Bay Boulevard east of Edgewood Drive was 12,000. West of Edgewood Drive the 2018 AADT was 5,800.

Residential land uses are directly adjacent to the corridor while single family subdivisions are also accessed directly from East Bay Boulevard. Five schools are also located within two miles of the study corridor and a new school is being built on Edgewood Drive.

B. PURPOSE OF CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN

The East Bay Boulevard Corridor Management Plan (CMP) will explore the potential to implement projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities as well as to address safety issues, and traffic operations along the corridor. Easy Bay Boulevard is an east/west road in Santa Rosa County, starting at US 98 (SR 30), going to the north then east to SR 87 along East Bay.

CMP Objectives

A. To determine the Corridor's existing and future transportation demands for all modes of travel.

B. To generally describe natural, physical, environmental, social, political, operational, and economic constraints within the Corridor that could have a negative effect upon any proposed improvements.

C. To provide sufficient preliminary engineering and environmental information using standard typical sections and sketch planning techniques to serve as input for future project production activities.

D. To maximize the public's participation in all phases of the planning process.
E. To develop a CMP that:

1. Identifies projects needed to improve the safe movement of all modes of travel.
2. Includes general cost estimates for each recommended project to allow the TPO, state and Santa Rosa County to determine funding strategies.
3. Recommends improvements that increase comfortable access for a variety of users.
4. Creates transportation compatibility with community context.

C. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

Atkins (CONSULTANT) will assist the TPO in performing the East Bay Boulevard Corridor Study. The goals of the study are as follows:

- Assess traffic operations along the segments and at key intersections.
- Evaluate safety issues along the corridor as well as access to the multi-use path with an emphasis on enhanced pedestrian crossing safety at signalized intersections.
- Assess roadway improvements, such as constructing a three lane sections, to reduce vehicular conflicts and improve safety along the corridor.
- Solicit input from the public and a Project Advisory Team (PAT) throughout the course of the project. This team will provide guidance to the CONSULTANT when recommending the preferred alternative.

D. MAJOR TASKS

The CONSULTANT will assist the TPO with the following major tasks:

- Prepare for and participate in one corridor walking or biking tour, two (2) Project Advisory Team (PAT) meetings and up to two (2) public workshops.
- Perform general data collection activities including:
  - Review right-of-way maps and straight-line diagrams along the study corridor;
  - A field review to observe existing operational conditions and corridor characteristics;
  - Vehicle volume and speed data; and
  - Pedestrian and bicycle crossing data.
- Perform an existing conditions analysis which includes:
  - Historical safety review for the last five years;
  - Existing and future land use as well as current zoning;
  - Existing corridor and intersection operational analysis; and
  - Issues and opportunities identification.
• Perform a future conditions assessment including the following tasks:
  o Determine future growth rates;
  o Forecast future traffic volumes; and
  o Perform future no-build operational analysis.

• Develop and analyze alternatives involving:
  o Development of cross sections and roadway alternatives, if needed;
  o Development of preliminary cost estimates; and
  o Analyze operational/multi-modal measures of effectiveness and recommend a preferred alternative.

The **CONSULTANT** will develop a schedule during the project’s first month and keep the schedule current throughout the project’s duration. The following subsections describe each task to be performed.

**E. SERVICES TO BE PERFORMED**

*Task 1.0 Project Initiation and Kick-off Meeting*

Prior to beginning work, after the notice to proceed is issued, The **TPO STAFF** shall prepare for and conduct one (1) Kickoff Workshop with representatives from local agencies as well as **TPO STAFF** to discuss the project and data collection. The **TPO STAFF** shall provide an agenda, take minutes, discuss the project and collect available information. The major points, at a minimum, to be discussed at the Workshop include:

- Project purpose
- Scope of services
- Key affected parties
- Potential areas of concern
- Previous history
- Project schedule
- Available data

At a minimum, representatives from the following organizations will be invited to the Workshop:

- Local Elected Officials
- Santa Rosa County Planning Staff
- FDOT District 3 Staff
- Santa Rosa County Public Works

In addition to the Kick-off Workshop, the **TPO STAFF** shall be available to meet with local officials to answer questions and discuss project expectations as requested.

The **TPO STAFF** shall be responsible for all presentations and presentation materials.
Task 2.0 Public Involvement

Gaining public support for the proposed CMP is of primary importance to the success of this project. To accomplish this, the TPO STAFF shall conduct proactive public involvement throughout the duration of the study. The Public Involvement Program will include traditional and innovative means of informing the public, collecting comments, and incorporating appropriate ideas into the alternative concepts.

Mailing/Contact List

Early in the study process the TPO Staff shall identify and compile mailing/contact lists for the following groups:

a. Any affected or possibly affected parties. This includes the identification (from County tax rolls) of all persons owning property within 500 feet either side of the centerline of all viable alternatives pursuant to the provisions of Florida Statutes 339.155. Mailings will be sent to all identified physical addresses and mailing addresses. In addition, the neighborhood associations representing the affected communities and/or “users” of the facility will be included on the mailing list.

b. Elected/appointed officials and other local officials serving the area, community leaders and interested parties.

Identify, Inspect and Reserve Public Meeting Site(s)

The TPO Staff shall inspect the suitability of prospective sites in the study area for meetings to be held during the plan development process. Consideration will be given to location, seating capacity, accessibility for the disabled, sound system, lighting, display space, and any other physical characteristics, which would influence the viability of the site.

The TPO Staff shall make arrangements for use of meeting facilities for all Workshops.

Collect Public Input

The TPO STAFF shall collect public input data throughout the life of the project. This activity requires maintenance of files, media outreach, letters, and especially direct contact before, during, and after any of the Public Workshops, as follows:

- Comments are gathered during each Public Workshop, by personal contact or by formal testimony and by letter, visit, or telephone call in response to Public Workshops.

The TPO STAFF shall compile a Comments and Coordination Report to: 1) document the public participation accomplished throughout the study period, and 2) summarize and respond to the comments received from the public involvement efforts. The Report will be updated regularly to document comments received and actions taken.
Public Workshops

The TPO STAFF shall hold one (1) Nontraditional Workshop as a community bikeability assessment. The purpose of the assessment is to allow staff and citizens to experience safety and traffic concerns in real time and develop solutions based on their assessment. Citizens and community members will be invited to a group ride on the multi-use path within the study area. Participants will be able to gauge safety and traffic concerns through a criterion ranking.

The TPO STAFF shall hold two (2) Public Workshops in the vicinity of the study area during the plan development process as follows:

1st Public Workshop – The purpose of this workshop, at the 30% project status, is to announce the plan development to the public. The CONSULTANT will participate in this workshop to provide technical support to the TPO Staff. The major points, at a minimum, to be discussed at the Workshop include:

- Project purpose
- Key affected parties
- Potential areas of concern
- Previous history
- Project schedule
- Conceptual study solutions and gather public comments

2nd Public Workshop – The purpose of this workshop is to present a final draft CMP and receive public input for possible final additions, deletions or changes to the plan. The CONSULTANT will participate in this workshop to provide technical support to the TPO Staff.

The TPO Staff shall place public notices, attend and conduct Public Workshops and prepare all necessary displays, maps, etc. conforming with the public participation plan. The TPO Staff shall perform the following tasks for each Public Workshop:

a. The TPO Staff shall prepare all media releases, and public notices.

b. The TPO Staff shall prepare a public notice announcing each Public Workshop prior to each workshop. Public notice costs are the responsibility of the TPO

c. The TPO Staff shall prepare and submit a general press release to local media prior to each workshop.

d. The TPO Staff shall notify elected and appointed officials and other interested persons by email prior to each workshop.

e. The TPO Staff shall prepare and send a mailing to all property owners and property occupants whose property lies in whole or in part within 500 feet of the centerline of the study corridor prior to each workshop.
Public Workshop tasks include the following:

a. The **TPO STAFF** shall develop each Public Workshop and present. The **CONSULTANT** will be available for technical support.

b. The **TPO STAFF** and **CONSULTANT** shall prepare appropriate displays or wall graphics and/or electronic projections for use during each Public Workshop. These include aerial photographs, renderings, charts, and graphs, as needed.

c. The **TPO STAFF** shall prepare project handouts for distribution at each Public Workshop. Content of the handouts will be supplied by the **CONSULTANT** and the **TPO STAFF**.

d. The **TPO STAFF** shall setup and take down each Public Workshop and return meeting facility to set up and condition that existed prior to the workshop.

e. The **TPO STAFF** and **CONSULTANT** shall provide adequately knowledgeable staff at each Public Workshop to handle the attendees anticipated. Although the workshop may be scheduled for a certain time period, the **TPO STAFF** and **CONSULTANT** shall be available for some time before and/or after those set hours in order to maintain public contact, availability for media interviews, etc.

f. The **TPO STAFF** and the **CONSULTANT** shall identify issues brought up at each Public Workshop as an integral part of the workshop debriefing process, which shall be attended by all staff members taking part in the workshop process and interacting with the public.

g. The **TPO STAFF** shall determine the significance of each issue brought up at each Public Workshop (i.e., are the issues valid and should they be considered or do the issues have elements that may require further consideration).

h. The **TPO STAFF** and the **CONSULTANT** shall address each issue brought up at each Public Workshop and respond to them. This task involves letter writing, the placement of an ad, distribution of news releases, or any other appropriate technique.

**Task 3.0 Data Collection**

The **CONSULTANT** shall collect all pertinent data on the corridor. The **CONSULTANT** will collect eight (8) hour turning movement counts at the major intersections (up to five (5) locations), vehicle speeds at two (2) locations along the corridor, and up to five (5) pedestrian crossing counts along the corridor for the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. Any counts collected by others within the previous twelve (12) months of the issuing of the Notice to Proceed will be used in the capacity analyses for the study.

The latest aerial photography available at the FDOT Surveying and Mapping Office or Santa Rosa County will be used to show current conditions, hotspots, crashes and recommended improvements. The **CONSULTANT** shall field verify the accuracy of the aerials to ensure that
recent roadway improvements and development access have been included in the study. The CONSULTANT shall collect other pertinent data as needed, including:

1. Speed limits;
2. Lane widths;
3. Intersection geometry;
4. Signal timing/phasing information for the study intersections;
5. Planned and programmed roadway projects in the area. This will also include a request for any approved but unbuilt access permits on the corridor.
6. Recently completed projects in the area.
7. Existing and future land use plans.
8. GIS data illustrating available information within the study area. This data generally consists of wetland, floodplains, threatened/endangered species and habitat, contamination, and cultural/historic sites used to identify fatal flaws with potential alternatives; and

3.2 Field Review

The CONSULTANT will perform two field reviews over the course of the project:

- During the Existing Conditions Analysis task to observe operational characteristics in the AM and PM peak hours. This field review will also consist of verifying intersection/cross sectional geometrics along with the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This review will also include a night review to observe lighting levels along the corridor.

- During the Alternatives Analysis task to verify specific roadway characteristics that may impact concept development features. This may include the location of driveways, curb returns, drainage inlets, open swales, utilities, or review of locations where potential conflicts between the roadway elements and proposed concepts may exist.

3.3 Right-of-Way Review

The CONSULTANT will coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Santa Rosa County to review ROW information within the limits of the study corridor. The ROW maps will be compared to the GIS parcel lines and utilized during Alternatives Analysis.
TASK 4.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

4.1 Historical Safety Review
The CONSULTANT will obtain 2013 to 2018 crash data using CARS and Signal 4 Analytics and summarize corridor wide and intersection crash trends. The CONSULTANT will prepare collision diagrams for the pedestrian and bicycle crashes along the corridor. The CONSULTANT will also create collision diagrams for up to three (3) high crash locations along the study corridor.

4.2 Existing Corridor Operational Analysis
Using the travel characteristics data collected for the study corridor, the CONSULTANT will perform a level of service (LOS) evaluation per Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) procedures as they apply to roadway intersections and segments for the AM and PM peak hours. The existing conditions analysis will be performed for two (2) signalized intersections and up to three (3) unsignalized intersection within the study corridor.

4.3 Issues and Opportunities Identification
Based on the existing conditions analysis, the CONSULTANT will review the data collected to identify the preliminary issues and opportunities along the corridor. This will include issues and opportunities based on safety, traffic operations, and pedestrian/bicycle mobility obtained through review of previous studies, field reviews, coordination with agencies, previous public workshops/meetings, operational analysis, and other publicly available data sources such as agency GIS resources and the TPO databases.

TASK 5.0 FUTURE CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

The CONSULTANT shall use the most recent version of Synchro to perform intersection and roadway operational analyses for the study area. The Synchro analyses results will be reported in the HCS format for this study.

The future roadway segment analyses will be completed for the segments between or approaching the study area intersections as identified above.

The analyses will consist of analyzing the impacts of alternative improvements and may include signal optimization, review of turn-lane lengths, turn radii, turn-lane installation, and turn prohibitions and possible driveway closings. The analyses will consider:

1. Conflict points at turn-lanes
2. Continuous middle turn-lanes
3. Access spacing
4. Queue Lengths

The following analyses will be conducted for each signalized intersection:

1. Existing PM
2. 2025 No-Build PM
3. 2025 Build PM
6.1 Development of Initial Roadway Alternatives

The CONSULTANT will develop up to three (3) initial roadway alternatives for the corridor that address corridor needs, goals, and objectives identified in Task 1 and are feasible based on the Future Conditions Assessment discussed in Task 5. These alternatives will provide accommodations for safe and efficient vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle modes of travel. These initial alternatives will be presented in the form of cross-sections to the Project Advisory Team to help facilitate thought and feedback. The three (3) initial alternatives will also be presented at the final public workshop to gain insight and feedback from the public on which alternative(s) should move forward to concept development.

6.2 Alternatives Analysis

The CONSULTANT will develop an evaluation matrix including several measures of effectiveness to compare the no-build alternative and the five initial roadway alternatives developed in Task 6.1. Measures of effectiveness will include quantifiable criteria as well as qualitative criteria that fulfill the corridor needs, goals and objectives, and are based on the guiding principles identified in Task 1. Examples of quantifiable measures could include multi-modal LOS, automobile travel time, intersection and segment LOS, safety improvements based on crash modification factors, and/or construction costs.

The CONSULTANT will prepare a preliminary construction cost estimate for the preferred alternative using the conceptual roadway layouts. Utility relocations and drainage ponds, if needed, will be included in the construction cost estimates. This section will also list potential funding options for implementation.

6.3 Select Preferred Alternative

A preferred alternative will be selected based on the results of the alternatives analysis process outlined in Task 6.2. The preferred cross section alternative may be one of the three alternatives considered or some combination of those alternatives. Once the preferred cross section is selected, signalized intersection approach cross sections will be developed for up to six intersection approaches. These cross sections will be utilized to develop the CADD concept for the corridor, as discussed in the next subtask.

6.4 Development of Roadway Concept

The preferred cross section alternative will be drafted in CADD over the background of an existing satellite aerial image. The concept will be provided to the Project Advisory Team in the form of roll plot and figure set for review and comment. The goal of developing the concept in CADD is to explore potential constraints with the cross sections and identify access management opportunities.

6.5 Development of Implementation Plan

The CONSULTANT, in coordination with the Project Advisory Team, will develop an implementation plan for the projects identified in this task. The plan will include short, medium, and long-term recommendations for project implementation.
F. ADDITIONAL PROJECT MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

**Kick-Off Meeting:** The **CONSULTANT** will attend a kick-off meeting with **TPO STAFF** and the Project Advisory Team to discuss the goals and anticipated outcomes of the project.

**Project Status Meetings:** Up to two (2) members of the **CONSULTANT** team will attend up to two (2) additional meetings with **TPO STAFF** to discuss project progress and receive input on tasks completed. The purpose of these meetings is to maintain clear communication between the **TPO** and the **CONSULTANT** team. The **TPO STAFF** will prepare a meeting agenda and prepare/distribute meeting notes following each of these meetings.

**Project Presentations:** It is anticipated the **CONSULTANT** will participate in three (3) presentations at the conclusion of the study to the following organizations:

- Presentation to the Florida-Alabama TPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC); and
- Presentation to the **TPO Board**.

The **TPO STAFF** will be responsible for preparing the PowerPoint presentation but will coordinate with the **CONSULTANT** on what will be included in the presentation. The **CONSULTANT** will provide all needed information and data to the TPO Staff in support of the presentations.

G. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

**Quality Assurance/Quality Control:** The **CONSULTANT** team will designate appropriate senior staff to conduct Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) reviews of work products.

**Project Schedule:** The **CONSULTANT** will prepare and submit a detailed project schedule identifying major tasks, their durations, and tasks relationships (within first 30 days after receipt of NTP). The **CONSULTANT** is responsible for keeping the schedule up to date. The beginning date of the services will be the date of authorization for this work order. Any changes to the schedule necessitated by circumstances outside the **CONSULTANT's** control will be coordinated with TPO staff. It is anticipated that all work tasks will be completed within 12 months of Notice to Proceed.

**Invoices:** Invoices will be prepared in the format prescribed by the TPO. A detailed invoice including a narrative description of the work performed by the **CONSULTANT** during the period covered by the invoice for each item in the scope will be submitted. The final invoice will be labeled "Final" and project close out procedures will be followed.

**Budget:** This work will be completed as a lump sum task order. Table 1 displays the budget breakdown for Atkins. A detailed summary budget table for Atkins is attached.
H. DELIVERABLES

The CONSULTANT shall provide the following documents:

1. **Monthly Progress Reports** – The CONSULTANT shall provide a monthly progress report to the TPO Staff. The report is required regardless of project status or payment request.
2. **Pre-Draft CMP Report** – The CONSULTANT and the TPO STAFF shall prepare and submit an electronic version of a Pre-Draft CMP Report for review and comment prior to preparing a Draft CMP Report for the TPO and advisory committees review and comment.
3. **Draft CMP Report** - The CONSULTANT and the TPO STAFF shall prepare and submit an electronic version of the draft report for Santa Rosa County, FDOT and FHWA for review. The draft report will be posted to the TPO’s website and made available to the TPO and advisory committees for review and comment. The comments from the TPO Staff, Santa Rosa County, FDOT, TPO and advisory committees will be incorporated into the final report as appropriate.
4. **Final CMP Report** – The CONSULTANT shall incorporate comments from the state, federal and local governing boards and workshop presentations into the final CMP Report as appropriate. An electronic version of the final report will be submitted to the TPO Staff and will be posted to the TPO’s website.

I. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The CONSULTANT will adhere to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 when developing recommendations for this corridor. The ADA is a wide-ranging civil rights law that prohibits, under certain circumstances, discrimination based on disability.

J. ADDITIONAL SERVICES

If through the course of the project any additional tasks are determined to be needed by the CONSULTANT, TPO, Santa Rosa County, or FDOT the cost must be determined and negotiated, and a change order must be processed by the TPO before the work is performed. If the CONSULTANT conducts the work first and requests payment afterwards the CONSULTANT risks not being paid for the work.
SUBJECT: Update on State Road 10A (US 90) West Cervantes Street from Dominguez Street to “A” Street Pedestrian Safety Study

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: FDOT, Financial Project Identification Number: 443769-1-32-01

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: This project focuses on pedestrian safety based on the recommendations of the W. Cervantes Corridor Management Plan adopted by the TPO in December of 2016.

A public meeting will be held on July 16, 2019 at the Brownsville Community Center, 3200 W. De Soto Street, Pensacola, from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

The FDOT is proposing pedestrian safety improvements for the Brownsville community. This project focuses on a 2.3-mile segment of West Cervantes Street from Dominguez Street to “A” Street. These improvements focus on pedestrian safety and will change the way vehicles access side streets and businesses resulting in access management changes due to the introduction of a center median.

FDOT will be requesting public input on proposed project features to include:
- Reduction of vehicle lane widths from 12-ft to 10-ft, retaining two vehicle travel lanes in each direction
- Addition of mid-block pedestrian crosswalks
- Introduction of a raised center median with a low barrier and dedicated openings for pedestrians
- Addition of two traffic signals at “L” Street and “I” Street, while retaining the existing seven traffic signals
- Additional street lighting at intersections and crosswalks

This pedestrian safety project is proceeding in parallel with the Emerald Coast Regional Council (ECRC)/ City of Pensacola / Escambia County Traffic Feasibility Study along the same project alignment which will address whether a future lane elimination (road diet) is possible from a traffic perspective.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This item is for information only. Please contact Mr. Tommy Johns, FDOT Project Manager, at 850.260.3215, or Tommy.Johns@atkinsglobal.com or Mr. Brad Collins, HDR Project Manager at 850-429-8931, or Michael.Collins@hdrinc.com if additional information is needed.
SUBJECT: Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) Bus Stop Assessment Plan Progress Update

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: FL-AL TPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: Emerald Coast Regional Planning Council (ECRC) and HDR Engineering (as General Planning Consultant) are preparing an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) assessment of Escambia County Area Transit (ECAT) bus stops, in accordance with the FL-AL TPO UPWP. Notice to Proceed was issued in February 2019. A draft assessment checklist was presented to the TPO in April 2019 for review and comment.

HDR transit planners reviewed the bus system stops to determine compliance with the ADA. Being ADA compliant helps with community accessibility to the system and is required for receiving federal aid. Additionally, ECAT wished to find potential weak points in the stop design to improve accessibility for all riders.

A total of approximately 1,100 stops were reviewed with special attention given to boarding and alighting areas, signage, and bench/shelter design. The team utilized a combination of desktop review and in the field evaluation. The preliminary results indicate that ECAT will need to address proper signage, stop positioning, and standardized bench/shelter designs. A presentation to the TPO and advisory committees will discuss the team’s initial findings as well as potential improvements to the stop designs. The final report will be presented at the October TPO meeting.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This item is for information only. Please contact Mr. Rob Mahan, ECRC staff, at 850-332-7976, Extension 216 or rob.mahan@ecrc.org with comments or if additional information is needed.
ENCLOSURE H
ENVELOPE H  
ALL COMMITTEES

SUBJECT: Review of the 2019 Florida-Alabama Title VI Program Major Update

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Staff

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

BACKGROUND: Title 49 CFR Section 21.9(b) requires Federal Transit Administration (FTA) financial assistance recipients to “keep such records and submit to the Secretary timely, complete, and accurate compliance reports determine to be necessary to enable him to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying with [49 CFR part 21].”

The FTA requires that all direct and primary recipients document their compliance by submitting a Title Program to the FTA regional civil rights officer once every three years. The Title VI Program must be approved by the direct or primary recipient’s board of directors or appropriate governing entity or official(s) responsible for policy decisions prior to submission to FTA. Recipients shall submit a copy of the board resolution, meeting minutes, or similar documentation with the Title VI Program as evidence that the board of directors or appropriate governing entity or official(s) has approved the Title VI Program.

As an FTA financial assistance recipient, the Florida-Alabama TPO is subject to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes. This document meets the requirements set forth by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to ensure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes as it applies to processing of Title VI and related statutes discrimination complaints.

The draft Florida-Alabama TPO Title VI Program can be viewed under the following link: https://www.ecrc.org/programs/public_involvement/florida-alabama_tpo_public_involvement/index.php#outer-198

The 2019 Florida-Alabama TPO Title VI Program is subject to 45 day review period, please submit all comments to Brittany Ellers at brittany.ellers@ecrc.org by Friday, September 20, 2019.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This item is for review and comment. Adoption will be requested in October. Please submit comments no later than Friday, September 20, 2019. For more information please contact Ms. Brittany Ellers, Public Involvement Coordinator, at (850) 332-7976, Extension 220 or brittany.ellers@wfrpc.org.
ENCLOSURE I
SUBJECT: Information Items (No Presentation Necessary)

ORIGIN OF SUBJECT: ECRC Staff

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION NEEDED: None

Attached are the following:
- TCC and CAC June Meeting Minutes
- FL-AL June Actions Report
- FDOT Joint Certification Statement
- Regional Rural Transportation Plan Notice to Proceed
- 2019 FL-AL TPO Schedule

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This item is for information. Please contact Ms. Tiffany Bates, ECRC staff, at 1-800-226-8914 Extension 217 or tiffany.bates@ecrc.org if additional information is needed.
FLORIDA - ALABAMA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC) MINUTES
EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL (Designated staff)
Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida 32502
June 10, 2019

Members in Attendance:
Griffin Powell, Chair  City of Orange Beach
Samantha Abell, Vice Chair  City of Gulf Breeze
Colette Wiedeman  Escambia County Transit
Terri V. Malone  Escambia County
John Fisher  Escambia County
Leslie Statler  City of Pensacola
Helen Gibson  City of Pensacola
Mike Hamlin  ECUA
Ryan Novota  City of Pensacola
Jenny Cook  City of Milton
Virginia Sutler  Santa Rosa County

Members Not in Attendance:
John Dosh  Escambia County
Sarah C Hart  Baldwin County
Cassie C Boatwright  Purchasing and Auxiliary Services
Chip Chism  University of West Florida
Chris Phillips  Santa Rosa County
Derrick Owens  City of Pensacola
Glenn C Griffith  Brownfields Coordinator
Horace Jones  Escambia County
Jud Crane  Santa Rosa County
Morgan Lamb  Santa Rosa Bay Bridge Authority
Stephen L Furman  Santa Rosa County
Steve Opalenik  Pensacola Naval Air Station
Taylor Rider  Baldwin County
Vince Jackson  Baldwin County
Steve Harrell  Escambia County
Amy Miller  Port of Pensacola
Max Rogers  CRA
Andrea Levitt Kvech  Pensacola Airport

Others in Attendance
Bryant Paulk  FDOT
Christy Johnson  FDOT
Cory Wilkinson  HDR
David Forte  Escambia County
Barbara Mayall  Citizen
James. L Gulley  Citizen
FLORIDA - ALABAMA TCC MEETING MINUTES
June 10, 2019 (Page 2 of 6)

Emerald Coast Regional Council Staff
Mary Beth Washnock
Gary Kramer
Tiffany Bates
Gabrielle Merritt
Cameron Smith
Brittany Ellers
Caitlin Cerame

A. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE / INVOCATION - Chairman Jeff Bergosh

Mr. Powell called the meeting to order.

Ms. Bates introduced the new TCC members, Ms. Jenny Cook, Ms. Virginia Sutler, and Ms. Colette Wiedeman.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Statler moved to approve the April 2019 FL-AL Technical Coordinating Committee agenda. Mr. Ward seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

C. PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers from the public.

D. FDOT/ALDOT UPDATES:

1. FDOT UPDATE: Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, or Ms. Christy Johnson, AICP, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Urban Liaisons.

Mr. Paulk stated that FDOT will hold an open house for the upcoming reconstruction of the State Road 30 (U.S. 98/Gregory Street) and S.R. 196 (Bayfront Parkway) intersection at 17th Avenue in Pensacola. The open house is scheduled for Tuesday, June 11, from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. at the Studer Community Institute, located at 220 West Garden St., Suite 100, in Pensacola. Mr. Paulk stated that there will be no formal presentation; however, representatives from FDOT will be available to discuss the project plans, answer questions and receive comments.

Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold an Alternatives public meeting concerning SR 292 (Sorrento Rd./Gulf Beach HWY) PD&E Study Alternatives meeting Tuesday, June 18, 2019 at First Baptist Church of Warrington. The meeting is from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. CDT. Mr. Paulk stated that the intent of the study is to evaluate the potential for improving the capacity of the existing State Road 292 (Sorrento Road/Gulf Beach Highway) corridor, from Blue Angel Parkway to Navy Boulevard.

Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold a public hearing regarding access management modifications associated with the U.S 98 widening project on Thursday, June 20, at the Tiger Point Community Center in Gulf Breeze. Mr. Paulk stated that the open house will start at 5:30 p.m., followed by a presentation at 6 p.m. and then a public comment period.
2. **ALDOT Update**
   
   *No Update*

E. **CONSENT:**

1. **ALL COMMITTEES:** Approval of April 2019 Meeting Minutes.

2. **ALL COMMITTEES:** Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-07 Adopting the Public participation Process (PPP) Plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO).

   Ms. Abell moved to approve the February 2019 FL-AL TCC Meeting Minutes and to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-07 Adopting the Public participation Process (PPP) Plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization. Ms. Statler seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

F. **ACTION:**

1. **ENCLOSURE A- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-08 Adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Authorizing the TPO to Administratively Amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to Include the Projects in FDOT's Variance Report -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

   Mr. Kramer stated that the TIP was posted online, and the link was e-mailed to the TPO, advisory committees, and review agencies on April 5, 2019 with comments requested by April 26, 2019. Mr. Kramer stated that the comments received and TPO staff responses were attached to the agenda.

   Mr. Ward moved to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 adopting the FY2020-2024 TIP with any changes that may have been presented and authorize TPO to administratively amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to include the projects in FDOT's Variance Report. Ms. Abell seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

2. **ENCLOSURE B- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to Amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Two Projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County Line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange-Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

   Mr. Kramer presented and stated that this action is recommended to expedite funding for these projects.

   Mr. Ward moved to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for two projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County line and (2) I-10 at
Beulah Road Interchange. Ms. Statler seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

3. ENCLOSURE C- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-11 Approving the Selection of a Firm for Signalization Consultant Continuing Services and Authorizing the Chairman to Execute the Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) -Ms. Jill Lavender, ECRC Staff.

Ms. Lavender stated the TPO, acting as the lead agency, published an RFQ on April 11, 2019 for a new professional services contract be created between the FL-AL TPO and a firm to provide general traffic engineering operation and management services for the entire Florida-Alabama TPO area, and redirect the box funds through the TPO to support the contract. A selection committee was also established to review and rank all proposals. Ms. Lavender stated that four RFP packets were received by the deadline of May 17, 2019 and that the selection committee met on May 28, 2019 to rank all four proposals.

Ms. Lavender stated that DRMP’s fee proposal and scope were submitted and that other agencies opted out before another selection committee meeting was needed. Ms. Lavender stated that the selection committee’s recommendation to move forward with DRMP for the new contract with the TPO.

Ms. Statler moved to recommend the TPO approve the top ranked firm for Signalization Consultant Continuing Services and to authorize the TPO chairman to execute the Joint Participation Agreement with Florida Department of Transportation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

4. ENCLOSURE D- TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-12 Approving the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan -Mr. Cory Wilkinson, AICP CEP, HDR.

5. ENCLOSURE E- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program Management Task Order and Review of TA Scoring Criteria -Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC Staff.

Ms. Cerame stated that in anticipation of TA solicitation in the Fall of 2019, TPO staff provided an opportunity for TCC members to provide input on the current scoring criteria content and procedures at a public workshop on May 22, 2019. Ms. Cerame reported that no significant changes were made to the content of the criteria. Ms. Cerame stated that the minor changes included: use of an independent 3rd party (consultant) to review and rank TA applications; a maximum of two applications can be submitted per local jurisdiction with representation on the TPO board; each application will be supported through a resolution by the local jurisdiction; an application review workshop will be held following submittal deadline to review applications and preliminary scoring. Ms. Cerame stated that the criteria will be presented for approval in July. Ms. Cerame ask that all comments on the draft TA scoring criteria be provided by June 17, 2019.
Ms. Mayall, a FL-AL CAC member, asked why the CAC was not included on this item. Ms. Washnock stated that it was directed towards a technical committee. Ms. Washnock informed Ms. Mayall that the item can be presented at the CAC meeting if requested.

Ms. Ward asked how FDOT was handling the LAP certification. Mr. Paulk stated that at this point it is not required to be LAP certified to be considered for funding because those projects could be several years out.

Ms. Gibson moved to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to execute a task order for the TA program management scoring criteria. Ms. Malone seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

6. ENCLOSURE F- TCC AND TPO CONSENT: Election of Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Chair and Vice Chair for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020) PLEASE NOTE: TCC NOMINATING COMMITTEE IS TO MEET 15 MINUTES PRIOR TO REGULAR MEETING TIME-Ms. Tiffany Bates, ECRC Staff

The nominating committee nominated Mr. Griffin Powell as the TCC Chairman and Terri Malone as the TCC Vice Chair for FY 2020.

Ms. Abell moved to appoint Mr. Griffin Powell as the FL-AL Technical Coordinating Committee chair for FY 2020 and Ms. Terri Malone as vice chair. Mr. Novota seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

7. ENCLOSURE G- CAC AND TPO CONSENT Consideration of Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC) Application from Mr. Mike Boltz -Ms. Brittany Ellers, ECRC Staff

G. EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT- TPO ONLY- Mr. Austin Mount, ECRC Executive Director.

H. MULTI MODAL UPDATE

I. PRESENTATIONS (no action):
   1. ENCLOSURE H- ALL COMMITTEES Review of Draft Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff

      Mr. Kramer presented a brief overview of the Project Priority process. Mr. Kramer also provided a link to an interactive map, which shows the location and the street view by category for the projects identified in the draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities. There were no further comments or questions.

      2. ENCLOSURE I- ALL COMMITTEES Review of the Draft FL-AL TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

      Mr. Kramer presented and stated that a public workshop on the draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives will be held at the Marie Ella Davis Community Center @4:00 p.m. on June 13, 2019.

Ms. Lavender gave a presentation on the draft Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan. Mr. Lavender stated that the TPO adopted the scope of services for a CMP for Berryhill Road from Locklin Technical College to SR 89/Dogwood Drive on June 13, 2018. Ms. Lavender stated that all comments must be submitted by Wednesday, June 26, 2019.

J. INFORMATION ITEMS (no presentation necessary)

1. ENCLOSURE K- ALL COMMITTEES

   • TCC and CAC April Meeting Minutes
   • FL-AL April Actions Report
   • City of Milton Letters to TPO Board
   • 2019 FL-AL TPO Schedule

K. OTHER BUSINESS- The next Florida-Alabama TPO meeting will be Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the Tiger Point Community Center, 1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze, Florida. Advisory committee meetings are to be held at Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida 32502. TCC will meet on Monday, July 8, 2019 at 8:30 a.m. The CAC will meet on Tuesday, July 9, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 AM
Members in Attendance:
Vernon Compton
Kurt Larson
Patrick M. McClellan
Bill Jeffries
Lisa Walsh
Sean Bullington
Mike Kilmer
Jim Roberts

Members Not in Attendance:
Robin Edwards
Terry Miller
Anne B. Bennett
Barbara Mayall
Sandy Boyd

Others in Attendance
Bryant Paulk FDOT
Christy Johnson FDOT
Cory Wilkinson HDR
David Forte Escambia County
Terri Malone Escambia County
Kathy Tanner Citizen
Mike Boltz Citizen

Emerald Coast Regional Council Staff
Austin Mount
Mary Beth Washnock
Gary Kramer
Tiffany Bates
Jill Lavender
Rob Mahan
Brittany Ellers
Cameron Smith
Gabrielle Merritt
Caitlin Cerame
A. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE / INVOCATION

Chairman Compton called the meeting to order.

Ms. Washnock stated new CAC member Ms. Charletha Powell could not attend this meeting but that she was listening in over the phone.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bullington discussed that he would like to see county staff attend more meetings so that the CAC members can stay informed and be kept up to date on recent projects.

Mr. Bullington moved to add a discussion item to the agenda regarding a request to have county staff attending CAC meetings. Mr. McClellan seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Mr. Bullington moved to approve the June 2019 FL-AL Citizen Advisory Committee agenda as amended. Ms. Walsh seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

C. PUBLIC FORUM

Ms. Kathy Tanner addressed the committee regarding her concerns about Bayfront parkway from 9th Avenue to S. Alcaniz Street. Ms. Tanner stated that she had lived there for years and that traffic speed has become a very prominent issue for that segment of Hwy. 196. Ms. Tanner stated that she had brought her concerns to the city with no relief and was hoping that she could get some help resolving this issue. She stated that currently the speed limit is 35 mph and that she believes it should be decreased to at least 25 mph. Ms. Tanner mentioned that the freight trucks leaving the port was not the issue, the issue was people flying through that area with no concern of pedestrians. Mr. Paulk stated that the segment in concern was looked at by the department and it was determined that the speed was adequate for traffic flow that accrues in that area. Mr. Bullington suggested contacting the traffic division at the police office. Mr. Kilmer agreed that something needed to be done to make that segment of Bayfront more accessible and safer for pedestrians. Ms. Tanner discussed increasing capacity on Government Street so that some of the traffic off Bayfront Parkway is diverted.

D. FDOT/ALDOT UPDATES:

1. FDOT UPDATE: Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, or Ms. Christy Johnson, AICP, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Urban Liaisons.

Mr. Paulk stated that FDOT will hold an open house for the upcoming reconstruction of the State Road 30 (U.S. 98/Gregory Street) and S.R. 196 (Bayfront Parkway) intersection at 17th Avenue in Pensacola. The open house is scheduled for Tuesday, June 11, from
5:30 to 6:30 p.m. at the Studer Community Institute, located at 220 West Garden St., Suite 100, in Pensacola. Mr. Paulk stated that there will be no formal presentation; however, representatives from FDOT will be available to discuss the project plans, answer questions and receive comments.

Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold an Alternatives public meeting concerning SR 292 (Sorrento Rd./Gulf Beach HWY) PD&E Study Alternatives meeting Tuesday, June 18, 2019 at First Baptist Church of Warrington. The meeting is from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. CDT. Mr. Paulk stated that the intent of the study is to evaluate the potential for improving the capacity of the existing State Road 292 (Sorrento Road/Gulf Beach Highway) corridor, from Blue Angel Parkway to Navy Boulevard.

Mr. Paulk reported that FDOT will hold a public hearing regarding access management modifications associated with the U.S 98 widening project on Thursday, June 20, at the Tiger Point Community Center in Gulf Breeze. Mr. Paulk stated that the open house will start at 5:30 p.m., followed by a presentation at 6 p.m. and then a public comment period.

Mr. McClellan asked about the safety study conducted on the Theo Baars Bridge. Mr. Paulk informed Mr. McClellan that the bridge did not meet the qualifications for replacement and that if he wanted to see improvements made to the bridge, he would have to address it at a TPO level. Mr. Paulk explained that improvements such as widening the bridge, would come out of the TPO's capacity dollars and would have to compete against the other capacity needs in the area.

**Mr. McClellan moved to request that the TPO consider amending the LRTP to include the widening of the Theo Baars Bridge. Mr. Burlington seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Kramer stated that the request would more appropriate at the July meeting to give staff time to prepare the information.

2. **ALDOT Update**

Mr. Kramer stated that Mr. Beebe could not make today's meeting and that he would be giving the ALDOT update. Mr. Kramer reported that the new roadway and bridge from the Foley Beach Express to SR-180 has been split into 2 parts, roadway from CR-4 to the Foley Beach Express and the roadway and bridge from SR-180 to CR-4.

Mr. Kramer reported that ALDOT is working to complete design plans, acquire remaining right-of-way, and relocate utilities. Mr. Kramer stated that construction letting dates could move based on progress.
Mr. Kramer stated that all required preliminary engineering is complete for the widening of SR-180 from the Foley Beach Express to SR-161. He reported that utility relocations are in progress and construction letting is currently scheduled for June 28, 2019.

E. CONSENT:
1. ALL COMMITTEES: Approval of April 2019 Meeting Minutes.


Ms. Walsh moved to approve the April 2019 FL-AL CAC Meeting Minutes and to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-07 adopting the Public participation Process (PPP) Plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization. Mr. Bullington seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

F. ACTION:
1. ENCLOSURE A- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-08 Adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Authorizing the TPO to Administratively Amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to Include the Projects in FDOT’s Variance Report -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

Mr. Kramer stated that the TIP was posted online, and the link was e-mailed to the TPO, advisory committees, and review agencies on April 5, 2019 with comments requested by April 26, 2019. Mr. Kramer stated that the comments received and TPO staff responses were included in the agenda.

Mr. Jeffries moved to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 adopting the FY2020-2024 TIP with any changes that may have been presented and authorize TPO to administratively amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to include the projects in FDOT’s Variance Report. Mr. Bullington seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

2. ENCLOSURE B- ALL COMMITTEES (TPO PUBLIC HEARING AND ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED) Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to Amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for Two Projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County Line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange-Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.
Mr. Kramer presented and stated that this action is recommended to expedite funding for these projects.

Ms. Walsh moved to recommend the TPO authorize the TPO chairman to sign Resolution FL-AL 19-09 to amend the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for two projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to the Okaloosa County line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange. Mr. Kilmer seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

3. ENCLOSURE C- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-11 Approving the Selection of a Firm for Signalization Consultant Continuing Services and Authorizing the Chairman to Execute the Joint Participation Agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) -Ms. Jill Lavender, ECRC Staff.

4. ENCLOSURE D- TPO ONLY Consideration of Resolution FL-AL 19-12 Approving the Scope of Work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan -Mr. Cory Wilkinson, AICP CEP, HDR.

5. ENCLOSURE E- TCC AND TPO ONLY Consideration of Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program Management Task Order and Review of TA Scoring Criteria -Ms. Caitlin Cerame, ECRC Staff.

6. ENCLOSURE F- TCC AND TPO CONSENT: Election of Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Chair and Vice Chair for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 (July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020) PLEASE NOTE: TCC NOMINATING COMMITTEE IS TO MEET 15 MINUTES PRIOR TO REGULAR MEETING TIME-Ms. Tiffany Bates, ECRC Staff

7. ENCLOSURE G- CAC AND TPO CONSENT Consideration of Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC) Application from Mr. Mike Boltz -Ms. Brittany Ellers, ECRC Staff

Chairman Compton introduced Mr. Boltz. Mr. Bullington welcomed Mr. Boltz to the CAC.

Mr. Bullington moved to recommend that the TPO approve the consideration of Mr. Mike Boltz as a member of the CAC. Mr. McClellan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

ADD ON ITEM:

Mr. Bullington stated that he would like to have more knowledge brought in from the county at meetings. Mr. Bullington stated that there is a lot of discussion about the state roads but not as much about the county roads. Mr. Bullington discussed his concern that
the County Commissioners do not always hear the voices of the citizens. Ms. Washnock stated that what the CAC would need to detail what it is that they want the city and county representatives to bring to the table. Ms. Washnock suggested bringing the wanted information to the representatives at least a meeting ahead, to give them time to prepare to answer the questions. There was discussion about Escambia County's planning process compared to the states. Mr. Forte stated that it is like FDOT's five-year work program that's updated every year. Mr. Forte informed the committee that if they would like to see the county Capital Improvement Plan or schedule of proposed projects, it is available on the county website.

The committee decided to table the item and bring it back at the July meeting with more key points.

There was discussion about the road swap agreement between Escambia County taking over Perdido Key Drive and FDOT taking over Beulah Road.

G. EMERALD COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT- TPO ONLY- Mr. Austin Mount, ECRC Executive Director.

Mr. Mount stated that over the last month, TPO staff went to each municipality to discuss advancing the ATMS project. Mr. Mount stated that it has been the top priority of the TPO. Mr. Mount said that because of the recent efforts collectively made by the TPO, FDOT stated that they are going to support this project and for the TPO to submit a build application.

H. MULTI MODAL UPDATE

I. PRESENTATIONS (no action):

1. ENCLOSURE H- ALL COMMITTEES Review of Draft Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff

   Mr. Kramer presented a brief overview of the Project Priority process. Mr. Kramer also provided a link to an interactive map, which shows the location and the street view by category for the projects identified in the draft FY 2021-2025 Project Priorities. There were no further comments or questions.

2. ENCLOSURE I- ALL COMMITTEES Review of the Draft FL-AL TPO 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Goals and Objectives -Mr. Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff.

   Mr. Kramer presented and stated that a public workshop on the draft 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Goals and Objectives will be held at the Marie Ella Davis Community Center @4:00 p.m. on June 13, 2019.

Ms. Lavender gave a presentation on the draft Berryhill Road Corridor Management Plan. Ms. Lavender stated that the TPO adopted the scope of services for a CMP for Berryhill Road from Locklin Technical College to SR 89/Dogwood Drive on June 13, 2018. Ms. Lavender stated that all comments must be submitted by Wednesday, June 26, 2019.

J. INFORMATION ITEMS (no presentation necessary)
1. ENCLOSURE K- ALL COMMITTEES
   • TCC and CAC April Meeting Minutes
   • FL-AL April Actions Report
   • City of Milton Letters to TPO Board
   • 2019 FL-AL TPO Schedule

K. OTHER BUSINESS- The next Florida-Alabama TPO meeting will be Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the Tiger Point Community Center, 1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze, Florida. Advisory committee meetings are to be held at Pensacola City Hall, 222 West Main Street, Pensacola, Florida 32502. TCC will meet on Monday, July 8, 2019 at 8:30 a.m. The CAC will meet on Tuesday, July 9, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

L. ADJOURNMENT

*The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM*
MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 21, 2019

TO: Mr. Bryant Paulk, AICP, FDOT Urban Liaison
   Ms. Christy Johnson, AICP, FDOT Urban Liaison
   Mr. Vincent Beebe, P.E., ALDOT

COPIES TO: TPO, TCC, and CAC Members

FROM: Tiffany Bates, Transportation Program Coordinator

RE: TPO Actions Report – June 2019

The following items were discussed and acted upon by the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) at the June 12, 2019 meeting. The TPO requests the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) to share this report with the appropriate department directors and to take action if requested by the TPO. Copies are sent to local government representatives for coordination with local plans.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:
The TPO approved by roll call vote Resolution FL-AL 19-08, adopting the Florida-Alabama TPO FY 2020-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and authorizing the TPO to administratively amend the FY 2020-2024 TIP to include the projects in FDOT’s variance report. This was recommended because the TIP has been developed in coordination with ALDOT, FDOT and local governments and is consistent with the TPO Long Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Systems Management Priorities, Transportation Alternatives Program Project Priorities, and Aviation, Port and Transit Master Plans.

LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN:
The TPO approved by roll call vote Resolution FL-AL 19-09 amending the Florida-Alabama 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan for two projects: (1) I-10 from Avalon Boulevard to Okaloosa County line and (2) I-10 at Beulah Road Interchange. This action was recommended to expedite funding for these projects.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS:
The TPO approved under consent Resolution FL-AL 19-07 adopting the Public Participation Process (PPP) plan for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). This action was recommended because the PPP provides guidelines for achieving quality public involvement when developing major planning documents and programs.
REGIONAL ADVANCED TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The TPO approved Resolution FL-AL 19-11 approving the selection of DRMP as the signalization consultant to continue services to the FL-AL TPO area and authorizing the chairman to execute the joint participation agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). This action was recommended to ensure a seamless transition for the TPO to be the lead agency in the continuing efforts for the full build out of the Regional Advanced Traffic Management System/Regional Traffic Management Center. The TPO board also authorized the chairman to sign a letter of support for a BUILD grant request for this project.

REGIONAL RURAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The TPO approved Resolution FL-AL 19-12 approving the scope of work for the Regional Rural Transportation Plan, amending the scope to include the Bluffs Industrial Complex, Rail USA, Alabama Gulf Coast Railway, the Gulf Power and Ascend Performance Materials private ports, and International Paper as additional stakeholders. This action was recommended in order for the project to proceed.

TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED PLANNING

The TPO approved under consent Resolution FL-AL 19-10 authorizing the filing of the Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund Planning Grant agreement with the Commission for Transportation Disadvantaged. This action was recommended to ensure that planning for the transportation disadvantaged needs of the area continues and that state operating assistance will continue to be available.

The TPO approved under consent the membership certification for the Escambia County and Santa Rosa County Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Boards. This action was recommended to maintain the function of the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Boards in Escambia County and Santa Rosa County.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PLANNING

The TPO approved a Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program Management task order for the TA program management scope of services.

TPO ADMINISTRATION

The TPO approved the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) recommendation of Griffin Powell as the TCC Chairman and Terri Malone as the TCC Vice Chair for FY 2020.

The TPO voted to approve Mr. Mike Boltz to serve on the (CAC) to represent Santa Rosa County Commissioner David Piech’s district.
April 11, 2019

Mrs. Mary Beth Washnock  
Transportation Planning Manager  
Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization  
4801 E. Olive Rd. Suite A  
Pensacola, FL 32514  

RE: FDOT Joint Certification Calendar Year 2018

Dear Mrs. Washnock:

The Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) is the transportation planning agency tasked with the development of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) process in the Florida-Alabama Urbanized area. Annually, the Florida Department of Transportation (Department), conducts a certification review of the planning process to certify that the TPO complies with state and federal planning requirements.

The Department continues to encourage the TPO to consistently submit monthly invoices and status reports. Based on the guidance set forth in Section 7.6 of the MPO Program Management Handbook, intended to satisfy the Risk Assessment requirements described in 2 CFR §200.331, the TPO's Risk Level is High. Quarterly monitoring is required in Calendar Year 2020.

The Department notes that the TPO staff has revised the Public Participation Plan (PPP) in response to the corrective action outlined in the Final TMA Certification Review Report, dated December 31, 2018. The revised PPP is scheduled for adoption by the TPO on June 12, 2019.

The TPO is commended for successful implementation of various non-traditional public involvement outreach intended to increase public participation in development of the Project Priorities and Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan, both adopted in 2018.

Thank you for TPO active involvement in transportation planning and ongoing commitment to the practice of comprehensive transportation planning. The Department looks forward to working with the TPO in the upcoming year on implementation of planning projects.

The Department has completed the joint certification of the TPO. The TPO planning process is hereby certified. Upon review and approval, please sign the Joint Certification Statement and return to the Department for final execution.

www.fdot.gov
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (850) 981-2754.

Sincerely,

Bryant Paulk
Urban Liaison

Enclosure:

CC: Mark Reichard, Administrator for Metropolitan Planning, FDOT Office of Policy Planning
    Erica Thompson, Statewide Metropolitan Planning Coordinator, FDOT Office of Policy Planning
    Cathy Kendall, Federal Highway Administration
    Luis D. Lopez, Federal Highway Administration
Pursuant to the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(5) and 23 CFR 450.334(a), the Department and the MPO have performed a review of the certification status of the metropolitan transportation planning process for the Florida-Alabama TPO with respect to the requirements of:

2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 C.F.R. Part 21
3. 49 U.S.C. 5332 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Section 1101(b) of the FAST Act and 49 C.F.R. Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
5. 23 C.F.R. Part 230 regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
6. The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and the regulations found in 49 C.F.R. Parts 27, 37, and 38;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101) prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of gender; and

Included in this certification package is a summary of noteworthy achievements by the MPO, attachments associated with these achievements, and (if applicable) a list of any recommendations and/or corrective actions. The contents of this Joint Certification Package have been reviewed by the MPO and accurately reflect the results of the joint certification review meeting held on March 11, 2019.

Based on a joint review and evaluation, the Florida Department of Transportation and the Florida-Alabama TPO recommend that the Metropolitan Planning Process for the Florida-Alabama TPO be certified.

Name: Phillip Gaines
Title: District Secretary (or designee)

Name: Jeff Betchik
Title: MPO Chairman (or designee)

Date: 5/12/19

Date: 4/10/19
June 28, 2019

Cory Wilkinson, Senior Planner, AICP, CEP
HDR
25 West Cedar Street, Suite 200
Pensacola, FL 32502

Dear Mr. Wilkinson:

RE: Notice to Proceed – Regional Rural Transportation Plan

The Emerald Coast Regional Council (ECRC) issues this Planning Services Notice to Proceed to HDR (CONSULTANT). The purpose of this notice and agreement is twofold. First, the ECRC desires to formally engage the services of CONSULTANT to assist with the development of the ECRC Regional Rural Transportation Plan, as described in the attached Scope of Services. Second, the ECRC is advising the CONSULTANT to proceed on this project as soon as possible.

Mr. Gary Kramer will be the ECRC Project Manager and the primary contact to act on behalf of the Manager of Transportation Planning, as required. By signature of the Manager and start date being the date of this correspondence, the CONSULTANT shall commence planning services. CONSULTANT will complete specified tasks on a schedule determined and agreed to by you and the ECRC Project Manager. These tasks and deliverables will be completed for a cost agreed upon and attached hereto, and not to exceed a lump sum of $107,692. Additional technical assistance will be based on the CONSULTANT’S hourly rates in effect as of this date and would be authorized only through an addendum to this Notice.

Please proceed with the project as expeditiously as possible. Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or need for clarification. The TPO and its staff look forward to working with you and your team to complete a multimodal, comprehensive transportation plan for the citizens of this area.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Wadsworth, Manager
Transportation Planning

Attachments: Approved Scope of Services and Approved Budget

cc: Austin Mount, ECRC Chief Executive Officer
    Gary Kramer, ECRC Staff
    Jeff Bergosh, FL-AL TPO Chairman
    Sam Parker, FL-AL TPO Vice-Chairman
    Nathan Boyles, O-W TPO Chairman
    Amy Jamieson, O-W TPO Vice-Chairman
    Pam Henderson, Bay TPO Chairman
    Robert Carroll, Bay TPO Vice-Chairman
    Bryant Paulk, FDOT
    Christy Johnson, FDOT
    Donna Green, FDOT
## 2019 Schedule

Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization

Below are the 2019 scheduled meeting locations, dates, and times for the Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization Board, Technical Coordinating Committee, and Citizens’ Advisory Committee. (Meeting schedule and location are subject to change. For updates and agendas, please visit [www.wfrpc.org](http://www.wfrpc.org) or email [tiffany.bates@wfrpc.org](mailto:tiffany.bates@wfrpc.org).)

### February
- **TCC**: Feb. 11, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: Feb. 12, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: Feb. 13, 9 a.m.
  W. Florida Regional Library*
  239 N. Spring Street, Pensacola

### April
- **TCC**: Apr. 8, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: Apr. 9, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: Apr. 10, 9 a.m.
  Tiger Point Community Center
  1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze

### June
- **TCC**: June 10, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: June 11, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: June 12, 9 a.m.
  W. Florida Regional Library*
  239 N. Spring Street, Pensacola

### July
- **TCC**: July 8, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: July 9, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: July 10, 9 a.m.
  Tiger Point Community Center
  1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze

### October
- **TCC**: Oct. 7, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: Oct. 8, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: Oct. 9, 9 a.m.
  W. Florida Regional Library*
  239 N. Spring Street, Pensacola

### December
- **TCC**: Dec. 9, 8:30 a.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **CAC**: Dec. 10, 3 p.m.
  Pensacola City Hall
  222 W. Main Street
- **TPO Board**: Dec. 11, 9 a.m.
  Tiger Point Community Center
  1370 Tiger Point Lane, Gulf Breeze

*This event is not sponsored or endorsed by the West Florida Public Libraries or Escambia County.

The FL-AL TPO is staffed by the West Florida Regional Planning Council, a regional entity providing professional planning, coordinating, and advisory services to local governments, state and federal agencies, and the public to preserve and enhance quality of life in northwest Florida. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability, or family status. Reasonable accommodation will be made for access in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Contact Brittany Ellers, 850-332-7976, ext. 220 or brittany.ellers@wfrpc.org, or TTY 711. Por favor a la Sr. Dan Deanda, de los requerimientos de acceso o el idioma en el 850-332-7976 ext. 227 o TTY 711 al menos 48 horas de antelación.