



REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, June 2, 2021
2:00 pm

Public Participation/Accessibility

Participation in Person: Public comments may be provided in person at the meeting. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact the St. Lucie TPO at 772-462-1593 at least five days prior to the meeting. Persons who are hearing or speech impaired may use the Florida Relay System by dialing 711.

Participation by Webconference: Using a computer or smartphone, register at <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1507849770698095630>. After the registration is completed, a confirmation will be emailed containing instructions for joining the webconference. Public comments may be provided through the webconference chatbox during the meeting.

Written and Telephone Comments: Comment by email to TPOAdmin@stlucieco.org; by regular mail to the St. Lucie TPO, 466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Suite 111, Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953; or call 772-462-1593 until 1:00 pm on June 2, 2021.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Comments from the Public
5. Comments from Advisory Committee Members (TAC/CAC/BPAC)
6. Approval of Agenda
7. Approval of Meeting Summary
 - *April 7, 2021 Regular Board Meeting*
8. Consent Agenda
 - 8a. Appointment to the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC): Appointment of a Resident Bicycling Representative to the BPAC to fill a vacancy.

Action: Appoint or do not appoint.

- 8b. Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Planning Grant Application: Adoption of Resolution 21-01 authorizing the execution of the TD Planning Grant Application for FY 2021/22.

Action: Adopt or do not adopt.

9. Action Items

- 9a. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Performance Targets: Review of the proposed PTASP performance targets for the St. Lucie TPO.

Action: Adopt the proposed PTASP performance targets, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

- 9b. Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report: Review of the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report.

Action: Accept the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report, accept with conditions, or do not accept.

- 9c. FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Review of the FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP for the St. Lucie TPO.

Action: Adopt the draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

- 9d. Draft 2021/22 List of Priority Projects (LOPP): Review of the draft 2021/22 LOPP for the St. Lucie TPO.

Action: Adopt the draft 2021/22 LOPP, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

10. Discussion Items

- 10a. Transit Representation on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB): Discussion of amendments to the St. Lucie TPO By-Laws, Rules, and Procedures regarding transit representation on the TAC and confirmation of transit membership on the LCB.

Action: Discuss and provide comments to Staff.

11. FDOT Comments

12. Recommendations/Comments by Members

13. TPO Staff Comments

14. Next Meeting: The next St. Lucie TPO Board Meeting is a regular meeting scheduled for 2:00 pm on Wednesday, August 4, 2021.
15. Adjourn

NOTICES

The St. Lucie TPO satisfies the requirements of various nondiscrimination laws and regulations including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Public participation is welcome without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, income, or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns about nondiscrimination should contact Marceia Lathou, the Title VI/ADA Coordinator of the St. Lucie TPO, at 772-462-1593 or via email at lathoum@stlucieco.org.

Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact Marceia Lathou at 772-462-1593 at least five days prior to the meeting. Persons who are hearing or speech impaired may use the Florida Relay System by dialing 711.

Items not included on the agenda may also be heard in consideration of the best interests of **the public's health, safety, welfare, and as necessary to protect every person's right of** access. If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the St. Lucie TPO with respect to any matter considered at this meeting, that person shall need a record of the proceedings, and for such a purpose, that person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Kreyòl Ayisyen: Si ou ta renmen resevwa enfòmasyon sa a nan lang Kreyòl Ayisyen, tanpri rele nimewo 772-462-1593.

Español: Si usted desea recibir esta información en español, por favor llame al 772-462-1593.



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd. Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, April 7, 2021
TIME: 2:00 pm
LOCATION: St. Lucie TPO
Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Call to Order
Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance
Chairman Johnson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call
The in-person roll was called, and a quorum was confirmed with eight members present.

- * MOTION by Commissioner Townsend to approve select members' remote participation.

- ** SECONDED by Commissioner Johnson Carried UNANIMOUSLY
The roll was called for the members participating remotely via the webconference.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Commissioner Jeremiah Johnson, Chair	City of Fort Pierce
Councilwoman Stephanie Morgan, Vice Chair	City of Port St. Lucie

Councilwoman Jolien Caraballo (via web)
Darrell Drummond
Commissioner Chris Dzadoovsky
Commissioner Curtis Johnson, Jr.
Jack Kelly

City of Port St. Lucie
Community Transit
St. Lucie County
City of Fort Pierce
St. Lucie County School
District
St. Lucie County
City of Port St. Lucie
St. Lucie County

Commissioner Sean Mitchell
Councilman David Pickett (via web)
Commissioner Cathy Townsend

Others Present

Kyle Bowman
Peter Buchwald
Yi Ding
Marceia Lathou (via web)
Rachel Harrison
Joseph DeFronzo
Christine Fasiska

Joy Puerta (via web)

Mira Skoroden (via web)
Caroline Valentin (via web)

Victoria Williams (via web)

Representing

St. Lucie TPO
St. Lucie TPO
St. Lucie TPO
St. Lucie TPO
Recording Specialist
City of Port St. Lucie
Florida Department of
Transportation (FDOT)
Martin Metropolitan
Planning Organization
FDOT
St. Lucie TPO/St. Lucie
County Attorney
Florida’s Turnpike
Authority

4. Comments from the Public – None.

5. Comments from Advisory Committee Members (TAC/CAC/BPAC) – None.

6. Approval of Agenda

* MOTION by Mr. Drummond to approve the agenda.

** SECONDED by Commissioner Townsend Carried UNANIMOUSLY

7. Approval of Meeting Summaries
 - January 27, 2021 Regular Board Meeting
 - February 3, 2021 SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Adoption Workshop

* MOTION by Commissioner Mitchell to approve the Meeting Summaries.

** SECONDED by Commissioner Johnson Carried UNANIMOUSLY

8. Consent Agenda

8a. Appointment to the Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB): Appointment to the LCB to fill a vacancy.

8b. Amendment to the FY 2020/21 – FY 2021/22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP): Adoption of an amendment to revise the State and local cash matches to a soft match for the Federal Transit Administration Section 5305(d) Metropolitan Planning Grant.

* MOTION by Mr. Kelly to approve the Consent Agenda.

** SECONDED by Commissioner Johnson Carried UNANIMOUSLY

9. Action Items

9a. Amendment to the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP): Adoption of an amendment to the TPO's COOP to change the Devolution Agency and to add Pandemic Procedures.

Mr. Buchwald explained the COOP as summarizing the functions, operations, and resources necessary to ensure the continuation of the TPO's Essential Functions should its normal operations at the TPO Headquarters be disrupted. He indicated that two updates had been identified as necessary during the annual review of the COOP: the changing of the Devolution Agency from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to FDOT District 4 at FHWA's request, and the addition of Pandemic Procedures. Mr. Buchwald described the circumstances required for Devolution and the Pandemic Procedures to be activated and subsequently terminated, and then elaborated on the provisions of the latter protocol.

Mr. Kelly initiated a discussion regarding the scope of the proposed Pandemic Procedures, with several members asking for clarification on the agencies identified as having the authority to declare and/or terminate a Pandemic. Mr. Buchwald explained the rationale behind the Pandemic Procedures update, noting that the TPO observed the mandates from the local, State, and Federal authorities. It was the consensus of the Board that the update was worded sufficiently broadly to allow for the appropriate flexibility in observing the mandates from multiple authorities.

* MOTION by Commissioner Dzadoovsky to adopt the COOP Amendment.

** SECONDED by Commissioner Johnson Carried UNANIMOUSLY

9b. Public Participation Plan (PPP) 2020 Annual Evaluation:
Review and acceptance of the PPP 2020 Annual Evaluation.

Mr. Buchwald explained that the February 2020 major update to the PPP established an annual review of the effectiveness of its outreach strategies. He noted that the 2020 evaluation of the PPP would serve as the base year for subsequent evaluations before inviting Ms. Lathou to continue. Ms. Lathou provided an overview of the TPO's public participation efforts and their intended outcomes, explained the rationale and methodology for reviewing their effectiveness, and then highlighted the numerous in-person, online, and Environmental Justice/Title VI outreach activities conducted during 2020. She concluded with the performance targets to be used in subsequent evaluations.

In response to Chairman Johnson's inquiry, Ms. Lathou explained that the single response listed within the 'email' category of Online Activities had been in reaction to a SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan eblast. She further noted that the eblast had linked to an online survey that received hundreds of responses.

* MOTION by Councilwoman Caraballo to accept the PPP 2020 Annual Evaluation

** SECONDED by Commissioner Dzadoovsky Carried UNANIMOUSLY

9c. Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) 2021 Grant Application: Review of a TAP grant application for the 2021 cycle.

Mr. Buchwald summarized the types of projects for which TAP funding may be used and explained how and when the \$650,000 of funding

available to the St. Lucie TPO for the 2021 grant cycle would be programmed. He indicated that an application had been submitted by the City of Port St. Lucie for the Kestor Drive Sidewalk project, provided details on the project's parameters, and noted that the applicant had requested \$764,053 in funding.

Commissioner Dzadovsky asked whether the Airborne Mountain Bike Club could request TAP funding for the Fort Pierce Mountain Bike Trail. Mr. Buchwald indicated that such a request would be possible if the trail were added to the Walk-Bike Network, if the project were then added to the List of Priority Projects, and if the club found a local agency to administer the project.

* MOTION by Commissioner Mitchell to endorse the TAP grant application for the 2021 cycle.

** SECONDED by Councilwoman Morgan Carried UNANIMOUSLY

9d. Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) 2021 Grant Application: Review of a TRIP grant application for the 2021 cycle.

Mr. Buchwald explained why TRIP was created and identified the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC) as the regional entity tasked with pursuing such funds. He indicated the types of projects for which TRIP funding could be used along with the percentage of project costs that could be covered before detailing the 2021 application submitted by the City of Port St. Lucie for the widening of Port St. Lucie Boulevard between Becker Road and Paar Drive. Mr. Buchwald noted that the project would be ready for construction upon the completion of the widening of the segments between Paar Drive and Darwin Boulevard, concluding with the City's request for \$8.2 million toward the overall project cost of \$16.4 million.

Mr. Buchwald noted that Mr. Kelly and Commissioner Dzadovsky would be representing the St. Lucie TPO with him at the TCTC meeting in April.

* MOTION by Mr. Drummond to endorse the TRIP grant application for the 2021 cycle.

** SECONDED by Mr. Kelly Carried UNANIMOUSLY

10. Discussion Items

10a. St. Lucie Walk-Bike Network (WBN) 2021 Update and Crosswalk Markings Visibility Inventory: Review of the St. Lucie WBN 2021 Update and Crosswalk Markings Visibility Inventory.

Mr. Buchwald introduced the agenda item and invited Mr. Ding to continue. Mr. Ding presented with the aid of a map the various pedestrian and bicycle facilities that had been added to the WBN since its last update in 2018, facilities which increased the Network by 34 miles. He reported the mileage expected to be constructed between 2021 and 2045, as well as the WBN's total present mileage, and then transitioned to the Crosswalk Markings Visibility Inventory. Mr. Ding explained how the intersection data had been obtained and how the condition of the markings had been evaluated before presenting the results, which comprised seven crosswalk markings in poor condition, 12 in fair condition, and 38 in good condition. He concluded by outlining the next steps in the process.

Commissioner Mitchell inquired about the costs of restriping an intersection. Mr. Ding explained that it would depend upon the condition of the intersection and the type of crosswalk chosen for implementation, describing several commonly used within the TPO area. Commissioner Dzadovsky described a three-dimensional style he had seen elsewhere, and Chairman Johnson elaborated on various engineering considerations that could also impact the cost.

Recognizing the requirement that intersections have a history of bicycle/pedestrian accidents in order to be included in the present study, Commissioner Johnson initiated a discussion of how to make intersections safer in cases where the condition of the crosswalks may not have been the primary cause of past incidents. He remarked on several factors, such as lack of curbing, traffic volume, and recklessness of drivers that could impact an intersection's safety, citing the intersection of South 13th Street and Delaware Avenue as being particularly problematic. Commissioner Mitchell commented on the number of crashes occurring at the intersection of Port St. Lucie and Gatlin Boulevards despite the newness of the striping, while Councilwoman Morgan remarked on the since-corrected multiple crosswalk styles used concurrently at the intersection of Selvitz Road and St. James Boulevard. Chairman Johnson noted the additional issue of incorporating ADA accessibility into crosswalks and reported on the concept of combining crosswalks with speed tables. Mr. Buchwald

acknowledged the narrow scope of the study and characterized it as a first step.

Chairman Johnson referenced the infrastructure surtax funding that would be distributed to the various jurisdictions represented at the meeting and suggested it be considered as a potential source of revenue for intersection improvements. He also asked if TPO funding might be available to the jurisdictions, and Mr. Buchwald explained the matter as being at the Board's discretion. Commissioner Mitchell inquired about potential funding from recent and upcoming federal legislation, and Mr. Buchwald reported that the TPO would be receiving a portion of \$2.4 million from the CARES Act and possibly some from the American Rescue Plan Act. He indicated that the TPO had several shovel-ready projects that would make suitable candidates for earmarks, commenting also on the possibility of receiving money toward implementing the electric vehicle charging station plan included in the UPWP.

11. FDOT Comments – None.

12. Recommendations/Comments by Members – Commissioner Townsend suggested that traffic lights on US-1 be better synchronized in the vicinity of Orange Avenue.

Mr. Kelly reported a phone call from a citizen concerned about electric bicycle use on Woodstork Trail in eastern Port St. Lucie adjacent to St. Lucie Medical Center. Mr. Buchwald explained that the State was currently evaluating how to legally categorize such bicycles and considering the appropriate legislation to incorporate them.

13. TPO Staff Comments – Mr. Buchwald reported on the recent Federal Quadrennial Certification Review virtual visit, noting that several special guests had testified on behalf of the TPO. He also remarked on the complimentary nature of the Federal officials' comments.

Mr. Buchwald announced that he and Commissioner Dzadoovsky had toured the Florida Power and Light Solar Energy Center the previous week, which was located near the site of the future Northern Connector. He also announced that he and Councilwoman Morgan would be attending the next MPO Advisory Council Meeting at the end of April.

14. Next Meeting: The next St. Lucie TPO Board Meeting is a regular meeting scheduled for 2:00 pm on Wednesday, June 2, 2021.

15. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved by:

Rachel Harrison
Recording Specialist

Commissioner Jeremiah Johnson
Chairman



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 8a

Item Title: Appointment to the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Item Origination: St. Lucie TPO By-Laws, Rules, and Procedures

UPWP Reference: Task 6.1: Public Involvement

Requested Action: Appoint or do not appoint

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended that Ms. Monica Yeschek be appointed as a Resident Bicycling Representative to the BPAC to fill a vacancy.

Attachments

- Application

APPLICATION FOR SERVING ON COMMITTEES/BOARD

1. Name Monica Yeschek
 2. Home or Mobile Phone [REDACTED] 3. Email Address monica.yeschek@gmail.com
 4. Home Address 3411 S Indian River Dr. Fort Pierce FL 34982
 5. How long have you lived at this location? 1.5 years
 6. Business Address (optional) Same as above
 7. Business Phone (optional) Same as above
 8. Are you employed by a government agency? Yes _____ No X
 9. Do you now serve on a government committee or board? Yes _____ No X
 10. If Yes, which one(s)? _____
 11. Brief summary of your education BSA Business from UCF , licensed realtor 22 years, various corporate educational trainings and certifications completed for best practice as it relates to growth strategies.
 12. Brief summary of your experience Corporate business to business sales in data analytics managing territories in Southern United States. Then transitioned to actively working in residential real estate for past decade.
 13. Please select each St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Board or Committee you are interested in serving on (more than one may be selected):
Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (LCB) _____
Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) _____
Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) X
 14. May your application be submitted to the TPO Board whenever vacancies occur on the selected Board/Committee(s) until you are appointed? Yes X No _____
 15. Will you be able to attend quarterly LCB meetings, CAC meetings every other month, or BPAC meetings every other month? Yes X No _____
- SIGNATURE Date 5/24/2021

Submit completed application by mail, fax, or email to:
 MAIL: St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization
 466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Suite 111
 Port St. Lucie, FL 34953
 FAX: 772-785-5839
 EMAIL: TPOAdmin@stlucieco.org

Note: Application is effective for two years from the date of completion

TITLE VI STATEMENT: The St. Lucie TPO satisfies the requirements of various nondiscrimination laws and regulations including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Public participation is welcomed without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, income, or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns about nondiscrimination should contact Marceia Lathou, the Title VI/ADA Coordinator of the St. Lucie TPO, at 772-462-1593 or via email at lathoum@stlucieco.org.

Crèole: Si ou ta rinmin recevoua information sa en crèole si l bous plait rèlè 772-462-1777.

Español: Si usted desea recibir esta informacìon en español, por favor llame al 772-462-1777.



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 8b

Item Title: Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Planning Grant Application

Item Origination: Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

UPWP Reference: Task 3.8–Transportation Disadvantaged Program

Requested Action: Adopt or do not adopt

Staff Recommendation: Because the TD Grant facilitates the implementation of the TD program in the TPO area, it is recommended that the Board adopt Resolution No. 21-01 to authorize the TPO Executive Director to apply for a FY 2021/22 TD Planning Grant and to execute an agreement for the Grant.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Excerpt from UPWP
- Resolution No. 21-01



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

FROM: Marceia Lathou
Transit Program Manager

DATE: May 21, 2021

SUBJECT: Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Planning Grant Application

BACKGROUND

The Florida Legislature created Florida's Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program in 1979 to foster the coordination of transportation services for the State's TD population. The TD population consists of individuals whose physical or mental disability, income status, or age make them unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation. The TD Program is administered at the State level by the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (FCTD) and at the local level by the St. Lucie County Community Services Department under the oversight of the Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB).

The St. Lucie TPO provides planning-related staff support and resources to the County and the LCB to assist in the identification of and response to public transportation needs in the St. Lucie service area. The TD Program and the support and resources provided by the TPO for the TD Program are further described in the attached excerpt from the TPO's FY 2020/21 – FY 2021/22 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

ANALYSIS

Attached is St. Lucie TPO Resolution No. 21-01 which authorizes the application for and the execution by the TPO Executive Director of a

TD planning grant agreement for FY 2021/22. The TPO Attorney has reviewed and approved the resolution for form and correctness.

The allocation for the TD grant is in the amount of \$26,657 and is 100-percent State funded. The grant funds are used to perform planning-related work tasks for the TD program as per Florida Statutes and as described in the UPWP excerpt.

RECOMMENDATION

Because the TD Grant facilitates the implementation of the TD program in the TPO area, it is recommended that the Board adopt Resolution No. 21-01 to authorize the TPO Executive Director to apply for a FY 2021/22 TD Planning Grant and to execute an agreement for the Grant.

Task 3.8 Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program		
Purpose:		
To provide coordination and planning services for the St. Lucie County TD Program in accordance with Chapter 427 FS, Rule 41-2 FAC, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which includes the identification of unmet TD needs.		
Previous Work:		
<p>The TPO Board re-designated the St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners as the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) for St. Lucie County. TPO Staff assisted the CTC in its role of providing safe, coordinated TD services to elderly persons, persons with disabilities, veterans, and economically disadvantaged citizens. TPO staff assisted the CTC in the development of a Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan/Coordinated Plan. Staff assisted in finding alternatives to accommodate unmet local needs.</p> <p>TPO staff provided administrative services to the LCB. This included preparation of meeting summaries, agendas, grant applications, progress reports, and other products. Staff also assessed legislatively mandated changes to the state TD program and undertook TD-related activities as necessary to comply with state legislation. The TD program is coordinated with other public transit planning and services, including veteran services, through the LCB and associated work products. TPO staff coordinated with FDOT, the County, and the transit operator and provided technical assistance for the transitioning of non-life sustaining trips from the current demand response program services to fixed or deviated route services.</p> <p>The TD Program continued to incorporate Environmental Justice into its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, the effects of programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. The TPO continued to strive to involve the potentially affected public and to develop partnerships with and enhance the participation by traditionally underserved communities.</p>		
Major Activities (performed continuously unless otherwise noted):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCB Meeting Support • LCB Planning Support • CTC Technical Assistance • TDSP Annual Updates • CTC Evaluations • TD Gant Applications • TD Invoice and Progress Reports 		
End Product:	Completion Date:	Responsible Agencies: St. Lucie TPO Participating Agencies: FDOT, St. Lucie County
TDSP Annual Update	June 2021	
TDSP Annual Update	June 2022	
2021 CTC Evaluation	June 2021	
2022 CTC Evaluation	June 2022	

Task 3.8 Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program Estimated Budget Detail for FY 2020/2021								
Budget Category	Budget Category Description	FHWA (PL)	FCTD	STBG	FTA	FTA STATE MATCH	FTA LOCAL MATCH	Total
A. Personnel Services:								
	TPO Staff Salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions	\$0	\$19,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,730
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$19,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,730
B. Consultant Services:								
	Contract/Consultant Services	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
C. Travel:								
	Travel Expenses	\$0	\$800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800
D. Direct Expenses:								
	Advertising	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200
	General & Administrative Charges	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
	Training & Seminar	\$0	\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250
	Postage	\$0	\$20	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$2,470	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,470
	Total:	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000

Task 3.8 Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program Estimated Budget Detail for FY 2021/2022								
Budget Category	Budget Category Description	FHWA (PL)	FCTD	STBG	FTA	FTA STATE MATCH	FTA LOCAL MATCH	Total
A. Personnel Services:								
	TPO Staff Salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions	\$0	\$19,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,730
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$19,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,730
B. Consultant Services:								
	Contract/Consultant Services	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
C. Travel:								
	Travel Expenses	\$0	\$800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800
D. Other Direct Expenses:								
	Advertising	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200
	General & Administrative Charges	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
	Training & Seminar	\$0	\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250
	Postage	\$0	\$20	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20
	Subtotal:	\$0	\$2,470	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,470
	Total:	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

RESOLUTION NO. 21-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF THE ST. LUCIE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TPO) AUTHORIZING THE APPLICATION FOR TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED (TD) GRANT FUNDS AND EXECUTION OF A TD GRANT AGREEMENT WITH THE FLORIDA COMMISSION FOR THE TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021/22.

WHEREAS, the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Governing Board hereinafter "BOARD" is eligible to apply for and receive Transportation Disadvantaged grant funds and to undertake a transportation disadvantaged service program as authorized by Section 427.0159, Florida Statutes, and Rule 41-2, Florida Administrative Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD THAT:

1. The BOARD has the authority to apply for TD funds and to execute a TD grant agreement for Fiscal Year 2021/22.
2. The BOARD authorizes the TPO Executive Director to apply for TD grant funds and execute a TD grant agreement on behalf of the BOARD with the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged.
3. The BOARD's Registered Agent in Florida is the TPO Executive Director. The Registered Agent's address is 466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Suite 111, Port St. Lucie, Florida, 34953.
4. The BOARD authorizes the TPO Executive Director to sign any and all agreements or contracts which are required in connection with the TD grant funds.
5. The BOARD authorizes the TPO Executive Director to sign any and all assurances, reimbursement invoices, warranties, certifications and any other documents which may be required in connection with the application, agreement or subsequent agreements.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED this 2nd day of June, 2021.

ST. LUCIE TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TPO)

Jeremiah Johnson, TPO Chairman

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
CORRECTNESS:

Kyle Bowman
Operations Administrator

Heather Young
St. Lucie TPO/Asst. County Attorney



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 9a

Item Title: Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Performance Targets

Item Origination: Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Federal Requirements

UPWP Reference: Task 3.2 – Transit Planning

Requested Action: Adopt the proposed Targets, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the establishment of transit safety targets for incorporation into the TPO's metropolitan planning process is necessary to evaluate safety performance and to meet Federal requirements, it is recommended that the proposed PTASP performance targets be adopted.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- St. Lucie County PTASP Excerpt



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, FL 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

FROM: Marceia Lathou
Transit Program Manager

DATE: May 25, 2021

SUBJECT: Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)
Performance Targets

BACKGROUND

The Federal PTASP regulation seeks to improve public transportation safety by guiding transit agencies to more effectively and proactively manage safety risks in their systems. The PTASP rule applies to providers of public transportation that are recipients and sub-recipients of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 funding and that fall under the safety jurisdiction of the FTA. Transit providers must establish safety performance targets to address the safety performance measures identified in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP). As described in the NSP, transit providers establish safety performance targets in four categories: fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability.

The PTASP rule requires the transit agency that drafted the safety plan to make its safety performance targets available to States and MPOs to aid in the planning process and to coordinate with the States and MPOs in the selection of State and MPO safety performance targets. MPOs must then integrate transit agency performance targets and performance plans into their planning documents, including the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), by certain dates set in the FTA and Federal Highway Administration planning rules. States, MPOs and transit agencies should coordinate with each other throughout this planning process.

St. Lucie County's Community Services Transit Division prepared a PTASP which was transmitted to the St. Lucie TPO on December 14, 2020. Three performance targets for the fixed-route bus system were identified in the County's PTASP for Fiscal Year 2021: fatalities, injuries, and safety events. The County updated its PTASP and transmitted the revised PTASP to the TPO on April 23, 2021. Four performance targets were identified: fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability.

ANALYSIS

The following FY 2021 PTASP performance targets were submitted by St. Lucie County:

FY 2021 PTASP Performance Targets Set by St. Lucie County

Fatalities	0/100,000 Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM)
Injuries	0.17/100,000 VRM or 1
Safety Events	0.34/100,000 VRM or 2
System Reliability	25,732 miles between mechanical failures

Based on the PTASP targets submitted by St. Lucie County, the following PTASP targets are proposed to be adopted by the St. Lucie TPO for Fiscal Year 2021.

FY 2021 PTASP Performance Targets Proposed by the St. Lucie TPO

Fatalities	0/100,000 Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM)
Injuries	0.17/100,000 VRM or 1
Safety Events	0.34/100,000 VRM or 2
System Reliability	25,732 miles between mechanical failures

At their meetings during the week of May 17th, the TPO Advisory Committees reviewed the FY 2021 PTASP Performance Targets and recommended them for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the establishment of transit safety targets for incorporation into the TPO's metropolitan planning process is necessary to evaluate safety performance and to meet Federal requirements, it is recommended that the proposed PTASP performance targets be adopted.

CAO.12.788

**Public Transportation Agency
Safety Plan**

**Treasure Coast Connector
St Lucie County Public
Transportation**



October 2020

Section 3. Safety Performance Targets

The following Performance Targets are aligned with the National Public Transportation Safety Plan supporting the four measures: Fatalities, Injuries, Safety Events & System Reliability.

1. **Fatalities** (total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total vehicle revenue miles) - A death or suicide confirmed within 30 days of a reported event. It does not include deaths in or on transit property resulting from illness or other natural causes. Reported in National Transit Database (NTD) data sheet S&S-40

2. **Injuries** (total number of reportable injuries and rate per total vehicle revenue miles) – Injury is defined as any damage or harm to persons because of an event that requires immediate medical attention away from the scene. Reported in National Transit Database (NTD) data sheet S&S-40 for major event and SS-50 for non-major event

3. **Safety Events** (total number of reportable events and rate per total vehicle revenue miles) - Safety Event is defined as a collision, derailment, fire, hazardous material spill, an act of nature (Act of God), evacuation, or OSONOC occurring on transit right-of-way, in a transit revenue facility, in a transit maintenance facility, or involving a transit revenue vehicle and meeting established National Transit Database (NTD) thresholds. Reported in National Transit Database (NTD) data sheet S&S-40 for major event and SS-50 for non-major event

4. **System Reliability/Major Mechanical Failure** (mean distance between *major mechanical failures* by mode) - Major mechanical failure is defined as a failure of some mechanical element of the revenue vehicle that prevents the vehicle from completing a scheduled revenue trip or from starting the next scheduled revenue trip because actual movement is limited or because of safety concerns. Reported in National Transit Database (NTD) data sheet S-20

Safety Performance Targets <i>Treasure Coast Connector has developed Safety Performance Targets in compliance with the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP) – §673.11(a)(3) requirements.</i>									
Mode of Transit Service	Vehicle Revenue Mile (VRM)	Fatalities Total	Fatalities (Per 100k VRM)	Injuries (Total)	Injuries (Per 100k VRM)	Safety Events (Total)	Safety Events (Per 100k VRM)	System Reliability (VRM/ failures)	
FY21 FR	588,648	0	0	1	.17	2	.34	25,732	
FY21 DR	541,728	0	0	1	.18	2	.37	22,716	
TOTAL	1,130,376	0	0	2	.18	4	.35		

Vehicle revenue miles (VRM) for FY21 are projected 541,728 miles for Para-Transit and 588,648 miles for Fixed Route, totaling 1,130,376 VRM. Performance targets for FY21 are as follows: The total fatalities are projected to be zero for FY21. The total reportable injuries combined are to be a goal of <.18/100k VRM, the total number of Safety Events combined are to be a goal of <.35/100k VRM, and System Reliability will for fixed route 25,732 miles between mechanical failure and for Para-Transit 22,716 miles between mechanical failure.

Safety Performance Target Coordination

Describe the coordination with the State and Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) in the selection of State and TPO safety performance targets.

Treasure Coast Connector shares safety performance targets with the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) annually as part of our continued coordination of transit data. Treasure Coast Connector also coordinates with these agencies to the maximum extent possible in the selection of safety performance targets as required under §673.15(a) and §673.15(b), respectively. This data also includes the Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM) updates and anticipated capital replacement schedules.

Targets Transmitted to the State	State Entity Name	Date Targets Transmitted
	Florida Department of Transportation	(date)
Targets Transmitted to the Transportation Planning Organization	Transportation Planning Organization Name	Date Targets Transmitted
	St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (St Lucie TPO)	(date)



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 9b

Item Title: Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report

Item Origination: Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

UPWP Reference: Task 3.2 – Transit Planning

Requested Action: Accept the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report, accept with conditions, or do not accept.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report evaluates the existing bus service, the public's preferences for future bus service improvements, and other relevant factors, it is recommended that the Draft Choices Report be accepted.

Attachments

- TPO Staff Report
- Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

FROM: Marceia Lathou
Transit Program Manager

DATE: May 25, 2021

SUBJECT: Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report

BACKGROUND

One of the planning/policy recommendations identified in *Bus Plus*, the *St. Lucie County Transit Development Plan 2020-2029* (TDP), is the completion of a Comprehensive Operations Analysis. To implement this recommendation, Task 3.2 of the *FY 2020/21 – FY 2021/22 Unified Planning Work Program* (UPWP) includes a Transit Route Optimization Study to be completed with consultant assistance. The purpose of the Study is to analyze the potential to improve customer service and grow ridership on existing bus routes and new routes as identified in the TDP.

ANALYSIS

The Transit Route Optimization Study will evaluate the existing bus services provided by St. Lucie County's transit system and identify financially sustainable opportunities to optimize service, improve service quality, and meet the demands of the County's growing population.

The Transit Route Optimization Study is being completed in two phases. Phase I is being funded and managed by the TPO. This phase analyzes the bus network and has resulted in the attached Draft Choices Report of existing conditions and key insights. Phase I highlights the difficult value judgments that must be made in order to redesign a bus route network. When finalized,

the Choices Report will assist stakeholders in developing a shared understanding of opportunities and challenges, which will make it easier to collaborate on solutions. Phase I of the Transit Route Optimization Study is being conducted by Marlin Engineering with Jarrett Walker + Associates as sub-consultant.

Phase II of the Transit Route Optimization Study will be funded and managed by St. Lucie County. During Phase II, a design workshop and other public involvement tools will be used to develop two network alternatives. The purpose of the alternatives is to present and analyze two contrasting visions of the bus network that illustrate the difficult trade-offs that decision-makers face. Both network alternatives would be operable within available resources.

A survey for Phase I was developed, the primary purpose of which was to determine preferences for a bus system with more routes or a system with faster service. Approximately two-thirds of all of the respondents indicated that more bus routes were more important.

The following is a summary of the Phase I public participation efforts:

- In-person surveys conducted at three branch libraries
- Email blast announcing the survey to the TPO's email subscriber list
- In-person surveys conducted at bus terminals
- Online surveys available at websites and social media
- A presentation to the CareerSource Research Coast Board of Directors
- A presentation to the Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB)
- A presentation to the Council of Social Agencies (COSA)

Approximately 260 online surveys were collected. The following is a summary of selected results:

- Non bus riders 47%
- Which is most important to you?
 - More bus routes 75%
 - Faster bus service 25%
- Age 65+ 26%

Approximately 65 surveys at libraries were collected. The following is a summary of selected results:

- Non bus riders 80%
- Which is most important to you?
 - More bus routes 49%
 - Faster bus service 51%
- Age 65+ 40%

Approximately 75 surveys at bus terminals were collected. The following is a summary of selected results:

- Non bus riders 0%
- Which is most important to you?
 - More bus routes 56%
 - Faster bus service 44%
- Age 65+ 13%

Taking the above preferences into consideration and other factors, the key findings of the Draft Choices Report are:

- St. Lucie County's current bus network spends about 40% of its resources on ridership and about 60% on coverage.
- When a transit agency can concentrate its service into fewer lines, that means longer walks for some people, but it also means higher frequency and therefore more ridership potential.
- Demand-Response service is a coverage solution that can be provided to places that get very little ridership.
- If St. Lucie County would like to pursue higher ridership, it can consider investing in expanded weekend service.
- In the long term, investments in more early-morning and night service, and expanded weekend service, would also be part of a higher-ridership strategy.

At their meetings during the week of May 17th, the TPO Advisory Committees recommended that the TPO Board accept the Draft Choices Report with the BPAC's recommendation conditioned on the Study's Phase II analysis considering the renaming of the bus routes to be more user-friendly and factoring in a dual approach and variable balance of ridership versus coverage corresponding to the variations in land-use patterns between Port St. Lucie and Fort Pierce.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report evaluates the existing bus service, the public's preferences for future bus service improvements, and other relevant factors, it is recommended that the Draft Choices Report be accepted.

TRANSIT ROUTE OPTIMIZATION STUDY ST. LUCIE COUNTY

Choices Report

May 2021



Table of Contents

- 1. Study Overview 3**
 - What is the Transit Route Optimization Study? 4
 - What contributes to high transit ridership? 5
 - Indicators of high ridership potential 6
 - Density 6
 - Walkability. 7
 - Linearity 8
 - Proximity. 9
 - Conflicting goals. 10
 - Demand-response service 14
 - Limitations. 15
 - Public Engagement. 16
 - Funding. 17
- 2. Market and Needs 18**
 - Market and needs assessment 19
 - Residential density 20
 - Job density 21
 - Activity density 22
 - Low-income density 23
 - Zero-Vehicle Households 24

- Senior density 25
- Civil Rights Assessment: Minority Residents. 26
- 3. The Existing Transit Network 27**
 - Where and when is service available? 28
 - When does service run? 29
 - Where are people riding transit?. 30
 - Productivity. 31
 - Deviations and one-way loops 32
 - Travel time example 33
 - Pulsing. 34
 - Network Challenges 35
 - Peer Comparison 36
- 4. Key Choices 39**
 - Ridership vs coverage 40
 - Walking vs waiting. 41
 - Providing coverage with demand-response 42
 - All-day, all-week service 43
- Appendix 44**
 - Route Atlas 45
 - Funding Sources 53

1. Study Overview

What is the Transit Route Optimization Study?

One of the planning and policy recommendations identified in "Bus Plus", the St. Lucie County Transit Development Plan 2020-2029, is the completion of a Comprehensive Operations Analysis which led to the Transit Route Optimization Study.

This study will culminate in transit network alternatives for St. Lucie County. The process of creating those alternatives involves both technical analysis and clear thinking about the County's values and goals for transit.

This report is the first step to update the St. Lucie County bus network. This document assesses the existing conditions and lays out key choices that arise for transit in St. Lucie County.

Do buses need to be full for transit to be "successful"? That depends on transit's purpose in the community.



What contributes to high transit ridership?

When we say ridership, we refer to the number of people getting on the bus. Most transit agencies consider high ridership an important goal. **IF** St. Lucie County wished to pursue high ridership, they would make decisions about what type of service to offer, when, and where.

Many factors outside of St. Lucie County's control can affect ridership, such as gas prices and the economy. Land-use and street design decisions made in the County also have an impact on ridership.


High transit ridership tends to arise on frequent, all-day and all-week service, in the places where street design and land use are conducive to transit.

Frequency

Frequent service means the bus is always coming soon, so people don't have to wait a long time. Better frequency is associated with high ridership. A bus that is coming every 30 minutes will be more useful to more people than a bus that is coming every 60 minutes, so more people will ride.

This is especially true when people are traveling short distances. Poor frequencies mean long waits, and waiting time can be much longer than riding time! An hourly bus route requires a rider to plan their life around the bus schedule.

Frequency and waiting time don't just happen at the beginning of a trip, they also happen at the end. If you have to be at a medical appointment at a certain time, a 60 minute frequency may force you to choose between being 40 minutes early or 20 minutes late. In addition, missing an infrequent bus can mean an extremely long wait, as shown in the graphic below.



With infrequent routes, missing a bus means an extremely long wait for the next one.

Indicators of high ridership potential

When looking at the geography, development and population of a County, a few factors have a big impact on ridership potential. They are Density, Walkability, Linearity, and Proximity.

Density

A place with many residents, employees, shoppers, students, and customers has high density.

The graphic on the right shows two identical bus routes. The route on the top is traveling in an area that has twice as many houses as the route on the bottom. All else being equal, places in St. Lucie County that have higher density are likely to get higher transit ridership than places that are less dense, regardless of who lives there.

How many people, jobs, and activities are near each potential transit stop?



+ Many people and jobs are within walking distance of transit.



- Fewer people and jobs are within walking distance of transit.

Indicators of high ridership potential


Walkability

To use transit, people need to be able to walk to the bus stop. The street design around a bus stop determines if people can reach the bus stop by walking.


The graphic on the right shows two bus stops with a 1/4 mile circle around each. The gray lines are streets and the shaded lines are streets within 1/4 mile of the bus stop. The street network in the top example is a simple grid that allows many people to walk easily to the bus stop. The bottom example shows a disconnected street network where fewer places are within a 1/4 mile walk of the bus stop. Even though many people may live near this bus stop, some people have to walk a long distance to get there.

It is also important that people are able to cross the street to reach the bus stop. If a road is too dangerous to cross, people won't be able to ride transit in both directions. When they are dropped off on the opposite side of the street, they will be stuck.


Is it possible to walk between the stop and the activities around it?

+


The dot at the center of these circles is a transit stop, while the circle is a 1/4 mile radius.

-


The whole area is within 1/4 mile, but only the black-shaded streets are within a 1/4 mile walk.



+ It must also be safe to cross the street at a stop. You usually need the stops on both sides for two-way travel!

For example, along U.S. 1, there are many places where traffic signals with crosswalks are a mile or more apart. So bus stops in between these places put riders in unsafe situations, limiting access to opportunities.

St. Lucie County has walkable places with a well-connected street network like downtown Fort Pierce and places that are less walkable. It is easier for transit to attract ridership from walkable places, because people there can easily get to the bus.

Indicators of high ridership potential


Linearity

The location of key destinations can determine how convenient transit is for many riders.

The graphic on the right shows four destinations aligned in different ways. In the town on the top, all destinations are located along the main road. Transit can serve all destinations with a straight line. People riding from one end to the other will find this service useful because they are always traveling towards their destination.

The town on the bottom has the same four destinations located far from the main road. To serve these places, a bus needs to drive away from the main road, get to the front door, and then drive back to the main road. If this is your destination, this is great for you. But if you are traveling between any other two points, you are traveling out of the way before getting where you want to go.

This can also happen if a road is too dangerous for people to walk across. For safety, a bus might have to deviate from the main road.



For example, Route 6 on St. Lucie West Boulevard deviates off of St. Lucie West Boulevard into shopping centers, to Indian River State College, and other destinations that are just too far off the main road to be walkable from the direct and linear path along the main road.

Also, the route on the bottom example is much longer. For transit, this means that it is more expensive. Since St. Lucie County has a fixed budget for transit, having long or circuitous routes like this one means that the County can't provide as much frequency, and people will have to wait longer for the bus.


Indicators of high ridership potential

Proximity

In transit, distance is a major contributor to the cost of service. Connecting places that are far away is more expensive than places that are close to each other. Within a fixed budget, a more expensive route means that a bus can't come as frequently, so people have to wait longer. If waits are longer, fewer people are likely to find the service useful.

For example, new development on the western fringes of Port St. Lucie, like Tradition, are far away from the other major activity centers in the County. These new developments extend the distance the bus system must cover if the County wants to reach everyone. It also stretches the distance, and time, that people must travel to reach the new job centers, medical centers, and other services that may have moved to these new developments.

Does transit have to traverse long gaps?




Conflicting goals

Throughout this report and this planning process we will use the word "IF" regularly to emphasize that different choices have different outcomes because different goals for transit lead us in different directions.

Imagine you are the transit planner for this fictional neighborhood. On the map to the right, the lines are roads and the dots are people and jobs. Places with more dots close together are places that more people want to travel to and from.


The buses in the picture are the resources the neighborhood has to run transit. Before you can plan transit routes, you must first decide: what is the purpose of your transit system?



Conflicting goals

If the goal is ridership...

...then all eight buses are focused on the busiest areas. Waits for service are short. Ridership is high because direct, frequent service is available in the places with the greatest travel demand, but some places have no service.



Conflicting goals

If the goal is coverage...

...then the eight buses are spread around so that each street has a route. Everyone lives near a stop, but every route is infrequent, so waits for service are long. Routes are looping and circuitous, so people spend a lot of time on the bus even when going a short distance. Fewer people can bear to wait or ride for so long, so ridership is low.

People with relatively few transportation options will ride but even low-income people will try to find other options when transit service is so infrequent and comparatively less useful. Therefore, coverage-oriented service will often discourage low-income residents and residents without vehicles from riding transit.



Conflicting goals

There are two basic sets of goals that transit can serve:

Ridership Goal

If a transit agency wanted to pursue **high ridership**, then it would put most routes in places that are dense, linear and walkable, as described by the indicators of high ridership on pages 6-9.

Density means that there are lots of people and activities near each bus stop, which means there are many potential riders for the service. If it is easy to walk in that area too, then many of those potential riders can actually get to the stop.

In a network designed for ridership, dense areas get very good service, with the next bus always coming soon. But when the agency focuses on making the high-ridership routes as useful as possible, it means it can't afford to run to a lot of other places.

Reasons to pursue a ridership goal include:

- Getting more riders
- Reduced vehicle trips
- Reduced emissions
- Less subsidy per ride

Coverage Goal

If the goal is **coverage**, the transit agency would spread its service out so that there's some service everywhere. But spreading it out means spreading it thin. Because there is such a huge area to serve with a fixed budget, none of the buses can come very often, which means that you have to plan your day around the timetable, which means that fewer people find them useful.

Some people who do use coverage services really need them, and will defend them. Other people may value having service available "just in case", even though they don't use it most of the time.

Reasons to pursue a coverage goal include:


- "Access for all."
- Service for people with severe needs for transit, no matter where they live.
- Service near every voter, taxpayer, neighborhood, etc.

Demand-response service


You may have heard about taxi-like services that pick you up when and where you request them, rather than running fixed routes. You may have heard about St. Lucie County running this type of service in Southwest Port St. Lucie. This type of service is often referred to as "micro-transit", "dial-a-ride", "On-Demand", or "Demand-Response".

The graphics below show how demand-response differs from fixed route transit. In fixed route transit, people walk to bus stops and buses arrive based on a predetermined schedule. Demand-response service can pick up riders where and when they request it.


Demand response service is convenient for riders because it doesn't ask them to walk to a bus stop, and it often lets them travel at the time they prefer. But these features don't come free.




Fixed Route



Fixed Route
with deviations



On-demand service
to a specific location



On-demand service
to anywhere


Limitations

Demand-response trips can be more expensive, sometimes vastly more expensive, to provide than fixed route trips. This is why transit agencies are careful and thoughtful about where they offer demand-response service and how they control its costs.

The cost of a fixed route is steady over time. It does not go up immediately when more people ride it. As a result, when more people ride, it becomes less expensive to provide each ride.

In contrast, the costs of demand-response service can rise quickly as more people request trips. There is a low ceiling on how many rides per hour a demand-response vehicle can serve before an additional vehicle and driver need to be deployed. Almost no demand-response services are able to average more than 5 boardings per vehicle, per hour. If you think about what the vehicle has to do – driving around to each person’s requested pick-up spot, then their requested drop-off spot, at the times they choose, not necessarily the most efficient times - then it’s clear why it would be so hard to do this very many times in an hour.

The scatterplot at right shows data for each route at a real mid-sized transit agency. Each dot is a route, and its height on the graph shows its average number of



boardings per hour, per vehicle. Demand-response (all the way to the right) handles many fewer rides per hour than even the lowest-ridership fixed routes. This difference in potential ridership per vehicle, when comparing fixed routes to demand-response, is quite typical, because of the basic math of how the two types of services work.

Public Engagement

TPO, St. Lucie County Transit, and South Florida Commuter Services staff developed a survey and facilitated public participation efforts which included an email blast to the TPO's subscriber list and presentations to the CareerSource Research Coast Board of Directors and the St. Lucie Economic Development Council. Outreach also included surveying, both online and in-person surveys at three branch libraries and at bus terminals.

The survey received over 400 responses. Of those, more than half (56 percent) were at least occasional riders and 38 percent ride at least once a week.

When asked what type of bus system they prefer, slightly more than half (51 percent) preferred a more coverage-oriented system - buses that took them to 50 places in an hour, rather than buses that took them 10 places every 20 minutes (49 percent). A third (66 percent) of respondents said that having more bus routes was more important than having faster bus service (33 percent).

Which type of bus system would you prefer?



Which is most important to you?



Demographics


Most respondents (70 percent) were between the ages of 18 and 64. More than a quarter (27 percent) of respondents were 65 years old or older.

A majority of respondents said they had not struggled to pay for food or housing in the last year but more than a quarter (29 percent) said they had struggled to pay for both food and housing.

Of respondents, 60 percent were White, 24 percent were Black/African American, 1 percent were Asian, 13 percent were "other" and 16 percent opted not to answer. In a separate question, 13 percent of respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino.

Funding

Transit is funded through various funding pots, all coming together to provide the service (operations) and the buses and shelters (capital) needed to run an effective system. These funds can come from federal, state and local sources, each with its own rules and regulations. A table was developed to provide a list of potential funding sources for St. Lucie County. The funding strategies table can be found in the Appendix.



2. Market and Needs

Market and needs assessment

This chapter presents maps that show basic demographic information in St. Lucie County.

Residents and Jobs

Density is one of the fundamental prerequisites for high transit ridership. The more people in the area around a bus stop, the more potential riders at that stop.

Residential density is important since most trips start or end at home, but employment density reveals places that are the destinations for many types of trips: not only commutes to work, but also trips to shopping, services and recreation.

Low-Income Residents

Transit is often asked to pay special attention to the needs of people in poverty, particularly when pursuing a coverage goal. People with limited incomes also have an added incentive to use transit, making them a potentially strong market for high ridership transit.

Senior Residents

Similar to people in poverty, seniors are another subset of the population transit is often expected to focus on, though seniors tend to be less segregated into certain neighborhoods and towns than are low income people.

Seniors also have extra incentives to use transit, because they are often unable or unwilling to drive

themselves places. Depending on where they are located, seniors can contribute to a strong market for high ridership transit.

Increasingly, seniors are also working past the traditional retirement age of 65 and need transportation to work just like younger residents.

Minority Residents

While information about people's income tells us something about their potential interest in or need for transit, information about minorities does not alone tell us how likely someone is to use transit.

However, avoiding placing disproportionate burdens on people of color, through transportation decisions, is essential to the transit planning process. Transit agencies are also required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to ensure that services they provide do not discriminate on the basis of race, color or national origin.


Equity-based transit goals are often articulated in terms of improving mobility or transit access for people of color, particularly in places where the existing development patterns and transportation network contribute to disparities in access to jobs and other opportunities.

Residential density

The places with high residential density in St. Lucie County are shown in darker shades.

The densest areas in the County are within Fort Pierce, particularly closer to downtown, and in the eastern parts of Port Saint Lucie. There are also higher-density communities on Hutchinson Island South and west of the Florida Turnpike, south of Midway Road.

Higher-density places in Fort Pierce are closer together and on more linear paths than in Port St. Lucie. This makes Fort Pierce's density easier to serve with efficient transit than Port St. Lucie's dispersed density.




Job density

Places that have high employment density are often places where people go to for many reasons, not just work. Retail, restaurants, schools, medical services, and other activity centers are often visited by customers, students, and patients.

This map shows a very high concentration of jobs in central Fort Pierce and along U.S. Route 1 northeast of Fort Pierce. These job-dense areas are closer together. This makes them easier to serve with efficient transit.

The main job centers in Port St. Lucie are more widely dispersed and harder to serve efficiently with transit. The densest concentration of jobs is east of U.S. 1. near the St. Lucie Medical Center. There is a moderate concentration of jobs just north of St Lucie West Boulevard and east of I-95 near the Indian River State College Pruitt Campus.




Activity density

If we combine residential density and job density, we get this map. Darker areas are denser and color indicates the land use. Yellow is jobs, blue is residents, and red is a combination of both.

Transit lines serving purely residential neighborhoods tend to be used in mostly one direction at a time—away from the residential neighborhood, towards jobs and services in the morning and vice-versa in the afternoon. In places that have a mix of residents and jobs, there is potential for two-way transit ridership throughout the day.


The highest mix of residential and commercial activity in the County is in central Fort Pierce and in the commercial area around the St. Lucie Medical Center.



Low-income density

In St. Lucie County, the density of residents living below the poverty line seems to follow residential density patterns. By comparing the map at right to the map of all residential density on page 20, we can see that places that have high residential density also tend to have high low-income density.


The highest concentrations of low-income residents are near central Fort Pierce, on Hutchinson Island South and in Port St. Lucie - along Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Airoso Boulevard and Crosstown Parkway. Most concentrations of low-income residents are near existing service today.



Zero-Vehicle Households


In St. Lucie County, the density of households without a vehicle closely mirror concentrations of low-income households on the previous page.

The highest concentrations of households without a vehicle are near central Fort Pierce, in northeastern Lakewood Park, in northern River Park, southeast of Glades Cut Off Road and in south Port St. Lucie.



Senior density


The density of seniors in St. Lucie County is quite similar to the density of all residents. However, there is a larger concentration in Port St. Lucie and in northeast Lakewood Park.



Civil Rights Assessment: Minority Residents

The map at the right shows where people of different races and ethnicities live in St. Lucie County. Each dot represents 50 residents. Where many dots are very close together, the overall density of residents is higher. Where dots of a single color predominate, people of a particular race or ethnicity make up most of that area's residents.

Information about people's income tells us something about their potential interest in or need for transit but information about ethnicity or race do not alone tell us how likely someone is to use transit. However, avoiding placing disproportionate burdens on minority residents, through transportation decisions, is essential to the transit planning process. It is also important to understand where large numbers of people of color live, so that public outreach during this project can be sensitive to language and cultural barriers.




3. The Existing Transit Network

Where and when is service available?

Transit service in St. Lucie County includes eight routes. All routes except Route 1 have a frequency of 60 minutes.

The network includes many one-way loops and deviations. With these loops and deviations, St. Lucie County's service covers many parts of the County, but it not providing much service on each route. Many people have service every 60 minutes but in one direction only. If they want to go the other direction, they have to ride the route all the way around.

Transit service in the adjoining counties of Martin and Indian River are shown on this map and discussed further on page 35.



When does service run?

Service is provided on most routes Monday through Friday from 6:00am to 7:00pm and from 8:00am to 3:30pm Saturdays. Route #7 starts running an hour later and stops running an hour earlier than Routes #1-6. Route #8 is run as a peak express and stops running during the middle of the day.

This means that if a person needs to travel on these routes outside of the times when they run, they will not find service useful and need to use another mode or forgo their trip.

Weekday service ends at 8pm, Saturday service ends at 4pm, and no service is provided on Sundays. This pattern severely limits the potential for residents to rely on transit to reach retail and service sector jobs. For example, many retail businesses are busiest on Saturday and Sunday. Many restaurants are open late and all weekend. Most retail and restaurant workers have limited control over their schedules. They would have to own a car (or get rides from friends, or pay for taxis) because they couldn't rely on transit to get them to work when they needed it.

EXISTING NETWORK Route Frequencies and Spans of Service

ROUTES	WEEKDAYS	SATURDAYS
1 - Treasure Coast Mall / Fort Pierce Intermodal	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
2 - Fort Pierce Intermodal / Taylor Creek Commons	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
3 - Fort Pierce Intermodal / Okeechobee Rd	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
4 - PSL Community Center / Lennard Rd	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
5 - Gatlin / PSL Community Center	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
6 - First Data Field / PSL Community Center	6am - 8pm	8-noon, 1-4pm
7 - Intergenerational Rec Center / Fort Pierce Intermodal	7am - 6pm	No service
8 - PSL Community Center / Fort Pierce Intermodal	7-11am, 3-7pm	No service

Notes:

1. Route 1 usually runs every 30 minutes but is running every 60 minutes during the Covid-19 pandemic.
2. Routes that run on Saturdays do not operate between noon and 1pm for 1-hour driver breaks.


The bus comes every...

■ 30 minutes ■ 60 minutes

Where are people riding transit?

This map shows the average number of people getting on buses daily in December 2020. Larger dots indicate more people using that bus stop. While overall ridership in December 2020 was lower due to the COVID-19 pandemic, looking at this data allows us to compare different routes and different bus stops to one another.

There are many people using transit along U.S. 1 and in the higher-density areas around Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie. There is very little ridership along Route 8 between River Park and Fort Pierce.



Productivity

When we assess ridership, it is important to actually measure *productivity*.


Productivity is ridership relative to the amount of service provided.

$$\text{Productivity} = \frac{\text{Ridership}}{\text{Cost}} = \frac{\text{Boardings}}{\text{Service Hour}}$$

Routes 1 and 3 have the highest productivity at over 15 boardings per service hour. More productive routes have a lower operating cost per boarding. These routes are productive because they serve more dense, linear corridors.

Route	Weekday Productivity (boardings per service hour)	Saturday Productivity (boardings per service hour)	Weekday Cost per Boarding	Saturday Cost per Boarding
Route 1	17.5	17.2	\$5.96	\$6.09
Route 2	9.5	10.5	\$11.04	\$9.93
Route 3	26.7	14.3	\$3.93	\$7.32
Route 4	5.8	6.6	\$17.92	\$15.75
Route 5	4.6	5.3	\$22.68	\$19.66
Route 6	6.6	5.2	\$15.87	\$20.27
Route 7	8.8	n/a	\$11.93	n/a
Route 8	0.8	n/a	\$136.40	n/a
Microtransit	2.5	2.4	\$19.81	\$21.21

Weekday and SAT



1. This assumes that Route 1 was running at a 60-minute frequency in December

2. This productivity assumes that December had 22 operational weekdays

Route 8 has the lowest weekday productivity. Less productive routes have a higher operating cost per boarding. The 8 has low productivity because it doesn't follow the ridership recipe. It doesn't run frequently or serve many dense, walkable places that are close together along a linear corridor.

Deviations and one-way loops

Many routes in St. Lucie County deviate from the main road to reach the front door of certain destinations. This is partly due to unsafe conditions for pedestrians to cross the main road. This may be essential to get people to and from the destination. However, people riding through have to spend extra time as they are taken out of direction when they are trying to get somewhere.

This is part of the reason that linearity is one of the four geographic indicators of high ridership potential, as described on page 8.

Another factor that limits the usefulness of service and adds complexity to the network is the prevalence of one-way loops. In a one-way loop, the way you go from A to B is different from the way you go from B to A. For this reason, one-way loops are harder for new and infrequent riders to understand.

Direct




Circuitous



Deviating



One-Way Loop



Most critically, every round-trip someone makes using a one-way loop requires that they ride all the way around the whole loop. If your trip going there was short, then your trip coming back is going to be long. This is the very opposite of linear and direct service, and it makes some transit trips in St. Lucie County extremely time-consuming.



Travel time example

In St. Lucie County, Route 2 is one-way for nearly its entire distance. This affects the time it takes to travel in each direction differently.

Imagine that Susan lives in Sunland Gardens, near the corner of Avenue Q and 39th Street. She has a job interview 3 miles away, near the Fort Pierce Intermodal Facility. This would be a 3 mile, 1-hour walk, or a trip on Route 2. Her interview starts at 11:30am and her bus can get her there at 11:00am or 12:00 noon, so she has to get there 30 minutes early or be 30 minutes late.

She plans ahead and takes the bus at 10:09am. Her bus takes her away from her destination - west on Avenue Q and northwest on Angle. The bus then drives to the airport and back, then to Taylor Creek Commons before looping back and driving through residential neighborhoods towards the Fort Pierce Intermodal Facility. Including the time she has to wait for the interview to start, Susan's trip took 1 hour and 21 minutes. The top map on the right shows this trip.


Susan doesn't control when her interview will end, so if she is done at 12:30pm, she will have to wait 30 minutes for the next bus home. Luckily, the return trip is shorter. She boards the bus at 1:00pm and gets home at 1:09pm. Susan's trip back home took 39 minutes. The bottom map on the right shows this trip.



Pulsing

Connecting between routes—often called transferring—is an integral part of a transit network. If people cannot connect between routes, they can only travel in one dimension along a single route. If they can connect to other routes, they can reach more places throughout the County. Some pulsing is happening in St. Lucie County, such as at the Fort Pierce Intermodal Center, but some adjustments could make the pulse even more effective.

To better facilitate connections between routes St. Lucie County could schedule in a 5-minute window for riders to make a timed transfer. Currently, routes #1 #2, #3 and #8 meet at the Intermodal Center on the hour each hour. However, if one bus is delayed reaching the center, passengers on that bus will have to wait another hour for their connecting bus. Instead, several buses could meet at a location at 55 minutes past each hour and depart five minutes later. These five minutes allow passengers to connect between routes easily and prevent small delays from disrupting timed connections.



A pulse is an excellent way to create a network out of a set of low frequency routes, because it makes transfers less difficult and risky than they would be if they happened at random.

Pulses are critical to ensuring that low-frequency networks work but can be easily "broken" in two ways: if routes are asked to cover more distance or forced to move more slowly (worsening traffic delays), they may no longer be able to reliably arrive at the pulse location on-time. Pulses are worth protecting and agencies should create their schedules to accurately reflect travel times.

Network Challenges

Span

While most routes in St. Lucie County operate 14 hours a day on weekdays, all routes stop running by 4pm on Saturdays and no routes run on Sundays. This makes the bus network difficult to use for evening trips on Saturdays and impossible to use on Sundays.

Connectivity to Route 1

All the routes that serve the north half of the County meet at with a timed connection at the Fort Pierce Intermodal Center. In the southern half of the County, only Routes 4, 5, 6, and 8 meet in a timed connection at the Port Saint Lucie Intermodal Center. Route 1, one of the most productive and frequent routes in the County, only meets Routes 4 and 6 in Port Saint Lucie. This means that someone who wants to get from most places along U.S. 1 to Tradition must transfer twice, and one of those transfers will be untimed, and therefore likely a long wait.

Changing Route 1 to serve the Port Saint Lucie Intermodal Center might be possible, and would improve connectivity within the County, but it would mean losing the direct connection to Treasure Coast Square.

Intermodal Facility Location

The Fort Pierce Intermodal facility is located next to, rather than in, downtown Fort Pierce. This means that

anyone trying to reach the commercial center of Fort Pierce will have a long walk or need to transfer to the #1 or the #3. A location for timed transfers that was closer to central Fort Pierce would minimize walking for those whose origin or destination is central Fort Pierce.

Inter-County Connections

Martin County to the south and Indian River County to the north both operate bus routes that enter St. Lucie County. Currently, neither system has timed connections with St. Lucie County's system but inter-County coordination could create timed connections and shorten travel times for trips between counties.

Martin County operates a route along U.S. Route 1 every 35 minutes that runs alongside St. Lucie County's Route 1 past Treasure Coast Square and travels as far north as the Walmart. The 35 minutes frequency prevents a timed connection being possible with St. Lucie County's Route #1.

Only Indian River County's Route 15 enters St. Lucie County. St. Lucie County Route 7 goes into Indian River County to touch Routes 4,6,7, and 15 at the Intergenerational Recreation Center on Oslo Rd.

Peer Comparison - Investment


Overview

This peer analysis looked at transit investment, operations and ridership characteristics of 13 transit agencies with service area populations similar to St Lucie County. Peer agencies included Martin County (directly south of St Lucie County) and Indian River County (directly north of St Lucie County), four (4) other agencies in Florida and seven (7) in other regions.

Investment

Investment is the number of service hours an agency operates per capita (based on the population of the service area). Agencies with high levels of investment per capita tend to see both higher relevance (ridership per capita) and productivity (boardings per revenue hour), as discussed below, because more investment generally results in more useful transit service.

Both St Lucie County and Martin County provide 0.2 service hours per capita, while peer agencies provide an average of 0.7 service hours per capita. Neighboring Indian River County provides 0.5 service hours per capita.




Peer Comparison - Relevance

Relevance

Relevance is the amount of ridership per capita. It is the number of transit trips the average resident (of the service area) takes annually and is a way of measuring the role of transit in the area's transportation system. Transit relevance is generally higher in places with higher levels of transit investment.

Average ridership per capita is relatively low in St Lucie County (the average resident takes just 2.3 transit trips a year), compared to the peer average of 8.8 trips per year. Residents in neighboring Martin County take an average of just 0.7 trips per year but residents in Indian River County take an average of 8.3 transit trips a year.




Peer Comparison - Productivity

Productivity

Productivity is the number of boardings per revenue hour. St Lucie County has a slightly higher than average level of productivity (11.3 boardings per revenue hour) compared to peer agencies (which have an average productivity of 11.1 boardings per revenue hour). A key reason for this difference is that St. Lucie County is the only provider in this group to have zero-fare service, and research shows that zero-fare services tend to get higher levels of ridership and productivity.

Martin County has very low productivity (3.5 boardings per revenue hour) compared to peer cities while Indian River County has much higher than average productivity (18.1 boardings per revenue hour).



4. Key Choices


Ridership vs coverage

One of the most important, but difficult, decisions that have to be made is whether St. Lucie County wants to have a system designed for high ridership, high coverage, or something in between.

A simpler way to answer this question is: how much of the transit budget should be allocated to pursue high ridership? The remaining budget would be used to provide coverage in places where few people will ride, but those who do ride need the service badly.

The fictional neighborhood below shows what a transit network could look like if it were focused on maximizing ridership or maximizing coverage. These two networks are on opposite ends of a spectrum.

St. Lucie County's current network spends about 40% of its resources on ridership and about 60% on coverage. Should the County maintain the current balance between investing in high-ridership services and providing wide coverage?



?



?




?



Existing
Network



?





Maximum Ridership

Maximum Coverage

Walking vs waiting

Another way to think about the question of ridership and coverage is to think specifically about how far a person should have to walk to reach a bus stop, and how long they should have to wait, on average, before the next bus comes. Walking and waiting are important to consider on their own, because both of these activities add time and inconvenience to any transit trip, and different people have a wide variety of preferences regarding each.

For example, a young and fit person in a hurry might want to walk over a half-mile to a bus stop if the bus is always coming soon. An older or disabled person might prefer to have a bus stop much closer to their front door, even if it means they need to memorize the bus schedule or risk waiting a long time. When a transit agency can concentrate its service into fewer lines, that means longer walks for some people, but it also means higher frequency and therefore more ridership potential.




Providing coverage with demand-response

Demand-Response service is a coverage solution that can be provided to places that get very little ridership. However, the most we should expect each demand-response vehicle to handle, on average, is five trips per hour. This means that even a very low productivity fixed-route moving 6 passengers per hour probably could not be completely replaced with demand-response without either driving away some of the existing riders or using more vehicles.

However, it is possible to switch to demand-response in this situation, and use more vehicles, without spending more budget. This becomes possible only if the demand-response service is cheaper to operate.

For example, imagine that fixed-route service in an area handles an average of 6 passengers per hour. We replace it with demand-response service that can handle about 3 trips per vehicle, per hour, on average. If we want to serve all existing customers, then we would have to deploy about twice as many hours of demand-response vehicle time as we had of fixed-route vehicle time.

But perhaps the demand-response service can be operated at one-half the cost of the fixed-route service. If that's the case, then this could be a budget-neutral change. (As long as there aren't other capital costs like vehicles or technology that need to be covered.)



This kind of a change could cause some people concern because doubling the number of vehicles on the road, and possibly driving longer distances, to move the same number of people, contributes to congestion and emissions. However, there are also social benefits to providing this quality of coverage, because people's experiences riding demand-response transit can be so much better.

[Continued on next page]

[Continued from previous page]

There is another caution about demand-response, which is that as it grows in popularity, the agency may get stuck with increasing costs. In the example above, if twice as many vehicles can handle the old fixed routes' ridership, but more people *really like* the demand-response, perhaps now 9 people per hour request trips. Now the number of vehicle hours that needs to be provided actually triples.

Many transit providers have adapted their demand-response services to manage this demand, and protect themselves from growing costs. They can do this by charging a higher fare, or negotiating with people about when they make their trip (so that they can pair trips together), or requiring advanced reservations. There is a trade-off between low cost-per-rider to the transit agency and promising short wait times that customers would like. Successful demand-response programs set clear policies about this trade-off. If the County wants to guarantee short wait times, it is likely to see overall costs increase significantly. To minimize costs, the County may have to increase promised wait times.

There may be potential for replacing parts of St. Lucie County's transit network in certain parts of the County with demand-response. With further analysis, St. Lucie County will better understand if the costs and benefits make providing coverage in this way feasible.

All-day, all-week service

High ridership tends to arise from all-day, all-week service. Many people that work in service jobs have shifts that are not Monday to Friday, 9 to 5. They have shifts throughout the week at different times of the day. If a person has to be at work before or after transit service is provided, they are not likely to find transit useful. In addition, people who work or go to school during the week value having a chance to do their shopping or visiting by transit on weekends.

In the past decade transit ridership has decreased in most of the US. Yet in a few cities, total ridership has grown or at least held steady as the transit providers shifted resources to remain competitive. Quite a bit of the increase in ridership in these cities has been the result of shifting investments towards weekends.

If St. Lucie County would like to pursue higher ridership, they can consider investing in weekend service, likely starting with running buses for more hours on Saturdays. In the long term, investments in more early-morning and night service, and Sunday service, would also be part of a higher-ridership strategy.



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 9c

Item Title: Draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Item Origination: Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Federal and State requirements

UPWP Reference: Task 3.3 – TIP

Requested Action: Adopt the draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and as the draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the Draft Tentative Work Program that was endorsed by the TPO Board, it is recommended that the draft TIP be adopted.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

FROM: Yi Ding
Transportation Systems Manager

DATE: May 25, 2021

SUBJECT: Draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 Transportation
Improvement Program (TIP)

BACKGROUND

According to Federal and State requirements, the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) annually must develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The purpose of the TIP is to identify the transportation improvement projects located within the TPO area that have been prioritized and are receiving Federal and State funding over the next five years.

In addition, the TIP is used to coordinate projects among the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the local governments located within the TPO area. The TIP is developed by the TPO in cooperation with these agencies and the Treasure Coast International Airport, the Port of Fort Pierce, St. Lucie Community Transit, and the general public.

ANALYSIS

The development of the TIP is a year-long process that is continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive. For the TPO's FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP, the process started in June 2020 with a meeting with staffs from the St. Lucie TPO, FDOT District 4, and the local governments to informally discuss the TPO's Priority Projects. The List of Priority Projects (LOPP) then was developed,

reviewed by the TPO Advisory Committees and adopted by the TPO Board, and submitted to FDOT District 4 in September 2020.

The LOPP was utilized by FDOT District 4 to develop their Draft Tentative Work Program for FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26. The Draft Tentative Work Program was reviewed by the TPO Advisory Committees and endorsed by the TPO Board in January 2021.

The Final Tentative Work Program was received from FDOT in April 2021 and used to prepare the attached TIP through the web-based Interactive TIP on Community Remarks. The Final Tentative Work Program, which is a primary component of the draft TIP, was reviewed by TPO staff and appears to be consistent with the Draft Tentative Work Program that was reviewed by the TPO Advisory Committees and endorsed by the TPO Board.

The draft TIP includes the following multimodal highlights:

- The widening of Midway Road from Jenkins Road to Selvtiz Road is programmed for construction in FY 2025/26;
- The widening of Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Alcantarra Boulevard to Darwin Boulevard remains programmed for construction in FY 2021/22, and the widening of Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Paar Drive to Alcantarra Boulevard is programmed for construction starting in FY 2023/24;
- The Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study for the widening of Jenkins Road from Midway Road to Orange Avenue is fully programmed starting in FY 2024/25;
- The Historic Highwayman Trail Gap for the East Coast Greenway (ECG)/Florida Shared Use Network (SUN) Trail is programmed for construction in FY 2022/23;
- The Feasibility Study for the Port of Fort Pierce Overpass Connector for the ECG/SUN Trail is programmed in FY 2021/22;
- The Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) projects from the TPO's Congestion Management Process (CMP) which consist of the installation of fiber optic cable along Prima Vista Boulevard from Airoso Boulevard to Floresta Drive and Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Tulip Boulevard to Gatlin Boulevard and the installation of traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections are programmed for installation in FY 2025/26;

- Over \$700,000 of funding is programmed for a new sidewalk on Walton Road through the TPO's Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding from the 2020 grant cycle;
- The resurfacing of US-1 between the Martin County Line and Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Emerson Avenue between Indrio Road and 25th Street, Okeechobee Road between Ideal Holding Road and Rock Road, and Port St. Lucie Boulevard between Shelter Road and US-1 is programmed; and,
- The design of the widening of Florida's Turnpike from the Martin County Line to Becker Road is programmed for FY 2024/25.

It should be further noted that the total amount of funding in the draft TIP for the TPO area exceeds a total of \$372 million. In addition, the draft TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.

At their meetings during the week of May 10th, the TPO Advisory Committees recommended the adoption of the draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and as the draft FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the Draft Tentative Work Program that was endorsed by the TPO Board, it is recommended that the draft TIP be adopted.



**DRAFT TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/26**

Adopted on _____

_____ Chairman

Jeremiah Johnson

TIP CONTACT INFORMATION

466 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard
Port St. Lucie, FL 34953

Yi Ding, Program Manager
www.stlucietpo.org

phone: (772) 462-1593
fax: (772) 462-2549

ENDORSEMENT: The Transportation Improvement Program of the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization has been developed consistent with Federal regulations 23 U.S.C. 134(j) and 23 CFR 450 and Florida Statute 339.175(8) in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation and public transit operators.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: The preparation of this report has been funded in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), under the Metropolitan Planning Program of the U.S. Code (Title 23, Section 104f). The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the USDOT.

TITLE VI STATEMENT: The St. Lucie TPO satisfies the requirements of various nondiscrimination laws and regulations including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Public participation is welcome without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability, income, or family status. Persons wishing to express their concerns about nondiscrimination should contact Marceia Lathou, the Title VI/ADA Coordinator of the St. Lucie TPO, at 772-462-1593 or via email at lathoum@stlucieco.org.

KREYOL AYISYEN: Si ou ta renmen resevwa enfòmasyon sa a nan lang Kreyòl Aisyen, tanpri rele nimewo 772-462-1593.

ESPAÑOL: Si usted desea recibir esta información en español, por favor llame al 772-462-1593.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A. INTRODUCTION	
A.1 How to Use the TIP	A-1
A.2 Project Index and TIP/RLRTP Cross Reference	A-2
A.3 TIP Project Location Maps	A-4
A.4 Glossary of Abbreviations and Phase/Funding Source Codes	A-6
A.5 TPO Metropolitan Planning Area Map	A-7
B. NARRATIVE	
B.1 Purpose	B-1
B.2 Financial Plan	B-1
B.3 Project Selection	B-6
B.4 Consistency with Other Plans	B-6
B.5 Project Priority Statement	B-6
B.6 Public Involvement	B-7
B.7 TIP Amendments	B-7
B.8 Annual Listing of Obligated Federal Funding/Implemented Projects	B-8
B.9 Certifications	B-13
B.10 Congestion Management Process (CMP)	B-13
B.11 Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program	B-14
B.12 Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP)	B-15
C. DETAILED PROJECT LISTINGS	
C.1 Highway/Roadway/Sidewalk	C 1-1
C.2 Aviation	C 2-1
C.3 Transit Projects	C 3-1
C.4 Miscellaneous Projects	C 4-1
C.5 Planning Projects	C 5-1
C.6 Bridge	C 6-1
C.7 Turnpike Enterprise Projects	C 7-1
C.8 Seaport Projects	C 8-1
D. LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS	D-1
E. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	E-1
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Example Public Comment Notice	
Appendix B: Local Projects City of Fort Pierce	
Appendix C: Local Projects City of Port St. Lucie	
Appendix D: Local Projects: St. Lucie County	
Appendix E: Summary of Comments	
Appendix F: TIP Comparison Table	
Appendix G: TIP Amendment Forms	

A. INTRODUCTION

A.1 HOW TO USE THE TIP

The intent of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is to identify and prioritize the transportation improvement projects over the next five years that are receiving State and Federal funding and are located within the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) of the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (St. Lucie TPO). The St. Lucie TPO MPA is identified on the map on page A-8.

To use the TIP:

- Locate the project in the Project Index in Section A.2 or on either of the Project Location Maps in Section A.3 to identify the Project Number or Project Name.
- Using the Project Name, reference directly the alphabetically-listed projects in the Detailed Project Listing pages or, by using the Project Number, identify the TIP Page Number for the project from the Project Index.
- Refer to the corresponding TIP Page Number to obtain information regarding the project in the Detailed Project Listings pages.
- Refer to the corresponding LRTP Page Number in the Project Index or in the Detailed Project Listings pages to cross-reference the project, if applicable, in the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).
- Refer to Section A.4 for a Glossary of Abbreviations and Phase/Funding Codes.
- Refer to Section B for information on Federal and State requirements for development of the TIP.
- Refer to Section C for the Detailed Project Listings which include whether the project is located on the Florida Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and the Total Project Cost.
- Refer to Section D for the TPO List of Priority Projects.
- Refer to Section E for an evaluation of project and system performance
- Refer to the Appendices for an Example Public Comment Notice and for information on locally-funded projects and TIP amendments that have been adopted.
- Refer to the contact information on the cover of the TIP if you have any questions or comments.

Explanations of the SIS and Total Project Costs

SIS: The SIS is a network of high priority transportation facilities in Florida which includes the State's largest and most significant commercial service airports, spaceport, deep-water seaports, freight and passenger rail terminals, intercity bus terminals, rail corridors, waterways and highways. All projects on the SIS will have a SIS identifier in the top right corner of the Detailed Project Listings pages in Section C of the TIP.

Total Project Costs: A typical project production sequence is to have a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) phase, followed by a Design (PE) phase, a Right of Way (ROW) phase and a Construction (CST) phase. Some projects may not include a ROW phase if land acquisition is not needed to complete the project. Costs in the Detailed Project Listing pages in Section C of the TIP may include the historical costs (Prior Year Cost), the costs in the five years of the current TIP, the costs in the years beyond the current TIP (Future Year Cost), and the sum of all of these costs which is the Total Project Cost. For some projects such as resurfacing, safety, or operational projects, there may not be a Total Project Cost identified, but additional details on that program will be included.


A.2 PROJECT INDEX AND TIP/RLRTP CROSS REFERENCE

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT LIMITS FROM	PROJECT LIMITS TO	DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NUMBER	LRTP Page	TIP Page	TIP MAP Page
A1A NORTH CAUSEWAY BRIDGE	ENTIRE BRIDGE	ENTIRE BRIDGE	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	4299362	8-3	C 6-2	A-4
A1A SUNTRAIL	FT PIERCE INLET STATE PARK	SLC/INDIAN RIVER COUNTY LINE	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4435061	8-2	C 1-2	A-4
ALCANTARRA BLVD	SAVONA BLVD	PORT ST.LUCIE BLVD	SIDEWALK	4443491	8-3	C 1-3	A-5
BELL AVENUE	SOUTH 25TH ST	SUNRISE BLVD	BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK	4460761	8-2	C 1-4	A-4
CURTIS ST	PRIMA VISTA BLVD	FLORESTA DRIVE	SIDEWALK	4443481	8-3	C 1-5	A-5
EMERSON AVE	INDRIO RD	25TH ST	RESURFACING	4476511	3-9	C 1-6	A-4
FEC OVERPASS	SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA	SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD.	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4400321	8-2	C 1-7	A-4
GATLIN BLVD	WEST OF I-95	PORT ST LUCIE BLVD	TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES/SYSTEM	4447071	8-3	C 1-8	A-5
HISTORIC HIGHWAYMAN TRAIL GAP	INDIAN HILLS DR	GEORGIA AVE	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4400342	8-11	C 1-9	A-4
I-95 @ BECKER RD INTERCHANGE	RAMPS AT BECKER RD	RAMPS AT BECKER RD	LANDSCAPING	4413141	3-9	C 1-10	A-5
I-95 @ ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	4353371	8-2	C 1-11	A-5
I-95 FROM SLC/MARTIN TO SR-70	SLC/MARTIN COUNTY LINE	SR-70/OKEECHOBEE RD	PD&E/EMO STUDY	4226816	8-3	C 1-12	A-4, 5
I-95 FROM GATLIN BLVD TO ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	GATLIN BLVD	ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	SKID HAZARD OVERLAY	4438471	3-9	C 1-13	A-5
I-95 OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD	NB OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD	SB OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	4397611	8-3	C 1-14	A-5
I-95 OFF-RAMPS AT MIDWAY RD	NB OFF-RAMPS AT MIDWAY RD	SB OFF-RAMPS AT MIDWAY RD	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	4397541	8-3	C 1-15	A-5
INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	LIGHTING	4470031	8-3	C 1-16	A-4
JENKINS RD	MIDWAY RD	ORANGE AVENUE	PD&E/EMO STUDY	4463311	8-3	C 1-17	A-4
KING'S HIGHWAY	500 feet S OF OKEECHOBEE RD	NORTH OF PICOS RD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2302566	8-2	C 1-18	A-4
KING'S HIGHWAY	NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIR	ST LUCIE BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383792	8-2	C 1-19	A-4
KING'S HIGHWAY	N OF I-95 OVERPASS	N OF COMMERCIAL CIR	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383791	8-2	C 1-20	A-4
KING'S HIGHWAY	NORTH OF PICOS RD	NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2302567	8-2	C 1-21	A-4
KING'S HIGHWAY	NORTH OF PICOS RD	NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS	LANDSCAPING	4380411	8-2	C 1-22	A-4
MIDWAY RD	GLADES CUT OFF RD	SELVITZ ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2314403	8-2	C 1-24	A-4, 5
MIDWAY RD	JENKINS RD	SELVITZ RD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2314405	8-11	C 1-25	A-5
N. 25th ST	NORTH OF AVE Q	ST LUCIE BLVD	RESURFACING	4439971	3-9	C 1-26	A-4

St. Lucie TPO Transportation Improvement Program - FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/2026


OKEECHOBEE RD	IDEAL HOLDING RD	ROCK RD	RESURFACING	4476531	3-9	C 1-27	A-4
OLEANDER AVENUE	MIDWAY RD	SOUTH MARKET AVENUE	SIDEWALK	4415661	8-3	C 1-28	A-4
ORANGE AVENUE	KINGS HWY	E OF I-95 SB RAMP	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	4461681	8-3	C 1-29	A-4
ORANGE AVENUE	E OF 13TH ST	US-1	RESURFACING	4461691	3-9	C 1-30	A-4
OUTFALL FOR VIRGINIA AVE	OLEANDER BLVD	INDIAN HILLS DR	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	4417151	3-9	C 1-31	A-4
PORT OF FORT PIERCE OVERPASS CONNECTOR	DIXIE HIGHWAY	2ND ST AT FISHERMANS WHARF	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4473991	8-11	C 1-32	A-4
PORT OF FORT PIERCE TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS	PORT OF FORT PIERCE	PORT OF FORT PIERCE	SEAPORT CAPACITY PROJECT	4485361	3-9	C 8-2	A-4
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	LONG CREEK	N FORK ST LUCIE RIVER	BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION	4435951	3-9	C 6-3	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	BECKER RD	PAAR DRIVE	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317523	8-2	C 1-33	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	PAAR DRIVE	DARWIN BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317522	8-2	C 1-34	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD	SOUTH OF DARWIN BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317526	8-2	C 1-35	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	SOUTH OF PAAR DR	SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317525	8-2	C 1-36	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	SHELTER DR	US-1	RESURFACING	4463761	3-9	C 1-37	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE TSM&O	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	ITS COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	4481341	8-11	C 1-38	A-5
S 25TH ST	N OF EDWARDS RD	N OF VIRGINIA AVE	RESURFACING	4461701	3-9	C 1-39	A-4
SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	LENNARD RD	SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4399993	8-3	C 1-40	A-4, 5
SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	WALTON RD	LENNARD RD	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4399992	8-2	C 1-41	A-5
SELVITZ RD	NW FLORESTA DRIVE	NW BAYSHORE BLVD	BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK	4460741	8-2	C 1-42	A-5
US HIGHWAY 1 @ VIRGINIA AVENUE	INTERSECTION	INTERSECTION	ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S)	4368681	8-2	C 1-43	A-4
US HIGHWAY 1	EDWARDS RD	TENNESSEE AVENUE	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	4417141	3-9	C 1-44	A-4
US HIGHWAY 1	MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	RESURFACING	4476521	3-9	C 1-45	A-5
US HIGHWAY 1	NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE	NORTH OF AVE O	RESURFACING	4461091	3-9	C 1-46	A-4
WALTON RD	800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD RD	GREEN RIVER PKWY	SIDEWALK	4483081	8-11	C 1-47	A-5

A.3 TIP PROJECT LOCATION MAPS



SOUTH ST. LUCIE TPO AREA


PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	TIP PAGE
4443491	ALCANTARRA BLVD	C 1-3
4443481	CURTIS ST	C 1-5
4447071	GATLIN BLVD	C 1-8
4413141	I-95 @ BECKER RD INTERCHANGE	C 1-10
4353371	I-95 @ ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	C 1-11
4438471	I-95 FROM GATLIN BLVD TO ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	C 1-13
4226816	I-95 FROM SLC/MARTIN TO SR-70	C 1-12
4397611	I-95 OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD	C 1-14
4397541	I-95 OFF-RAMPS AT MIDWAY RD	C 1-15
2314403	MIDWAY RD	C 1-24
2314405	MIDWAY RD	C 1-25
4435951	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 6-3
4463761	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-37
4317522	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-34
4317523	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-33
4317525	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-36
4317526	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-35
4481341	PORT ST. LUCIE TSM&O	C 1-38
4399992	SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	C 1-40
4399993	SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	C 1-41
4460741	SELVITZ RD	C 1-42
4476521	US HIGHWAY 1	C 1-45
4483081	WALTON RD	C 1-47



A.4 GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND PHASE/FUNDING SOURCE CODES

ADM	Administration	MNT	Contract Maintenance
BPAC	Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee	MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
BRDG	Bridge	MSC	Grant to Local Government
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee	OPS	Operations
CAP	Capital	PD&E	Project Development and Environmental
CEI	Construction, Engineering, & Inspection	PE	Preliminary Engineering
CIP	Capital Improvements Program	PIP	Public Involvement Program
CLV	Culvert	PLN	Planning
CMP	Congestion Management Process	PST	DES Post Design
CST	Construction	PTO	Public Transportation Office
CTC	Community Transportation Coordinator	RELOC	Right of Way Relocation
DCA	Department of Community Affairs	RLRTP	Regional Long Range Transportation Plan
DSB	Design Build	ROW	Right of Way Support
E/D	Engineering & Design	ROW LND	Right of Way Land
ENV	Environmental	RR	CST Railroad Construction
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	RRX	Railroad Crossing
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	RRU	Railroad/Utilities Construction
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation	SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—a Legacy for Users
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	SLC	St. Lucie County
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	SRA	Senior Resource Association, Inc.
INC	Construction Incentive	TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
IRC	Indian River County	TD	Transportation Disadvantaged
LAR	Local Agency Reimbursement	TDC	Transportation Disadvantaged Commission
LCB	Local Coordinating Board	TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
LOPP	List of Priority Projects	TMA	Transportation Management Area
MAP - 21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century	TPO	Transportation Planning Organization
MC	Martin County	UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
MIT	Mitigation	UTL	Utility Coordination

A.5 TPO METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA MAP



B. NARRATIVE

B.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of the TIP is to identify and prioritize transportation improvement projects receiving Federal and State funding over a five-year period that are located within the St. Lucie TPO MPA. In addition, the TIP is used to coordinate the transportation improvement projects of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the local governments located within the MPA. Projects in the TIP are presented in Year of Expenditure (YOE), which takes into account the inflation rate over the five years in the TIP. Therefore the programmed cost estimate for each project is inflated to the year that the funds are expended based on reasonable inflation factors developed by the State and its partners. The TIP is also used to identify all regionally significant transportation projects for which Federal action is required, whether or not the projects receive Federal funding. As the St. Lucie TPO is in an air quality attainment area, there are no regionally significant air quality-related transportation improvement projects in the TIP.

B.2 FINANCIAL PLAN

The Financial Plan of the TIP is based upon the FDOT District 4 Tentative Work Program for FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26; the previous year's TIP; the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP); and information provided by St. Lucie County, the City of Port St. Lucie, and the City of Fort Pierce. The Financial Plan includes Federal, State, and local transportation funding sources which are identified in the following tables based on the type of transportation improvement:

HIGHWAY/ROADWAY/SIDEWALK FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
AC FREIGHT PROG (NFP)	ACFP	4,122,014	16,869	487,924	382,386	-	5,009,193
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION NHPP	ACNP	-	-	550,000	2,110,000	-	2,660,000
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SS,HSP)	ACSS	-	7,103,186	310,407	-	-	7,413,593
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SU)	ACSU	1,798,166	-	-	-	-	1,798,166
COUNTY INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM	CIGP	-	-	-	4,645,975	6,996,444	11,642,419
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	10,448,533	5,685,292	7,313,312	4,923,390	2,463,001	30,833,528
STATE IN-HOUSE PRODUCT SUPPORT	DIH	540,994	604,103	157,947	251,929	168,927	1,723,900
STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS & PTO	DS	9,600,120	2,118,216	4,750	8,317,828	7,668,015	27,708,929
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	5,825,558	188,341	2,734,109	-	8,000,000	16,748,008
LOCAL FUNDS FOR PARTICIPATING	LFP	-	-	-	5,020,975	1,000,000	6,020,975
NAT HWY PERFORM - RESURFACING	NHRE	-	1,473,201	-	11,928,140	1,956,681	15,358,022
STP, ANY AREA	SA	1,477,890	494,625	6,649,202	4,911,578	4,415,004	17,948,299
STP, MANDATORY NON-URBAN <= 5K	SN	-	-	977,516	135,047	1,183,516	2,296,079
SAFE ROUTES - TRANSFER	SR2T	-	-	-	5,000	-	5,000
STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K	SU	5,911,975	2,893,225	1,814,352	2,929,066	3,502,055	17,050,673
TRANSPORTATION ALTS- ANY AREA	TALT	674,510	398,983	444,371	-	-	1,517,864
TRANSPORTATION ALTS- >200K	TALU	22,376	270,052	290,759	-	-	583,187
SB2514A-TRAIL NETWORK 2015	TLWR	830,000	10,244,696	60,000	2,738,340	1,077,556	14,950,592
TRANS REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGM	TRIP	3,968,681	-	29,094	2,399,671	2,324,527	8,721,973
SB2514A-TRAN REG INCT PRG 2015	TRWR	1,101,310	-	-	494,329	-	1,595,639
GRAND TOTAL							191,586,039

AVIATION FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	2,575,920	-	-	-	-	2,575,920
STATE - PTO	DPTO	320,000	947,384	4,201,600	-	-	5,468,984
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	783,980	236,856	1,052,000	-	-	2,072,836
GRAND TOTAL							10,117,740

TRANSIT OPERATIONS FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	-	663,919	693,858	836,751	825,045	3,019,573
STATE - PTO	DPTO	739,502	80,000	80,000	-	-	899,502
STATE PRIMARY/FEDERAL REIMB	DU	59,919	62,915	62,293	64,026	75,199	324,352
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION	FTA	2,695,000	2,695,000	2,695,000	2,695,000	2,695,000	13,475,000
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	799,421	846,553	894,317	900,777	900,244	4,341,312
GRAND TOTAL							22,059,739

MISCELLANEOUS FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY	D	1,945,000	2,150,000	1,925,000	1,925,000	1,925,000	9,870,000
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	333,539	376,795	388,059	400,701	412,722	1,911,816
STATEWIDE ITS - STATE 100%.	DITS	270,372	243,422	250,726	266,247	274,235	1,305,002
GRAND TOTAL							13,086,818

PLANNING FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
STATE - PTO	DPTO	13,989	13,849	13,988	14,132	15,867	71,825
STATE PRIMARY/FEDERAL REIMB	DU	111,908	110,788	111,905	113,059	126,935	574,595
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	13,989	13,849	13,988	14,132	15,867	71,825
METRO PLAN (85% FA; 15% OTHER)	PL	545,333	544,419	544,419	544,419	544,419	2,723,009
STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K	SU	300,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	1,900,000
GRAND TOTAL							5,341,254

BRIDGE FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (BRT)	ACBR	14,540,079	4,925,742	5,836,113	-	-	25,301,934
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SA)	ACSA	11,923,171	-	-	-	-	11,923,171
AMENDMENT 4 BONDS (BRIDGES)	BNBR	64,246,663	-	-	-	-	64,246,663
STATE BRIDGE REPAIR & REHAB	BRRP	919,404	-	-	-	-	919,404
UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY	D	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	260,000
STATE IN-HOUSE PRODUCT SUPPORT	DIH	379,741	-	-	-	-	379,741
STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS & PTO	DS	123,120	-	630,000	-	-	753,120
STP, ANY AREA	SA	6,064	50,000	-	-	-	56,064
GRAND TOTAL							103,840,097

TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
TURNPIKE IMPROVEMENT	PKYI	-	-	-	6,330,000	-	6,330,000
TURNPIKE RENEWAL & REPLACEMENT	PKYR	1,088,356	2,789,307	14,791,779	-	-	18,669,442
GRAND TOTAL							24,999,442

SEAPORT FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	500,000	-	-	-	-	500,000
SEAPORTS	PORT	500,000	-	-	-	-	500,000
GRAND TOTAL							1,000,000

FINANCIAL PLAN GRAND TOTAL 372,031,129

The TIP is financially constrained each year with the project cost estimates equal to the funding source estimates as demonstrated in the Financial Summary below:

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCE ESTIMATES	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total Program
Highway/Roadway/Sidewalk	46,322,127	31,490,789	21,823,743	51,193,654	40,755,726	191,586,039
Aviation	3,679,900	1,184,240	5,253,600	0	0	10,117,740
Transit Operations	4,293,842	4,348,387	4,425,468	4,496,554	4,495,488	22,059,739
Miscellaneous	2,548,911	2,770,217	2,563,785	2,591,948	2,611,957	13,086,818
Planning	985,219	1,082,905	1,084,300	1,085,742	1,103,088	5,341,254
Bridge	92,190,242	5,027,742	6,518,113	52,000	52,000	103,840,097
Turnpike Enterprise	1,088,356	2,789,307	14,791,779	6,330,000	0	24,999,442
Seaport	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	1,000,000
						372,031,129

PROJECT COST ESTIMATES	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total Program
Highway/Roadway/Sidewalk	46,322,127	31,490,789	21,823,743	51,193,654	40,755,726	191,586,039
Aviation	3,679,900	1,184,240	5,253,600	0	0	10,117,740
Transit Operations	4,293,842	4,348,387	4,425,468	4,496,554	4,495,488	22,059,739
Miscellaneous	2,548,911	2,770,217	2,563,785	2,591,948	2,611,957	13,086,818
Planning	985,219	1,082,905	1,084,300	1,085,742	1,103,088	5,341,254
Bridge	92,190,242	5,027,742	6,518,113	52,000	52,000	103,840,097
Turnpike Enterprise	1,088,356	2,789,307	14,791,779	6,330,000	0	24,999,442
Seaport	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	1,000,000
						372,031,129

FUND SOURCE	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total Program
Federal	44,188,405	21,439,005	21,174,261	26,217,721	14,898,809	127,918,201
Local	7,922,948	1,285,599	4,694,414	5,935,884	9,916,111	29,754,956
R/W and Bridge Bonds	64,246,663	-	-	-	-	64,246,663
State 100%	34,662,225	23,179,676	15,800,334	27,266,293	24,203,339	125,111,867
Toll/Turnpike	1,088,356	2,789,307	14,791,779	6,330,000	-	24,999,442
GRAND TOTAL FROM ALL JURISDICTIONS	152,108,597	48,693,587	56,460,788	65,749,898	49,018,259	372,031,129

Note: See Section A-8 for Fund Code Source and Fund Code Description

B.3 PROJECT SELECTION

The selection of federally-funded projects within the St. Lucie TPO MPA for the TIP is consistent with Federal regulations [23 CFR450.330(c)] and is carried out by the TPO in cooperation with FDOT and the transit operator. The TIP has been developed in coordination with the USDOT, FDOT, St. Lucie TPO Advisory Committees, local governments, port and aviation authorities, transit operators, and the general public as summarized in Section B.6 of the TIP.

For the TPO's FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/26 TIP, the project selection and TIP development process started in June 2020 with a meeting with staffs from the St. Lucie TPO, FDOT District 4, and the local governments to informally discuss the priority projects. The List of Priority Projects (LOPP) then was developed based on the LRTP and other plans as identified in Section B.4, local agency input, and public comments. The LOPP was reviewed by the St. Lucie TPO Advisory Committees and was adopted by the St. Lucie TPO Board and submitted to FDOT District 4 in September 2020. The LOPP was utilized by FDOT District 4 to develop their Draft Tentative Work Program for FY 2021/22 -FY 2025/26. The Draft Tentative Work Program was reviewed and endorsed by the Board in January 2021. The Final Tentative Work Program was received from FDOT in April of 2021. The Final Tentative Work Program is the primary component of the TIP. The TPO LOPP is reproduced in Section D of the TIP.

B.4 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER PLANS

The projects in the TIP are based on the LRTP, the St. Lucie Transit Development Plan, the Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan/ Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan, and other transportation plans of the St. Lucie TPO. These plans are cross-referenced in the LOPP, and the TIP projects are cross-referenced with the LRTP in the Project Index and TIP/LRTP Cross Reference in Section A.2. The projects also are consistent with the St. Lucie County Airport Master Plan, the Port of Fort Pierce Master Plan, and the 2060 Florida Transportation Plan.

In addition, the TIP has been developed to be consistent with adopted local Comprehensive Plans including the St. Lucie County, City of Fort Pierce, City of Port St. Lucie, and St. Lucie Village Comprehensive Plans. The transportation network in the TPO MPA contains the traffic circulation elements included in the adopted St. Lucie County, City of Fort Pierce, City of Port St. Lucie, and St. Lucie Village Comprehensive Plans. Projections of future traffic volumes and levels of service were developed based on the Future Land Use Elements of the respective plans. The projections, as identified in the LRTP, served as a basis for determining the need for new or expanded transportation facilities and transportation management systems to support proposed development and to maintain or improve adopted level of service standards.

B.5 PROJECT PRIORITY STATEMENT

The projects selected in the TIP are based upon the TPO LOPP and the corresponding prioritization methodology and the goals, objectives and performance measures identified in Table 3-1 of the LRTP. The project prioritization was based on qualitative and quantitative analyses of the transportation projects in the TPO MPA which included the scoring and ranking of multimodal project priorities as identified in Table 7-1 and Appendix E of the LRTP. The project priorities were further refined with the development of transportation alternatives and scenarios planning as summarized in Chapter 7 of the LRTP and the consideration of public comment as summarized in Chapter 8 of the LRTP.

B.6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement in the development of the LOPP and the TIP is continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive and was conducted in accordance with the adopted Public Involvement Program (PIP) of the St. Lucie TPO and with Federal regulations [23 CFR 450.316 and 23 CFR 450.324(b)]. Reasonable opportunity to comment on the LOPP and the TIP was provided to all interested parties including, but not limited to, citizens, affected public agencies, public transit providers, freight shippers, private transportation providers, bicycle/pedestrian representatives, and the disabled. The process included those traditionally underserved and underrepresented consistent with the principles of Title VI. The process is followed for all projects funded in whole or part by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) or the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) pursuant to the Federal requirements.

B.7 TIP AMENDMENTS

TIP Amendments are completed in accordance with applicable requirements [23 CFR 324 and 326] when a project is added or deleted, when the fiscal constraint of the TIP is impacted by a project, and/or when there are significant changes in the scope of a project. The amendment of the TIP includes the preparation of a TIP Amendment Form that summarizes the nature of the changes.

Prior to the adoption of a TIP amendment by the TPO Board, notice and public comment opportunities are provided regarding the amendment consistent with Section B.6. Upon adoption of the amendment by the TPO Board, the TIP Amendment Form is incorporated into Appendix G of the TIP.

B.8 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATED FEDERAL FUNDING/IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

FHWA OBLIGATED FUNDING

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
2302566	SR-713/KINGS HWY FR 500 FEET S OF SR-70 TO NORTH OF PICOS ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.200	9,690	GFSA	
				-34,401	SA	
				278,909	SU	
				35,203	TALT	
				340,001	SU	
				9,690	GFSA	
				-34,401	SA	
				278,909	SU	
				35,203	TALT	
				340,001	SU	1,258,804
2303384	SR-614/INDRIO ROAD FROM WEST OF SR-9/I-95 TO EAST OF SR-607/EMERSON AV	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.709	100,259	NHPP	100,259
2314402	W. MIDWAY RD/CR-712 FROM S. 25TH STREET/SR-615 TO SR-5/US-1	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.803	2,561,317	SA	
				81,305	SU	
				-37	SA	
				-18,107	SA	
				-9	SA	
				-770,800	SU	1,853,669

St. Lucie TPO Transportation Improvement Program - FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/2026

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
2314403	W. MIDWAY RD/CR-712 FROM GLADES CUT OFF ROAD TO SELVITZ ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.577	23,105	SU	
				24,931	SA	
				635,910	SU	683,946
4108445	CROSSTOWN PARKWAY FROM MANTH LANE TO SR-5/US-1	NEW BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION	2.651	15,239	EB	15,239
4287281	SR-5/US-1 FROM N. OF MIDWAY RD TO EDWARDS RD	RESURFACING	2.362	-196	NHRE	
				-26,653	SA	-26,849
4299362	SR-A1A NORTH BRIDGE OVER ICWW BRIDGE #940045	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	1.205	63,653	NHBR	
				2,648,912	NHBR	
				25,010	NHBR	2,737,575
4317291	DEL RIO BLVD FROM PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD TO CALIFORNIA BLVD.	SIDEWALK	2.785	-282,056	TALU	
				-1,160	TALU	-283,216
4317522	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM PAAR DRIVE TO DARWIN BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.946	16,969	SU	
				4,696	SA	
				-76,495	SA	
				-278	SU	-55,108
4317523	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM BECKER ROAD TO PAAR DRIVE	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.119	1,134,673	SU	1,134,673
4331951	CAMEO BLVD FROM PORT ST.LUCIE BLVD TO CROSSTOWN PARKWAY	SIDEWALK	1.733	-122,147	TALT	

St. Lucie TPO Transportation Improvement Program - FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/2026

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
				-1,878	TALT	-124,025
4343601	CR-712A/MCCARTY RD. BRDG #940031 OVER TEN MILE CREEK, REPLACEMENT	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	0.120	-96,013	SA	
				-30,669	SA	
				65,037	NHBR	-61,645
4368591	TULIP BLVD. FROM COLLEGE PARK RD. TO CHERRY HILL RD.	SIDEWALK	1.664	-5,615	TALU	-5,615
4368681	SR-5/US-1 @ SR-70/VIRGINIA AVENUE	ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S)	0.071	809,902	SU	
				7,306	SU	
				977,345	SU	1,794,553
4381301	PAAR DRIVE FROM SW PORT ST LUCIE BLVD TO SW DARWIN BLVD	SIDEWALK	1.034	283,548	TALU	283,548
4383792	SR-713/KINGS HWY FROM N OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE TO NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.210	475,517	SU	475,517
4383793	SR-713/KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD TO INDRIO ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.190	2,144,838	GFSA	
				766,366	SA	2,911,204
4398471	SR-5/US-1 FROM S. OF PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD. TO NE RIOMAR DRIVE	RESURFACING	4.987	198,269	GFSA	
				2,038,383	SA	
				101,066	HSP	2,337,718
4400181	NORTH MACEDO BLVD FROM SELVITZ RD TO ST JAMES DR	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	1.049	270,447	TALU	
				14,393	TALU	

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
				-97	TALU	284,743
4428421	HURRICANE IRMA PERMANENT SIGN REPAIR - SR-9 AT MM 121 AND 131	EMERGENCY OPERATIONS	0.011	3,834	ER17	3,834
4436851	SR-70/OKEECHOBEE ROAD AT CR-712/MIDWAY ROAD	LIGHTING	0.397	20,315	HSP	20,315
4443481	CURTIS STREET FROM NW PRIMA VISTA BLVD TO NW FLORESTA DRIVE	SIDEWALK	0.543	5,000	TALU	5,000
4443491	ALCANTARRA BLVD FROM SW SAVONA BLVD TO SW PORT ST.LUCIE BLVD	SIDEWALK	0.800	5,000	TALU	5,000
4447061	PRIMA VISTA BLVD @ AIROSO BLVD	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	0.384	5,000	GFSA	5,000
4393262	ST. LUCIE FY 2018/2019-2019/2020 UPWP	TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	0.000	318,470	PL	318,470
4393263	ST. LUCIE FY 2020/2021-2021/2022 UPWP	TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	0.000	136,418	PL	
				300,000	SU	436,418
GRAND TOTAL						16,109,027

FTA OBLIGATED FUNDING

FTA GRANT NUMBER	COUNTY	FTA GRANTEE	FEDERAL FUND CODE	FTA PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL FTA FUNDS IN TIP	TOTAL FEDERAL FUNDS OBLIGATED	TOTAL LOCAL FUNDS	TOTAL
FL-2020-004-00	SLC	SLC	5307	Capital/Operating	\$2,694,000	\$2,324,371	\$1,021,403	\$6,039,774
FL-2020-003-00	SLC	SLC	5339	Bus and Bus Facilities	\$197,400	\$256,763		\$454,163
G1F61 (FDOT)	SLC	SLC	5311	Operating	\$59,069	\$58,023	\$58,023	\$175,115
TBD	SLC	SLC	5310	Elderly and individuals with disabilities				
TOTAL					\$2,950,469	\$2,639,157	\$1,079,426	\$6,669,052

B.9 CERTIFICATIONS

To ensure Federal requirements are being met, the FHWA and FTA conduct Federal certification reviews on a quadrennial basis of the urbanized areas of TPOs/MPOs which also are designated by census as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) because the population exceeds 200,000 people. The urbanized area of the St. Lucie TPO is designated as the Port St. Lucie TMA. The last Federal review of the TMA was completed in September 2017 and resulted in no corrective actions, five noteworthy practices, and six recommendations were identified to improve the current planning process of the TPO.

The TPO and FDOT also perform joint certification reviews annually to ensure that State and Federal requirements are being met. The last joint certification review was completed in March 2021 which resulted in the joint certification of the St. Lucie TPO. Support documentation concerning the Federal and joint certification reviews is on file at the St. Lucie TPO offices and available for review during normal business hours.

B.10 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)

The development and implementation of a CMP is a requirement to be eligible for Federal funding. CMP Box Funds in the amount of \$300,000 - \$400,000 annually have been established by the St. Lucie TPO. Beyond the five fiscal years of the TIP, the LRTP continues to allocate approximately \$3.25 million in funding towards the CMP on a yearly basis through 2045.

The overall purpose of the St. Lucie TPO CMP is to create a better quality of life for St. Lucie residents and visitors through lowering travel delay, reducing harmful emissions, and improving safety. The CMP identifies areas with congestion or safety issues, develops strategies to address the issues, and prioritizes projects based a ranking criteria.

The St. Lucie TPO CMP was adopted in 2018, and a two-tiered approach (Phase I and Phase II) was utilized in the CMP to identify projects. The Phase I analysis provided a system-wide screening for areas of concern. The Phase II analysis included a detailed evaluation of the identified areas of concern. Based on the results of the Phase II evaluation, CMP projects were identified, and a project scoring criteria and the basis for the CMP Implementation Plan were developed.

Incorporating multimodal performance measures, the CMP Implementation Plan utilizes both traditional and non-traditional strategies to address the areas of concern, to reduce vehicle miles traveled, and to consider climate adaptation and proposes improvements which support multimodal elements and safety. The CMP projects from the CMP Implementation Plan that are not funded in the TIP may be added to CMP List of the TPO's LOPP for future funding with the CMP Box Funds.

B.11 TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED (TD) PROGRAM

TD services are facilitated by the St. Lucie TPO pursuant to Florida Statute 427.015. The projects and costs of the St. Lucie TPO TD Program are summarized in the following:

DRAFT								
Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged								
Trip & Equipment Grant Allocations								
FY 2021-2022								
COUNTY	TRIP/EQUIP GRANT	LOCAL TRIP/EQUIP MATCH	TOTAL TRIP/EQUIP FUNDS	VOLUNTARY DOLLARS FM/Job # 43202818401	VOLUNTARY DOLLARS LOCAL MATCH	TOTAL VOLUNTARY DOLLARS	PLANNING GRANT ALLOCATION	TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING
Saint Lucie	\$695,993.00	\$77,333.00	\$773,325.00	\$62.00	\$7.00	\$69.00	\$26,657.00	\$800,051.00

B.12 TRANSPORTATION REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM (TRIP)

In 2005, the Florida Legislature enacted the Florida TRIP through Senate Bill 360. The stated purpose of the program is to encourage regional planning by providing state matching funds for improvements to regionally-significant transportation facilities identified and prioritized by regional partners. According to FDOT, two primary program requirements are as follows:

- Eligible recipients must be a partner, through an Interlocal Agreement, to a regional transportation planning entity; and,
- The partners must represent a regional transportation planning area and develop a plan that identifies and prioritizes regionally significant facilities.

To satisfy the application requirements for TRIP funding, an Interlocal Agreement was executed by the St. Lucie TPO, Martin MPO, and Indian River MPO to create a regional transportation planning entity known as the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC). The TCTC subsequently adopted a plan to identify and prioritize regionally significant facilities for the selection of projects for TRIP funding. This plan subsequently was updated in 2016.


St. Lucie TPO projects currently programmed in this TIP include \$8,721,973 of TRIP funding. The MIDWAY RD project (#2314405) is receiving \$1,231,795 in TRIP funding, the PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD project (#4317525, #4317526) is receiving \$4,109,081, and the I-95 at ST LUCIE WEST BLVD INTERCHANGE project (#4353371) is receiving \$2,006,097 in TRIP funding, and the JENKINS ROAD project (#4463311) is receiving \$1,375,000 in TRIP funding.

C. DETAILED PROJECT LISTINGS

C.1 HIGHWAY/ROADWAY/SIDEWALK

A1A FROM FT PIERCE INLET STATE PARK TO SLC/INDIAN RIVER COUNTY LINE

4435061 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL: ST. LUCIE COUNTY NORTH A1A INDIAN RIVER LAGOON TRAIL IMPROVEMENT

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: FT PIERCE INLET STATE PARK

Length: 5.193

To: SLC/INDIAN RIVER COUNTY LINE

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL, P D & E

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PE	DIH	0	0	0	0	32,923	32,923
ENV	TLWR	0	0	0	0	200,000	200,000
PE	TLWR	0	0	0	0	877,556	877,556
						1,110,479	1,110,479

Prior Year Cost: 274,692

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,385,171

LRTP: Page 8-2

ALCANTARRA BLVD FROM SW SAVONA BLVD TO SW PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD

4443491 Non-SIS



Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2019 TPO TAP PRIORITY #2 LAP W/ THE CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
From: SW SAVONA BLVD
To: SW PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD
Length: 0.8
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TALU	22,376	0	0	0	0	22,376
CST	LF	253,791	0	0	0	0	253,791
CST	TALT	325,398	0	0	0	0	325,398
		601,565					601,565

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 606,565
LRTP: Page 8-3

**BELL AVE FROM SOUTH 25TH ST TO SUNRISE BLVD
4460761 Non-SIS**



Project Description: BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2020 TPO TAP PRIORITY #12 LAP WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTH 25TH ST
Length: 0.4 **To:** SUNRISE BLVD
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TALU	0	4,089	0	0	0	4,089
CST	LF	0	85,158	0	0	0	85,158
CST	TALT	0	319,427	0	0	0	319,427
			408,674				408,674

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 413,674
LRTP: Page 8-2

CURTIS ST FROM NW PRIMA VISTA BLVD TO NW FLORESTA DR
4443481 Non-SIS




Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2019 TPO TAP PRIORITY #1 LAP WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
From: NW PRIMA VISTA BLVD
To: NW FLORESTA DRIVE
Length: 0.543
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TALT	18,716	0	0	0	0	18,716
CST	LF	223,261	0	0	0	0	223,261
CST	TALT	325,396	0	0	0	0	325,396
		567,373					567,373

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 572,373
LRTP: Page 8-3

**EMERSON AVE FROM INDRIO RD TO 25TH ST
4476511 Non-SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 2.525

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: INDRIO RD

To: 25TH ST

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	55,344	0	55,344
CST	DS	0	0	0	186,785	0	186,785
CST	DDR	0	0	0	1,563,459	0	1,563,459
PE	DIH	24,818	0	0	0	0	24,818
PE	DS	310,222	0	0	0	0	310,222
		335,040			1,805,588		2,140,628

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,140,628

LRTP: Page 3-9

FEC OVERPASS FROM SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA TO SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD

4400321 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 0

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RAILRD & UTILITIES, P D & E

From: SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA

To: SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD

Prior Year Cost: 106,220
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,681,466
LRTP: Page 8-2

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	96,505	0	96,505
CST	TLWR	0	0	0	2,738,340	0	2,738,340
ROW	DIH	0	12,000	0	0	0	12,000
ROW	DS	0	48,651	4,750	0	0	53,401
ENV	TLWR	0	165,000	0	0	0	165,000
PE	DIH	5,000	0	0	0	0	5,000
RRU	TLWR	20,000	0	60,000	0	0	80,000
PE	TLWR	425,000	0	0	0	0	425,000
		450,000	225,651	64,750	2,834,845		3,575,246

GATLIN BLVD FROM WEST OF I-95 TO PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD
4447071 Non-SIS



Project Description: TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES/SYSTEM

Extra Description: 2021 TPO CMP PRIORITY #1 AND #2 LAP WITH PORT ST. LUCIE INSTALL TRAFFIC CAMERAS AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS; OPTIMIZE GREEN TIME, ADD ADAPTIVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROL

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: WEST OF I-95

Length: 0

To: PORT ST LUCIE BLVD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	SU	0	0	14,000	0	0	14,000
CST	SU	0	314,000	300,000	0	0	614,000
PE	SU	5,000	0	0	0	0	5,000
		5,000	314,000	314,000			633,000

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 633,000

LRTP: Page 8-3

HISTORIC HIGHWAYMAN TRAIL GAP FROM INDIAN HILLS DR TO GEORGIA AVE

4400342 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL FY2017 PD/E DESIGN LIAISON = JULY JIIMENEZ JPA WITH THE CITY OF FT PIERCE

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From: INDIAN HILLS DR

To: GEORGIA AVE

Length: 0

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TLWR	0	762,176	0	0	0	762,176
			762,176				762,176

Prior Year Cost: 171,385

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 933,561

LRTP: Page 8-11

**I-95 @ BECKER RD INTERCHANGE
4413141 SIS**



Project Description: LANDSCAPING
Extra Description: STANDALONE INDEPENDENT PROJECT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** I-95
Length: 0.478 **To:** BECKER ROAD
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	38,374	0	0	0	0	38,374
CST	DDR	696,401	0	0	0	0	696,401
		734,775					734,775

Prior Year Cost: 144,971
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 879,746
LRTP: Page 3-9

I-95 AT ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD
4353371 SIS



Prior Year Cost: 2,180,418
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 20,493,920
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES

Extra Description: 2017 TPO PRIORITY #5; LFA W/PORT ST. LUCIE = 3.1M LUMPSUM FROM COMMERCE CENTER DR TO PEACOCK BLVD, WIDENING OF RDWAY TO ACCOMMODATE THREE EB LANES AND TWO WB LANES ACROSS THE BRIDGE OVER I-95 AND BUILD A NEW EB BRIDGE. WIDENING THE SOUTHBOUND OFF RAMP INTERSECTION TO PROVIDE TWO LEFT TURN LANES AND ONE RIGHT TURN LANE. WIDENING THE...

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: I-95


Length: 1.814

To: ST LUCIE WEST BLVD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, CONTRACT INCENTIVES, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	78,329	67,864	0	0	0	146,193
INC	DDR	150,000	0	0	0	0	150,000
CST	TRWR	537,093	0	0	0	0	537,093
CST	TRIP	2,006,097	0	0	0	0	2,006,097
CST	LF	3,020,513	0	0	0	0	3,020,513
CST	DS	5,736,855	0	0	0	0	5,736,855
CST	DDR	6,716,751	0	0	0	0	6,716,751
		18,245,638	67,864				18,313,502

**I-95 FROM MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE TO OKEECHOBEE RD
4226816 SIS**




Project Description: PD&E/EMO STUDY
Extra Description: R/W NEEDED
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 15.499
Phase Group: P D & E

From: MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE
To: SR-70

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PDE	ACNP	0	0	550,000	2,110,000	0	2,660,000
				550,000	2,110,000		2,660,000

Prior Year Cost: 7,863,710
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 10,523,710
LRTP: Page 8-3

I-95 FROM NORTH OF GATLIN BLVD TO SOUTH OF ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD
4438471 SIS



Project Description: SKID HAZARD OVERLAY

Extra Description: ANTICIPATED NPV=\$7,258,112; B/C=2.1;1)LENGTHEN ON-RAMP ACCELERATION LANES (NORTHBOUND ON-RAMP FROM GATLIN BLVDAND SOUTHBOUND ON-RAMP FROM ST. LUCIE W. BLVD) TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT FDOT DESIGN STANDARDS;2)INSTALL A DYNAMIC MESSAGE (DMS) IN THE NORTHBOUND DIRECTION SOUTH OF GATLIN BOULEVARD INTERCHANGE;3)INSTALL CONVENTIONAL RDWAY LIGHTING WITH

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: NORTH OF GATLIN BLVD

Length: 2.967

To: SOUTH OF ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	39,771	40,865	0	0	80,636
CST	ACSS	0	7,061,309	0	0	0	7,061,309
PE	DIH	67,920	0	0	0	0	67,920
		67,920	7,101,080	40,865			7,209,865

Prior Year Cost: 1,460,959

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 8,670,824

LRTP: Page 3-9

I-95 NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD
4397611 SIS



Project Description: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES

Extra Description: GATLIN BLVD AT NORTHBOUND & SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMP INTERSECTION
 SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS: A)ADD A THIRD LEFT AND TRIPLE RIGHT TURN LANES ON SB OFF-RAMP WITH MINOR WIDENING TO RECEIVING LANES ON GATLIN BLVD B) ADD THIRD LEFT TURN LANE AND DUAL RIGHT TURN LANES ON NB OFF-RAMP. 52-01 LFA FOR PAINTED MAST ARMS (LUMPSUM)

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: OFF-RAMPS

Length: 1.704

To: GATLIN BLVD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DDR	57,153	0	0	0	0	57,153
CST	LF	63,051	0	0	0	0	63,051
CST	DS	1,812,203	0	0	0	0	1,812,203
CST	ACFP	3,812,014	16,869	0	0	0	3,828,883
		5,744,421	16,869				5,761,290

Prior Year Cost: 1,151,818

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 6,913,108

LRTP: Page 8-3

**I-95 NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMPS AT MIDWAY RD
4397541 SIS**




Project Description: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES
Extra Description: MIDWAY RD AT I-95 NB & SB OFF-RAMP INTERSECTION SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS; A)ADD SECOND LEFT TURN LANES TO BOTH NB AND SB OFF-RAMPS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** OFF-RAMPS
Length: 0.775 **To:** MIDWAY RD
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	51,750	0	0	0	51,750
CST	DS	0	1,468,425	0	0	0	1,468,425
		1,520,175					1,520,175

Prior Year Cost: 693,774
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,213,949
LRTP: Page 8-3

**INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT
4470031 Non-SIS**



Project Description: LIGHTING

Extra Description: INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT 25TH ST @ EDWARDS RD/ CORTEZ BLVD/OKEECHOBEE RD/DELAWARE AVE./ORANGE AVE.; A1A/SEAWAY DR @ BINNEY DR.

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From:

Length: 2.701

To:

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	ACSS	0	0	310,407	0	0	310,407
RRU	ACSS	0	41,877	0	0	0	41,877
			41,877	310,407			352,284


Prior Year Cost: 148,000

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 500,284

LRTP: Page 8-3

**JENKINS RD FROM MIDWAY RD TO ORANGE AVE
4463311 Non-SIS**



Project Description: PD&E/EMO STUDY

Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #7 LFA WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY IS R/W NEEDED

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: MIDWAY ROAD

Length: 2.128

To: ORANGE AVE

Phase Group: P D & E

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PDE	SU	0	0	0	20,000	20,000	40,000
PDE	LFP	0	0	0	375,000	1,000,000	1,375,000
PDE	TRIP	0	0	0	375,000	1,000,000	1,375,000
					770,000	2,020,000	2,790,000

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,790,000

LRTP: Page 8-3

**KINGS HWY FROM 500 S OF OKEECHOBEE RD TO NORTH OF PICOS RD
2302566 SIS**



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: PE/ENGINEERING UNDER 230256-2 2012 TPO PRIORITY #2 1,550 FT OF PROJECT WILL BE CONCRETE, BALANCE IS FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT PH5202=LFA WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY; \$187,669 LF RECD 3/1/17

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: 500 S OF OKEECHOBEE RD

Length: 2.2

To: NORTH OF PICOS ROAD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, RIGHT OF WAY, RAILRD & UTILITIES

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	SU	89,520	1,036,941	89,250	0	0	1,215,711
ROW	DDR	0	973,887	0	0	0	973,887
ROW	DS	54,436	0	0	0	0	54,436
		143,956	2,010,828	89,250			2,244,034

Prior Year Cost: 79,899,042

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 82,868,363

LRTP: Page 8-2

KINGS HWY FROM N OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE TO NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD

4383792 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2017 TPO PRIORITY #4 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES; PD&E UNDER 230256-5

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: N OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE

Length: 1.21

To: NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD

Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	SN	0	0	0	0	1,183,516	1,183,516
ROW	SA	0	0	0	4,911,578	0	4,911,578
ROW	DDR	0	600	0	0	0	600
ROW	DDR	1,000	0	0	0	2,463,001	2,464,001
ROW	ACSU	178,869	0	0	0	0	178,869
ROW	SU	0	363,993	277,699	87,000	0	728,692
		179,869	364,593	277,699	4,998,578	3,646,517	9,467,256

Prior Year Cost: 10,067,412

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 37,764,092

LRTP: Page 8-2

KINGS HWY FROM N OF I-95 OVERPASS TO N OF COMMERCIAL CIR

4383791 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2017 TPO PRIORITY #4 WIDENING 2 TO 4 LANES PD&E UNDER 230256-5

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: N OF SR-9/I-95 OVERPASS

Length: 1.4

To: N OF COMMERCIAL CIR

Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	SN	0	0	0	135,047	0	135,047
ROW	SA	0	0	6,344,156	0	0	6,344,156
ROW	DS	0	456,760	0	5,074,545	0	5,531,305
ROW	SU	0	191,523	0	163,000	0	354,523
ROW	DDR	88,360	0	2,724,864	3,051,169	0	5,864,393
		88,360	648,283	9,069,020	8,423,761		18,229,424

Prior Year Cost: 10,067,412

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 37,764,092

LRTP: Page 8-2

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF PICOS RD TO NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS

2302567 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: PE/ENGINEERING UNDER 230256-2 2013 TPO PRIORITY #1 CONCRETE AT THE INTERSECTION OF ORANGE AVE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: NORTH OF PICOS RD

Length: 1.217

To: NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, RIGHT OF WAY, RAILRD & UTILITIES

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	DDR	1,900	0	0	0	0	1,900
		1,900					1,900

Prior Year Cost: 79,899,042

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 82,868,363

LRTP: Page 8-2

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF PICOS RD TO NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS

4380411 Non-SIS



Project Description: LANDSCAPING

Extra Description: STANDALONE DEPENDENT PROJECT FOR 230256-7

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: NORTH OF PICOS RD

Length: 1.552

To: NORTH OF SR-9/I-95 OVERPASS

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	43,612	0	0	0	43,612
CST	DDR	0	527,678	0	0	0	527,678
		571,290					571,290

Prior Year Cost: 149,220

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 720,510

LRTP: Page 8-2

**KINGS HWY FROM SOUTH OF OKEECHOBEE RD TO NORTH OF PICOS RD
2302568 Non-SIS**




Project Description: LANDSCAPING
Extra Description: STANDALONE DEPENDENT PROJECT FOR 230256-6
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTH OF OKEECHOBEE RD
Length: 1.89 **To:** NORTH OF PICOS RD
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	56,253	0	0	0	56,253
CST	DDR	0	639,236	0	0	0	639,236
PE	DIH	27,898	0	0	0	0	27,898
		27,898	695,489				723,387

Prior Year Cost: 79,899,042
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 82,868,363
LRTP: Page 8-2

MIDWAY RD FROM GLADES CUT OFF RD TO SELVITZ RD
2314403 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES LFA WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY FOR PD&E AND DESIGN CK #09828620 RECD FROM ST. LUCIE CO. BCC FOR 1.65M ON 10/7/14 FOR PD&E. THIS IS A CAT2 CHECK RECD 1/25/2017 FROM ST. LUCIE CO. \$2,108,000 PH32/37

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: GLADES CUT OFF RD

Length: 1.577

To: SELVITZ RD

Phase Group: ENVIRONMENTAL, RIGHT OF WAY, RAILRD & UTILITIES, P D & E, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	SA	0	494,625	0	0	0	494,625
ROW	SU	0	0	973,875	0	0	973,875
			494,625	973,875			1,468,500

Prior Year Cost: 77,488,992

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 102,822,264

LRTP: Page 8-2

MIDWAY RD FROM WEST OF JENKINS RD TO SELVITZ RD
2314405 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES. BASED ON PD&E COMPLETED UNDER 231440-3 DESIGN AND RIGHT OF WAY ON 231440-3 56-01:UTILITIES RELOCATION

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: WEST OF JENKINS RD

Length: 0.785

To: SELVITZ RD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TRIP	0	0	0	0	1,231,795	1,231,795
CST	SU	0	0	0	0	3,171,529	3,171,529
CST	SA	0	0	0	0	4,415,004	4,415,004
CST	CIGP	0	0	0	0	6,996,444	6,996,444
CST	LF	0	0	0	0	8,000,000	8,000,000
RRU	SU	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000
					50,000	23,814,772	23,864,772


Prior Year Cost: 77,488,992

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 102,822,264

LRTP: Page 8-11

**N. 25TH ST FROM NORTH OF AVE Q TO ST. LUCIE BLVD
4439971 Non-SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 1.255

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: NORTH OF AVE Q

To: ST LUCIE BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	73,477	0	0	0	0	73,477
CST	DDR	2,085,532	0	0	0	0	2,085,532
		2,159,009					2,159,009

Prior Year Cost: 449,065

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,608,074

LRTP: Page 3-9

**OKEECHOBEE RD FROM IDEAL HOLDING RD TO S ROCK RD
4476531 SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 7.858

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: IDEAL HOLDING RD

To: S ROCK RD

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	41,344	0	41,344
CST	DS	0	0	0	1,198,968	0	1,198,968
CST	NHRE	0	0	0	9,343,683	0	9,343,683
PE	DIH	66,743	0	0	0	0	66,743
PE	DS	964,069	0	0	0	0	964,069
		1,030,812			10,583,995		11,614,807

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 11,614,807

LRTP: Page 3-9

**OLEANDER AVE FROM SOUTH MARKET AVE TO EDWARDS RD
4480661 Non-SIS**



Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: FOREST GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL; LAP WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTH MARKET AVE
Length: 1.326 **To:** EDWARDS RD
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PE	SR2T	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000
					5,000		5,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 5,000
LRTP: Page 8-3

ORANGE AVE FROM KINGS HWY TO E OF I-95 SB RAMP
4461681 SIS



Project Description: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES

Extra Description: ADD EB RIGHT TURN LANE FROM ORANGE AVE TO I-95 SB ON-RAMP & ADD WB RIGHT-TURN LANE FROM ORANGE AVE TO NB KINGS HWY. NB & WB PROTECTED RIGHT TURN PHASES TO BE ADDED AT INTERSECTION OF ORANGE AVE AND KINGS HWY. EB TO SB ON-RAMP ENTRANCE TO BE RELOCATED TO THE EXISTING SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION FOR THE WB TO SB (SEE WP45)

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: KINGS HWY

Length: 0.646

To: E OF I-95 SB RAMP

Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, P D & E

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	ACFP	0	0	0	382,386	0	382,386
ENV	ACFP	0	0	10,000	0	0	10,000
PE	ACFP	0	0	477,924	0	0	477,924
PDE	ACFP	310,000	0	0	0	0	310,000
		310,000	487,924	382,386			1,180,310

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,180,310

LRTP: Page 8-3

**ORANGE AVE FROM N 32ND ST TO US-1
4461691 Non-SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 1.915

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: N 32ND ST

To: SR-5/US-1

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	117,082	0	0	117,082
CST	SN	0	0	977,516	0	0	977,516
CST	DDR	0	0	2,725,198	0	0	2,725,198
PE	DIH	15,451	0	0	0	0	15,451
		15,451		3,819,796			3,835,247

Prior Year Cost: 535,158

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 4,370,405

LRTP: Page 3-9

**OUTFALL FOR VIRGINIA AVE
4417151 SIS**



Project Description: DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** OLEANDER BLVD
Length: 0.185 **To:** INDIAN HILLS DR
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	DIH	16,000	0	0	0	0	16,000
ROW	DS	235,392	144,380	0	0	0	379,772
		251,392	144,380				395,772

Prior Year Cost: 832,547
Future Year Cost: 7,850,981
Total Project Cost: 9,079,300
LRTP: Page 3-9

PORT OF FORT PIERCE OVERPASS CONNECTOR
4473991 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: A SEGMENT OF THE HISTORIC FT. PIERCE DOWNTOWN PROJECT FROM DIXIE HIGHWAY TO 2ND ST AT FISHERMANS WHARF

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PLN	TLWR	250,000	0	0	0	0	250,000
		250,000					250,000

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 250,000

LRTP: Page 8-11

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM BECKER RD TO PAAR DR
4317523 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #3 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** BECKER RD
Length: 1.119 **To:** PAAR DR
Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	SU	0	986,768	0	0	0	986,768
ENV	SU	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000
		100,000	986,768				1,086,768

Prior Year Cost: 15,784,271
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 47,015,913
LRTP: Page 8-2

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM PAAR DR TO DARWIN BLVD
4317522 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2020 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES CONSTRUCTION SPLIT OUT TO SEG 5 AND 6 PH43 INCLUDES \$121 TO COVER RECORDING FEES LFA WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: PAAR DR

Length: 1.946

To: DARWIN BLVD

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL, RIGHT OF WAY

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PE	LF	131,977	0	0	0	0	131,977
		131,977					131,977

Prior Year Cost: 15,784,271

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 47,015,913

LRTP: Page 8-2

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BV TO SOUTH OF DARWIN BLVD

4317526 Non-SIS



Prior Year Cost: 15,784,271
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 47,015,913
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2020 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES DESIGN AND RIGHT OF WAY ON 431752-2 56-01 LF UWHCA 62-03 LF FOR CEI FOR UWHCA
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BV
Length: 0.713 **To:** SOUTH OF DARWIN BLVD
Phase Group: CONTRACT INCENTIVES, CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
INC	SU	0	0	125,433	0	0	125,433
CST	LF	28,609	0	0	0	0	28,609
CST	SA	147,789	0	0	0	0	147,789
CST	TRWR	564,217	0	0	0	0	564,217
CST	SA	1,330,101	0	0	0	0	1,330,101
CST	ACSU	1,619,297	0	0	0	0	1,619,297
CST	TRIP	1,962,584	0	0	0	0	1,962,584
RRU	LF	2,104,356	0	0	0	0	2,104,356
CST	SU	5,717,455	0	0	0	0	5,717,455
		13,474,408		125,433			13,599,841

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM SOUTH OF PAAR DR TO SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD
4317525 Non-SIS



Prior Year Cost: 15,784,271
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 47,015,913
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2020 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROM 2 TO 4 LANES DESIGN AND RIGHT OF WAY ON 431752-2 LFA WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE 56-02 LF UWHCA 62-03 LF FOR CEI FOR UWHCA CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 1.076
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES
From: SOUTH OF PAAR DR
To: SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TRWR	0	0	0	494,329	0	494,329
CST	TRIP	0	0	0	2,024,671	92,732	2,117,403
CST	SU	0	0	0	2,609,066	0	2,609,066
CST	LFP	0	0	0	4,645,975	0	4,645,975
CST	CIGP	0	0	0	4,645,975	0	4,645,975
RRU	TRIP	0	0	29,094	0	0	29,094
RRU	SU	0	0	29,095	0	0	29,095
CST	LF	0	0	34,646	0	0	34,646
RRU	LF	0	0	1,807,473	0	0	1,807,473
				1,900,308	14,420,016	92,732	16,413,056

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM W OF SE SHELTER DR TO US-1
4463761 Non-SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 1.543

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: W OF SE SHELTER DR

To: US-1

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	0	94,193	94,193
CST	DDR	0	0	0	308,762	0	308,762
CST	NHRE	0	0	0	2,584,457	0	2,584,457
PE	DIH	18,135	18,135	0	0	0	36,270
PE	DDR	384,028	0	0	0	0	384,028
		402,163	18,135		2,893,219	94,193	3,407,710


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 3,407,710

LRTP: Page 3-9

**PORT ST. LUCIE TSM&O VARIOUS LOCATIONS
4481341 Non-SIS**



Project Description: ITS COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Extra Description: 2021 ST. LUCIE TPO CMP PRIORITY #3, 4 AND 5; INCLUDES INSTALLATION OF FIBER OPTIC CABLE ALONG PRIMA VISTA BLVD FROM AIROSO BLVD TO FLORESTA DR ALONG PRIMA VISTA BLVD FROM FLORESTA DR TO NARANJA AVE AND ALONG PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM TULIP BLVD TO GATLIN BLVD ALSO INCUDES TRAFFIC CAMERAS AND ADAPTIVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROL AT... (SEE WP45)

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 1.182

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	SU	0	0	0	0	310,526	310,526
PE	SU	0	0	5,000	0	0	5,000
				5,000		310,526	315,526

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 315,526

LRTP: Page 8-11

**S 25TH ST FROM N OF EDWARDS RD TO N OF VIRGINIA AVE
4461701 Non-SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 1.024

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: N OF EDWARDS RD

To: N OF VIRGINIA AVE

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	SA	0	0	305,046	0	0	305,046
CST	DDR	0	0	1,863,250	0	0	1,863,250
PE	DIH	27,469	0	0	0	0	27,469
		27,469		2,168,296			2,195,765

Prior Year Cost: 406,768

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,602,533

LRTP: Page 3-9

SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK FROM LENNARD RD TO SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA

4399993 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL FY2017 PD&E PHASE 2; DESIGN ON 439999-1 G/W 439999-2

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: LENNARD RD

Length: 0

To: SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	96,384	0	0	0	96,384
CST	TLWR	0	2,734,883	0	0	0	2,734,883
ROW	DDR	41,458	27,580	0	0	0	69,038
ENV	TLWR	135,000	0	0	0	0	135,000
		176,458	2,858,847				3,035,305

Prior Year Cost: 1,853,652

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 11,496,313

LRTP: Page 8-3

SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP FROM WALTON RD TO LENNARD RD

4399992 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL FY2017 PD&E PHASE 1, DESIGN ON 439999-1 G/W 439999-3

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: WALTON RD

Length: 0

To: LENNARD RD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TLWR	0	6,582,637	0	0	0	6,582,637
CST	DIH	0	24,719	0	0	0	24,719
			6,607,356				6,607,356

Prior Year Cost: 1,853,652

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 11,496,313

LRTP: Page 8-2

SELVITZ RD FROM NORTHWEST FLORESTA DR TO NORTHWEST BAYSHORE BLVD
4460741 Non-SIS



Project Description: BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2020 TPO TAP PRIORITY #1 LAP WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
From: NORTHWEST FLORESTA DR
To: NORTHWEST BAYSHORE BLVD
Length: 0.482
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TALT	0	79,556	0	0	0	79,556
CST	LF	0	103,183	0	0	0	103,183
CST	TALU	0	265,963	0	0	0	265,963
			448,702				448,702

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 453,702
LRTP: Page 8-2

**US-1 @ VIRGINIA AVE
4368681 SIS**




Project Description: ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S)
Extra Description: 2015 TPO #3 SOUTH BOUND RIGHT TURN LANE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:**
Length: 0.071 **To:**
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY
 ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
ROW	DS	157,704	0	0	0	0	157,704
		157,704					157,704

Prior Year Cost: 2,751,519
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,909,223
LRTP: Page 8-2

US-1 FROM EDWARDS RD TO TENNESSEE AVE
4417141 SIS



Project Description: DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS

Extra Description: DRAINAGE/STORM WATER UPGRADES RESURFACING ON PHASE 52-02 INCLUDING: INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT. UPGRADE PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS TO COUNTDOWN AT THE FOLLOWING INTERSECTIONS: EDWARDS RD, EMIL AVE. GARDENIA AVE. AND VIRGINIA AVE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: EDWARDS RD

Length: 1.176

To: TENNESSEE AVE

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES, RIGHT OF WAY, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	0	41,811	41,811
RRU	DS	0	0	0	0	50,000	50,000
CST	NHRE	0	0	0	0	1,956,681	1,956,681
CST	DS	0	0	0	0	7,618,015	7,618,015
ROW	DIH	26,000	150,000	0	0	0	176,000
		26,000	150,000			9,666,507	9,842,507

Prior Year Cost: 1,074,129

Future Year Cost: 43,122

Total Project Cost: 10,959,758

LRTP: Page 3-9

US-1 FROM MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE TO SE PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD
4476521 Non-SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 0.605

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: MARTIN/ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE

To: SE PORT ST LUCIE BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	0	0	58,736	0	58,736
CST	DS	0	0	0	1,857,530	0	1,857,530
PE	DIH	26,339	0	0	0	0	26,339
PE	DS	329,239	0	0	0	0	329,239
		355,578			1,916,266		2,271,844


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,271,844

LRTP: Page 3-9

**US-1 FROM NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE TO NORTH OF AVE O
4461091 SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 2.704

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From: NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE

To: NORTH OF AVE O

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	0	43,615	0	0	0	43,615
CST	NHRE	0	1,473,201	0	0	0	1,473,201
CST	DDR	0	3,516,311	0	0	0	3,516,311
PE	DIH	29,041	0	0	0	0	29,041
PE	DDR	225,950	0	0	0	0	225,950
		254,991	5,033,127				5,288,118

Prior Year Cost: 644,030

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 5,932,148

LRTP: Page 3-9

WALTON RD FROM 800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD RD TO GREEN RIVER PARKWAY

4483081 Non-SIS



Project Description: SIDEWALK

Extra Description: CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALK, ELEVATED PEDESTRIAN BOARDWALK

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From: 800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD RD

To: GREEN RIVER PARKWAY

Length: 0.946

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	TALU	0	0	290,759	0	0	290,759
CST	TALT	0	0	444,371	0	0	444,371
CST	LF	0	0	891,990	0	0	891,990
PE	TALT	5,000	0	0	0	0	5,000
		5,000		1,627,120			1,632,120

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0


Total Project Cost: 1,632,120

LRTP: Page 8-11

C.2 AVIATION

AEROEAST TAXIWAY DEVELOPMENT (CONSTRUCTION)

4481151 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT

From:

AVAILABLE

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	0	0	1,052,000	0	0	1,052,000
CAP	DPTO	0	0	4,201,600	0	0	4,201,600
				5,253,600			5,253,600


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 5,253,600

LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR AERO EAST TAXIWAY (DESIGN)
4480801 Non-SIS**




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000
CAP	DDR	400,000	0	0	0	0	400,000
		500,000					500,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 500,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

FPR AIRFIELD GENERATOR AND TERMINAL GENERATOR (CONSTRUCTION)

4480951 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION SAFETY PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT

From:

AVAILABLE

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	0	90,000	0	0	0	90,000
CAP	DPTO	0	360,000	0	0	0	360,000
			450,000				450,000

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 450,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

FPR AIRFIELD GENERATOR AND TERMINAL GENERATOR (DESIGN)

4480821 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT

From:

AVAILABLE

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	11,000	0	0	0	0	11,000
CAP	DDR	44,000	0	0	0	0	44,000
		55,000					55,000


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 55,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR AIRMANS WAY AIRSIDE DEVELOPMENT
4480931 Non-SIS**




Project Description: AVIATION REVENUE/OPERATIONAL
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	0	112,360	0	0	0	112,360
CAP	DPTO	0	449,440	0	0	0	449,440
		561,800					561,800

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 561,800
LRTP: Page 3-9

FPR CONST PHASE TAXIWAY E REALIGNMENT / TAXIWAY C4 AND C5 DEMOLITION

4480791 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	300,000	0	0	0	0	300,000
CAP	DDR	1,200,000	0	0	0	0	1,200,000
		1,500,000					1,500,000


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,500,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR CONSTRUCT SOUTHSIDE RDWAY EXTENSION
4480781 Non-SIS**




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	60,000	0	0	0	0	60,000
CAP	DPTO	240,000	0	0	0	0	240,000
		300,000					300,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 300,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR EA TAXIWAY E NORTH HANGAR
4459621 Non-SIS**




Project Description: AVIATION ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	80,000	0	0	0	0	80,000
CAP	DPTO	80,000	0	0	0	0	80,000
		160,000					160,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 160,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR RUNWAY 28L ROFA CLEARING
4480941 Non-SIS**



Project Description: AVIATION SAFETY PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:
To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	0	2,160	0	0	0	2,160
CAP	DPTO	0	8,600	0	0	0	8,600
			10,760				10,760


Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 10,760

LRTP: Page 3-9

FPR TAXIWAY E DEMOLITION
4480921 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	0	32,336	0	0	0	32,336
CAP	DPTO	0	129,344	0	0	0	129,344
			161,680				161,680

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 161,680
LRTP: Page 3-9

**FPR TAXIWAY REALIGNMENT PROJECT
4480811 Non-SIS**



Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	232,980	0	0	0	0	232,980
CAP	DDR	931,920	0	0	0	0	931,920
		1,164,900					1,164,900

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,164,900
LRTP: Page 3-9

C.3 TRANSIT PROJECTS

PSL UZA - ST. LUCIE COUNTY SECTION 5307 FORMULA FUNDS

4134941 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 31,354,273

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 43,454,273

LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

Extra Description: FY11 - GRANT FL-90-X727 EXECUTED PER K.SCOTT-ST.LUCIE CO EMAIL FROM J. MELI 10/13/10. GRANT FL90-X765 EXECUTED 10/20/11 \$1,407,322 EMAIL FROM K. SCOTT/SLC 1-11-12 TO J. MELI. ST.LUCIE COUNTY SEC 5307 OPERATING ASSISTANCE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COA

From:

Length: 0

To:

Phase Group: OPERATIONS, CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	FTA	810,000	810,000	810,000	810,000	810,000	4,050,000
CAP	FTA	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000	8,050,000
		2,420,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	12,100,000

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING ASSISTANCE
4071873 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 16,660,838
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 24,596,873
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DDR	0	663,919	693,858	0	0	1,357,777
OPS	DPTO	739,502	80,000	80,000	0	0	899,502
OPS	LF	739,502	783,638	832,024	0	0	2,355,164
		1,479,004	1,527,557	1,605,882			4,612,443

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING ASSISTANCE
4071874 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 16,660,838
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 24,596,873
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	LF	0	0	0	836,751	825,045	1,661,796
OPS	DDR	0	0	0	836,751	825,045	1,661,796
					1,673,502	1,650,090	3,323,592

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY SECTION 5311 OPERATING RURAL FUNDS
4071853 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 2,336,468
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,985,172
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DU	59,919	62,915	62,293	0	0	185,127
OPS	LF	59,919	62,915	62,293	0	0	185,127
		119,838	125,830	124,586			370,254

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY SECTION 5311 OPERATING RURAL FUNDS
4071855 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 2,336,468
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,985,172
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DU	0	0	0	64,026	75,199	139,225
OPS	LF	0	0	0	64,026	75,199	139,225
					128,052	150,398	278,450

ST. LUCIE COUNTY SECTION 5339 CAPITAL FOR BUS & BUS FACILITIES

4345481 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 1,579,114

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,954,114

LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

Extra Description: ST.LUCIE CO. SECTION 5339 CAPITAL FOR BUS & BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM 16.
CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**

Length: 0

To:

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	FTA	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	1,375,000
		275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	1,375,000

C.4 MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

**CITY OF FT. PIERCE JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS ON SHS
4379751 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 283,037
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,823,780
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF FORT PIERCE
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS
From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DITS	101,573	104,315	107,445	110,668	113,988	537,989
OPS	DDR	188,961	194,063	199,845	206,840	213,045	1,002,754
		290,534	298,378	307,290	317,508	327,033	1,540,743

**CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS ON SHS
4379771 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 115,247
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 760,221
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS
From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DDR	37,916	73,190	75,386	77,648	79,978	344,118
OPS	DITS	80,789	48,720	50,182	59,687	61,478	300,856
		118,705	121,910	125,568	137,335	141,456	644,974

**ST. LUCIE - PRIMARY MOWING AND LITTER CONTRACT
2340038 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 2,859,831
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,984,831
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	225,000	225,000	0	0	0	450,000
		225,000	225,000				450,000

**ST. LUCIE - PRIMARY MOWING AND LITTER CONTRACT
2340039 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 2,859,831
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,984,831
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	0	225,000	225,000	225,000	0	675,000
			225,000	225,000	225,000		675,000

ST. LUCIE - PRIMARY MOWING AND LITTER CONTRACT

4480521 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 225,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 0

Phase Group: BRDG/RDWAY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	0	0	0	0	225,000	225,000
						225,000	225,000

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY INTERSTATE-RDWAY
2343761 SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 6,200,718
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,710,718
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWAY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000
		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS ON SHS
4379761 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 189,418
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,220,519
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
OPS	DITS	88,010	90,387	93,099	95,892	98,769	466,157
OPS	DDR	106,662	109,542	112,828	116,213	119,699	564,944
		194,672	199,929	205,927	212,105	218,468	1,031,101

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM RDWAY
2338591 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 57,548,780
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 65,798,780
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	8,000,000
		1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	8,000,000

**TREASURE COAST OPERATIONS- CARPET REPLACEMENT
4468952 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 35,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 55,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY
Extra Description: 55150200-100777-A9-\$20,000 55041010418-FY20/21-242055
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000
		20,000					20,000

C.5 PLANNING PROJECTS

**ST. LUCIE FY 2020/2021-2021/2022 UPWP
4393263 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 3,656,402
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 8,279,411
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #1

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PLN	SU	300,000	0	0	0	0	300,000
PLN	PL	545,333	0	0	0	0	545,333
		845,333					845,333

**ST. LUCIE FY 2022/2023-2023/2024 UPWP
4393264 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 3,656,402
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 8,279,411
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Extra Description: 2021 TPO PRIORITY #1

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PLN	SU	0	400,000	400,000	0	0	800,000
PLN	PL	0	544,419	544,419	0	0	1,088,838
			944,419	944,419			1,888,838

**ST. LUCIE FY 2024/2025-2025/2026 UPWP
4393265 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 3,656,402
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 8,279,411
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PLN	SU	0	0	0	400,000	400,000	800,000
PLN	PL	0	0	0	544,419	544,419	1,088,838
					944,419	944,419	1,888,838

**ST. LUCIE TPO SECTION 5305D TRANSIT PLANNING
4137373 Non-SIS**


Prior Year Cost: 1,766,741
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,484,986
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: PTO STUDIES
Extra Description: TRANSIT PLANNING STUDIES
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE MPO **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PLN	DPTO	13,989	13,849	13,988	14,132	15,867	71,825
PLN	LF	13,989	13,849	13,988	14,132	15,867	71,825
PLN	DU	111,908	110,788	111,905	113,059	126,935	574,595
		139,886	138,486	139,881	141,323	158,669	718,245

C.6 BRIDGE

A1A NORTH BRIDGE OVER ICWW BRIDGE #940045
4299362 Non-SIS



Project Description: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Extra Description: RISK WORKSHOP 32-02

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 1.205

From: ENTIRE BRIDGE

To: ENTIRE BRIDGE

Phase Group: CONTRACT INCENTIVES, RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RAILRD & UTILITIES, P D & E

Prior Year Cost: 22,590,711
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 125,204,255
LRTP: Page 8-3

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
INC	DS	0	0	630,000	0	0	630,000
ROW	SA	0	50,000	0	0	0	50,000
CST	SA	6,064	0	0	0	0	6,064
ROW	BNBR	106,500	0	0	0	0	106,500
CST	DS	123,120	0	0	0	0	123,120
CST	DIH	195,280	0	0	0	0	195,280
CST	ACSA	11,923,171	0	0	0	0	11,923,171
CST	ACBR	14,040,079	0	0	0	0	14,040,079
CST	BNBR	64,140,163	0	0	0	0	64,140,163
ROW	DIH	137,312	0	0	0	0	137,312
RRU	ACBR	500,000	0	0	0	0	500,000
ROW	ACBR	0	4,925,742	5,836,113	0	0	10,761,855
		91,171,689	4,975,742	6,466,113			102,613,544

PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD OVER LONG CREEK & N FORK ST. LUCIE RIVER BRDG
4435951 Non-SIS



Project Description: BRIDGE-REPAIR/REHABILITATION
Extra Description: BRIDGE 940139, 940144, 940140, 940145 SCOUR COUNTERMEASURES
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:**
Length: 0.227 **To:**
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	DIH	47,149	0	0	0	0	47,149
CST	BRRP	919,404	0	0	0	0	919,404
		966,553					966,553

Prior Year Cost: 275,874
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,242,427
LRTP: Page 3-9

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY INTERSTATE BRIDGES
2343762 SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 6,200,718
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,710,718
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Extra Description: PH 70 INCLUDES IN-HOUSE BRIDGE INSPECTIONS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:**
Length: 0 **To:**
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	10,000
		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	10,000

ST. LUCIE COUNTY STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM BRIDGES

2338592 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 57,548,780

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 65,798,780

LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE

Extra Description: PH 70 INCLUDES IN-HOUSE BRIDGE INSPECTIONS

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From:

Length: 0

To:

Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MNT	D	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	250,000
		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	250,000

C.7 TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

**PAINT BRIDGES - TPK MAINLINE OVER GLADES CUT OFF RD (MP 150.7) (940076, 940951)
4385501 SIS**



Project Description: BRIDGE - PAINTING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 0.2

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, RAILRD & UTILITIES, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	PKYR	0	1,140,123	0	0	0	1,140,123
RRU	PKYR	0	150,000	0	0	0	150,000
PE	PKYR	16,328	0	0	0	0	16,328
		16,328	1,290,123				1,306,451

Prior Year Cost: 179,798

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,486,249

LRTP: Page 3-9

**PAINT BRIDGES - TPK MAINLINE OVER RIM DITCH (MP142.2) (940049,940082)
4385511 SIS**



Project Description: BRIDGE - PAINTING
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0.2
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	PKYR	0	669,762	0	0	0	669,762
PE	PKYR	10,028	0	0	0	0	10,028
		10,028	669,762				679,790

Prior Year Cost: 115,040
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 794,830
LRTP: Page 3-9

**PAINT BRIDGES IN ST. LUCIE COUNTY (940050 @ MP 150.5)(940072 @ MP 152.
4354101 SIS**



Project Description: BRIDGE - PAINTING
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 0.132
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	PKYR	0	829,422	0	0	0	829,422
PE	PKYR	38,000	0	0	0	0	38,000
		38,000	829,422				867,422

Prior Year Cost: 182,540
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,049,962
LRTP: Page 3-9

RDSIDE IMPROVEMENT FOR TPK MAINLINE FROM MP 169.3 - 173
4444022 SIS



Project Description: GUARDRAIL
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
Length: 3.7
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, P D & E, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	PKYR	0	0	1,155,925	0	0	1,155,925
				1,155,925			1,155,925

Prior Year Cost: 169,059
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 15,984,838
LRTP: Page 3-9

RESURFACE TPK MAINLINE IN ST. LUCIE COUNTY, MP 169.3 - 173
4444021 SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

Length: 3.7

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

From:

To:

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CST	PKYR	0	0	13,635,854	0	0	13,635,854
PE	PKYR	1,024,000	0	0	0	0	1,024,000
		1,024,000		13,635,854			14,659,854

Prior Year Cost: 169,059

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 15,984,838

LRTP: Page 3-9

WIDEN TPK FROM MARTIN C/L TO BECKER RD (MP138.08-138.5) (4T08)
4463341 SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: MARTIN C/L

Length: 0.404

To: BECKER RD

Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
PE	PKYI	0	0	0	6,330,000	0	6,330,000
					6,330,000		6,330,000

Prior Year Cost: 1,500
Future Year Cost: 51,135,633
Total Project Cost: 57,467,133
LRTP: Page 3-9

C.8 SEAPORT PROJECTS

PORT OF FORT PIERCE TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS
4485361 Non-SIS



Project Description: SEAPORT CAPACITY PROJECT

Extra Description: SEQ 01 UTILITIES

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
CAP	LF	500,000	0	0	0	0	500,000
CAP	PORT	500,000	0	0	0	0	500,000
		1,000,000					1,000,000

Prior Year Cost: 0

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,000,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

D. LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS



2020/21 List of Priority Projects (LOPP) (Adopted August 5, 2020)

Master List

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To					
1	N/A ³	St. Lucie TPO			Planning/administration as detailed in the Unified Planning Work Program	To start in FY 2022/23	N/A	\$400,000	1
2	Yes	Midway Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Selvitz Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ and ROW ⁵ underway	Yes	\$51,710,000 ⁶	3
3	Yes	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Becker Road	Paar Drive	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$16,409,000 ⁶	4
4	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange			New interchange at Midway Road for Florida's Turnpike	Included in PD&E ⁷ for Florida's Turnpike from Jupiter to Fort Pierce	No	\$42,000,000 ⁸	NR ⁹
5	Yes	Kings Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$38,077,000 ⁶	5
6 ¹⁰	Yes	Northern/Airport Connector	Florida's Turnpike	Kings Highway	New multimodal corridor with interchanges at Florida's Turnpike and I-95	Feasibility Study underway	Yes (Northern Connector)	\$122,580,000 ¹¹	6
7 ¹⁰	Yes	Jenkins Road	Midway Road	Orange Avenue	PD&E for project to add 2 and 4 new lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PD&E to start in FY 2024/25	Yes	\$2,135,000 ¹¹	NR

¹Landscape funding eligibility for capacity projects based on 2012 FDOT Landscape Policy

²LRTP: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*

³N/A: Not Applicable

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

⁵ROW: Right-of-Way Acquisition

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: Florida Department of Transportation District 4, July 2020

⁷PD&E: Project Development and Environment Study

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Public Works Department, June 2020

⁹NR: Not Ranked

¹⁰Any funding allocated to this project shall not reduce the funding to be allocated to higher-ranked projects that are not on the State Highway System

¹¹Source of Estimated Cost: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, adopted February 2016, amended October 2, 2019*

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects

(The St. Lucie TPO's allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant funds to CMP projects is \$300,000 - \$400,000 annually)

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Facility/Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source and Priority	2019/20 Priority Ranking
1	Gatlin Boulevard from West of I-95 to Port St. Lucie Boulevard Phase 1	Install traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at I-95, Brescia Street, and Savage Boulevard intersections	To be programmed for construction in FY 2022/23 with funding from FM#444706-1 after its deletion from Work Program.	\$300,000	CMP ² #7	NR ³ (#4 on 2018/19 CMP List)
2	Gatlin Boulevard from West of I-95 to Port St. Lucie Boulevard Phase 2	Install traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at Import Drive, Rosser Boulevard, Savona Boulevard, and Port St. Lucie Boulevard intersections	Programmed for construction in FY 2023/24 (FM#444707-1). Project limits need to be changed.	\$300,000	CMP #7	NR (#4 on 2018/19 CMP List)
3	Prima Vista Boulevard at Floresta Drive Phase 1	Install fiber optic cable along Prima Vista Boulevard from Airoso Boulevard to Floresta Drive and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP#2, ATMS Master Plan ⁴ Phase 2	2
4	Prima Vista Boulevard at Floresta Drive Phase 2	Install fiber optic cable along Prima Vista Boulevard from Floresta Drive to Naranja Avenue and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP #2, ATMS Master Plan Phase 2	2
5	Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Tulip Boulevard to Gatlin Boulevard	Install fiber optic cable along Port St. Lucie Boulevard and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP #8, ATMS Master Plan PSL Phase ⁵	3
6	St. Lucie Transportation Management Center (TMC)	Design, construction, and installation of equipment including communication servers, video displays, and workstations	The design-build of Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan is underway without a TMC.	\$400,000 ⁶	ATMS Master Plan Phase 1	NR
7	Easy Street at US-1	Reconstruct the east leg of the intersection to consist of a narrow, consistent-width median with three lanes westbound and two lanes eastbound merging into the existing Easy Street roadway with the sidewalks extended east from US-1 along both sides of Easy Street to the terminus of the merge	St. Lucie County is conducting public/stakeholder involvement to address FDOT concerns	\$400,000	CMP #1	1

¹Source of Estimated Cost: Local staffs, unless otherwise noted

²CMP: *St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Congestion Management Process Major Update, June 2018*

³NR: Not Ranked

⁴ATMS Master Plan: *Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) Master Plan for St. Lucie County, February 2013*

⁵PSL Phase: City of Port St. Lucie Phase

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: ATMS Master Plan

Transit Projects

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2019/20 Priority Ranking
1	Transit Operations Center	Centralized operation and maintenance facility to serve the transit system fleet.	Capital	Yes	\$14,712,200	1
2	Express Route Bus Service	Continuation of the express bus service linking the Port St. Lucie Intermodal Facility to the Fort Pierce Intermodal Facility along 25th Street to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$800,000	NR ⁴
3	Vehicle Purchases	New/replacement buses as specified in the Transit Asset Management Plan ⁵ .	Capital	Yes	\$1,455,000	3
4	Micro-Transit	Expand the on-demand flex service to augment the fixed-route bus service with first and last mile connectivity to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$325,000 - \$450,000 ⁶	NR
5	Jobs Express Terminal Bus Rapid Transit	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach to provide express commuter services.	Operating	Yes	\$460,500 ⁶	5
6	Expanded Local Services	Improve frequency to 30 minutes on high performing routes.	Operating	Yes	\$800,000	6
7	Bus Route Infrastructure	Miscellaneous locations along the fixed routes with priority at transfer locations.	Capital	Yes	\$200,000 (total for bus shelters)	8

¹LRTP: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*

²TDP: *St. Lucie County FY 2020-FY 2029 Transit Development Plan Major Update, June 2019*

³Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Transit Staff, June 2020, unless otherwise noted

⁴NR: Not Ranked

⁵*Transit Asset Management Plan, June 2017*

⁶*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study, June 2020*

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	48.5	Walton Road	Lennard Road	Green River Parkway	Sidewalk-1.1 miles	2020 TA Grant Application ³ and St. Lucie WBN ⁴	\$1,628,446 ⁵	8
2	66	U.S. Highway 1	Southern Limit of MidFlorida Credit Union Event Center	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Install median landscaping and irrigation	City of Port St. Lucie	\$3,000,000 ⁶	NR
2	66	St. James Drive	Port St. Lucie Northern City Limit	Airosa Boulevard	Install median bio-swales, crosswalks, sidewalk landscaping, and canal trail connections	City of Port St. Lucie	\$2,500,000 ⁶	NR
4	50.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Fort Pierce Downtown Retrofit	Georgia Avenue	North State Route A1A	Install bicycle boulevard, roadway section connections, and railroad crossing improvements	Florida SUN Trail Grant and St. Lucie WBN	TBD ⁷	5
5	46.0	Rosser Boulevard	Openview	Bamberg Street	Sidewalk-2.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$708,889 ⁸	9
5	46.0	Torino Parkway	Cashmere Boulevard	California Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	9
7	44.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Highwayman Trail Gap	Indian Hills Drive	Georgia Avenue	Multi-use trail and roadway section connections	Florida SUN Trail Grant and St. Lucie WBN	TBD	12
7	44.0	Paar Drive	Bamberg Street	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,136,495 ⁸	12
9	43.5	Orange Avenue	Rock Road	North Kings Highway	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$500,000 ⁹	14
10	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,500,000 ⁹	16
10	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk-1.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,650,000 ⁹	16
12	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airosa Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$825,000 ⁸	18
12	42.0	Sandia Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Thornhill Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$323,000 ⁸	18
12	42.0	Sandia Drive	Lakehurst Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$516,000 ⁸	20
12	42.0	North Kings Highway	North of I-95 State Project	Indrio Road	Sidewalk-5.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,219,982 ⁹	20
16	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$225,000 ⁹	22
17	41.0	Savage Boulevard	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,448,383 ⁸	24
17	41.0	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Savage Boulevard	Sidewalk-2.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,405,781 ⁸	24

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
17	41.0	West Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	California Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.6 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,710,000 ⁸	24
17	41.0	Blanton Boulevard	East Torino Parkway	West Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$690,000 ⁸	24
21	40.5	Volucia Drive	Blanton Boulevard	Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-1.0 mile	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	28
21	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-2.6 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$3,050,790 ⁹	28
23	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk-1.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,323,840	30
24	38.0	Emil Avenue	Oleander Avenue	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-1.7 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$347,487	34
25	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,461,595 ⁹	36
26	36.0	17th Street Sidewalk Gaps	Georgia Avenue	Avenue Q	Sidewalk-1.7 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$222,700	37
26	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$123,200	37
26	36.0	North Torino Parkway	East Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$652,000 ⁸	37
29	35.0	29th Street Sidewalk Gaps	Avenue I	Avenue Q	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$77,000	40
29	35.0	29th Street	Avenue Q	Avenue T	Sidewalk-0.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$197,000	40
29	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$575,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$323,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Cadima Street	Fairgreen Road	Galiano Road	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$96,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Fairgreen Road	Cadima Street	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$523,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Galiano Road	Cadima Street	Import Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$290,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Kestor Drive	Darwin Boulevard	Becker Road	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$865,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Volucia Drive	Blanton Boulevard	East Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	40
38	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$445,220	50
39	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk-6.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,300,000 ⁹	51
39	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk-5.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,753,580 ⁹	52
41	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk-3.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,600,000 ⁹	54
42	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk-2.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,250,000 ⁹	55

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
43	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	2019 TA Grant Application and St. Lucie WBN	\$411,836 ¹⁰	2
43	29.5	Fort Pierce Boulevard	Indrio Road	Sebastian Road	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$870,000 ⁹	56
45	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk-5.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$6,066,780 ⁹	57
46	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk-2.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,830,390 ⁹	58
46	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,160,000 ⁹	58
48	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,090,396 ⁹	60
48	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk-2.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,760,790 ⁹	60
50	24.5	Juanita Avenue	Bridge	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,041,592 ⁹	62
50	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 25th Street	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,041,592 ⁹	62
52	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,076,392 ⁹	64
53	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,160,000 ⁹	65

¹Scores are based on the *St. Lucie TPO TA Project Prioritization Methodology*

²Source of Estimated Cost: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*, unless otherwise noted

³Project is anticipated to be programmed for construction in the FDOT FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/26 Work Program as a result of the 2020 TA Grant Cycle

⁴WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁵Source of Estimated Cost: 2020 TA Grant Application, May 2020

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: City of Port St. Lucie

⁷TBD: To be Determined

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: *City of Port St. Lucie Sidewalk Master Plan (Design and Construction), July 2017*

⁹Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Citing FDOT Cost Per Mile @ \$226,656

¹⁰Source of Estimated Cost: 2019 TA Grant Applications

E. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

E. PERFORMANCE AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

E.1 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Even before Federal legislation such as the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act required Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) to implement transportation performance management, the St. Lucie TPO and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) were using performance management to connect investment and policy decisions to help achieve performance goals. Performance measures are quantitative criteria used to evaluate progress toward meeting those goals, and performance measure targets are the benchmarks against which the data collected for the criteria are compared to evaluate the progress. Consistent with MAP-21 and the FAST Act, the St. Lucie TPO conducts performance-based planning, tracks performance measures, and establishes data-driven targets to evaluate the progress.

Performance-based planning ensures the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds by increasing accountability, transparency, and providing for better investment decisions that focus on key outcomes related to the following seven national goals:

- Improving Safety;
- Maintaining Infrastructure Condition;
- Reducing Traffic Congestion;
- Improving the Efficiency of the System and Freight Movement;
- Protecting the Environment; and,
- Reducing Delays in Project Delivery.

According to MAP-21 and the FAST Act, State DOTs are required to establish Statewide performance targets, and MPOs have the option to support the Statewide targets or adopt their own targets. In addition to the Federally-required performance targets, the St. Lucie TPO has established targets for local performance measures in the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) related to local goals. The performance targets adopted to date by the St. Lucie TPO and the FDOT are identified in the TIP/LRTP System Performance Report. The St. Lucie TPO recognizes the FDOT Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Implementation Plan 2020 which demonstrates Florida's progress toward meeting its annual safety performance targets as required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

The TIP reflects the investment priorities established by the St. Lucie TPO in the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP by including projects that support the goals and objectives of the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP. By using the prioritization and project selection process described in Section B.3, the TIP has the anticipated effect of contributing toward the progress in meeting the performance targets. For example, the TPO will make progress toward achieving the adopted performance targets of the Safety Performance Measures by selecting and supporting the implementation of projects which address safety issues such as sidewalk and bicycle lane construction and intersection improvements. Likewise, the TPO will make progress toward achieving performance targets upon adoption in the Florida Freight Mobility and Trade Plan, dated January 2018, by selecting and supporting freight projects in the TPO area which address freight issues such as freight bottlenecks. This anticipated effect and the progress toward meeting the performance targets are confirmed annually by the TIP/LRTP System Performance Report which also demonstrates the linking of the investment priorities to the targets.


The TIP/LRTP System Performance Report is presented as follows:

TIP/LRTP System Performance Report											
SmartMoves 2045 LRTP Goals	SmartMoves 2045 LRTP Objectives	SmartMoves 2045 and/or FAST Act Performance Measures	Federal Requirement	Data		FDOT Performance Target		County Target	St. Lucie TPO Performance Target	Progress Towards Meeting Target	
				2019	2020	2 Year	4 Year				
SUPPORT ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES	Enable the efficient movement of people and goods on the roadway network	% of person miles traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable	✓	100% ⁽¹⁾	100% ⁽¹⁾	75%	70%		70%	+	
		% of person miles traveled on the non Interstate NHS that are Reliable	✓	96.4% ⁽¹⁾	96.8% ⁽¹⁾		50%		50%	+	
		The Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index - the average of the maximum TTTR calculated for each reporting segment on the Interstate	✓	1.28 ⁽¹⁾	1.10 ⁽¹⁾	1.75	2		2	+	
	Optimize the management and operations of the transportation system	TSM&O Strategic Network / ATMS Network Deployment		n/a	34% ⁽²⁾				100%		
	Maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the current transit system and improve access to destinations that support economic growth	% population within ¼ mile of Major Activity Centers (MACs)		10.7% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				16%		
		Transit routes providing access to MACs		7 ⁽⁴⁾	8 ⁽⁴⁾				10	+	
PROVIDE TRAVEL CHOICES	Encourage walking, cycling, and other micromobility options	% of roadways with sidewalks and bike lanes		28% ⁽²⁾	29% ⁽²⁾				43%	+	
		% of transit stops with sidewalk access		89% ⁽²⁾	90% ⁽²⁾				100%	+	
	Improve transit accessibility	Miles of fixed route transit service		174 ⁽⁴⁾	206 ⁽⁴⁾				300	+	
MAINTAIN THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	Maintain condition of existing transportation assets	% of Interstate pavement in good condition	✓	coming soon	coming soon		60%		60%		
		% of Interstate pavement in poor condition	✓	coming soon	coming soon		5%		5%		
		% of non-Interstate National Highway System pavement in good condition	✓	coming soon	coming soon		40%		40%		
		% of non-Interstate National Highway System pavement in poor condition	✓	coming soon	coming soon		5%		5%		
		% of National Highway System bridges classified as in good condition	✓	87.4% ⁽¹⁾	83.4% ⁽¹⁾		50%		50%		
	% of National Highway System bridges classified as in poor condition	✓	0% ⁽¹⁾	0% ⁽¹⁾		10%		10%	+		
	Maintain condition of existing transit assets	Equipment - % of non-revenue, support-service and maintenance vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	✓	0% ⁽⁴⁾	14% ⁽⁴⁾			0%	0%		
		Rolling Stock - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have either met or exceeded their useful life benchmark	✓	0% ⁽⁴⁾	0% ⁽⁴⁾			0%	0%	+	
% of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale		✓	0% ⁽⁴⁾	0% ⁽⁴⁾			0%	0%	+		
PROVIDE EQUITABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY	Support healthy living strategies, programs, and improvements to create more livable communities	Walking modal share		1.5% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase		
		Bike modal share		0.5% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase		
		Transit modal share		0.4% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase		
	Ensure community participation is representative	Opportunities for engagement in traditionally underserved areas		7 ⁽²⁾	7 ⁽²⁾				Maintain or Increase	+	
	Provide for transportation needs of transportation disadvantaged	% of low income, older adults, persons with disabilities within ¼ mile of transit route		26.8% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				30%		
	Make transportation investments that minimize impacts to natural environment and allocate resources toward mitigation	Number of additional roadway lane miles of impacting environmentally sensitive areas		0 ⁽²⁾	0 ⁽²⁾				0		
	Improve transportation system's stability/resiliency in event of climate change, emergencies, or disasters	% of roadway lane miles subject to climate change impacts		0% ⁽⁵⁾	0% ⁽⁵⁾				0%		
IMPROVE SAFETY AND SECURITY	Improve safety and security in the Highway System	Number of fatalities	✓	38 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		35/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
		Fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	✓	1.09 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		1.04/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
		Number of serious injuries	✓	146 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		151/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
		Serious injury rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	✓	4.2 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		4.05/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
	Improve safety and security in the Non-Motorized System	Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries combined		✓	26 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		24/0 ⁽⁷⁾	
		Improve safety and security in the Transit System	Total number of reportable fatalities	✓	n/a	coming soon			0	SupportCounty Target	
	Rate of reportable fatalities per total vehicle revenue miles by mode		✓	n/a	coming soon			0	SupportCounty Target		
	Total number of reportable injuries		✓	n/a	coming soon			2	SupportCounty Target		
	Rate of reportable injuries per total vehicle revenue miles by mode		✓	n/a	coming soon			0.18	SupportCounty Target		
	Total number of reportable safety events		✓	n/a	coming soon			4	SupportCounty Target		
Rate of reportable safety events per total vehicle revenue miles by mode	✓		n/a	coming soon			0.35	SupportCounty Target			
Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode	✓	n/a	coming soon			25,732	SupportCounty Target				

1- FDOT Data; 2 - St. Lucie TPO; 3- ACS 5-year estimates; 4 - St. Lucie County Community Service Department Transit Division; 5 - Results from Florida Sea Level Scenario Sketch Planning Tool, based on NOAA High projections in 2040; 6 - FDOT 5-year rolling average; 7 - Interim Benchmark/Target.

The following graphic further demonstrates how the TIP reflects the investment priorities established in the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP and how those investment priorities are linked to the performance targets in the TIP:

There are 87 projects totaling \$372,031,129. The below graphic illustrates the percentage of projects dedicated to the following goals:



E.2 ASSET MANAGEMENT

MAP-21 and the FAST Act require transit providers to adopt performance targets for transit asset management, also known as “State of Good Repair” targets, in cooperation with the MPOs. The performance targets adopted to date by the St. Lucie TPO and St. Lucie County, which is the local transit provider, are identified in the TIP/LRTP System Performance Report.

In addition, MAP-21 and the FAST Act require the development of a risk-based TAMP for all pavement and bridges on the National Highway System. The initial Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) was completed by FDOT on April 30, 2018. The TAMP will serve as the basis for establishing in future TIPs the targets for the pavement and bridge condition performance measures identified in the TIP/LRTP System Performance Report. The TPO will make progress toward achieving performance targets upon adoption in the TAMP by selecting and supporting asset management projects in the TPO area which address asset management issues such as pavement resurfacing and bridge replacement projects.

The St. Lucie TPO will continue to coordinate with St. Lucie County and FDOT to establish performance targets and meet the other requirements of the Federal performance management process.

E.3 FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES CONSENSUS PLANNING DOCUMENT

In accordance with 23 CFR 450.314(h), the St. Lucie TPO, FDOT, and St. Lucie County (as the provider of public transportation) have agreed upon and developed specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the St. Lucie TPO area, and the collection of data for FDOT's asset management plan for the National Highway System. These provisions are documented as follows:

Purpose and Authority

This document has been cooperatively developed by the FDOT and Florida's 27 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) through the Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC), and, by representation on the MPO boards and committees, the providers of public transportation in the MPO planning areas.

The purpose of the document is to outline the minimum roles of FDOT, the MPOs, and the providers of public transportation in the MPO planning areas to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practicable in satisfying the transportation performance management requirements promulgated by the United States Department of Transportation in Title 23 Parts 450, 490, 625, and 673 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (23 CFR). Specifically:

- 23 CFR 450.314(h)(1) requires that "The MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation shall jointly agree upon and develop specific written procedures for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward achievement of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS)."
- 23 CFR 450.314(h)(2) allows for these provisions to be "Documented in some other means outside the metropolitan planning agreements as determined cooperatively by the MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation."

Section 339.175(11), Florida Statutes creates the MPOAC to "Assist MPOs in carrying out the urbanized area transportation planning process by serving as the principal forum for collective policy discussion pursuant to law" and to "Serve as a clearinghouse for review and comment by MPOs on the Florida Transportation Plan and on other issues required to comply with federal or state law in carrying out the urbanized transportation planning processes." The MPOAC Governing Board membership includes one representative of each MPO in Florida.

This document was developed, adopted, and subsequently updated by joint agreement of the FDOT Secretary and the MPOAC Governing Board. Each MPO will adopt this document by incorporation in its annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or by separate board action as documented in a resolution or meeting minutes, which will serve as documentation of agreement by the MPO and the provider(s) of public transportation in the MPO planning area to carry out their roles and responsibilities as described in this general document.

Roles and Responsibilities

This document describes the general processes through which FDOT, the MPOs, and the providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will cooperatively develop and share information related to transportation performance management.

Email communications will be considered written notice for all portions of this document. Communication with FDOT related to transportation performance management generally will occur through the Administrator for Metropolitan Planning in the Office of Policy Planning. Communications with the MPOAC related to transportation performance management generally will occur through the Executive Director of the MPOAC.

1. Transportation performance data:

- a) FDOT will collect and maintain data, perform calculations of performance metrics and measures, and provide to each MPO the results of the calculations used to develop statewide targets for all applicable federally required performance measures. FDOT also will provide to each MPO the results of calculations for each applicable performance measure for the MPO planning area, and the county or counties included in the MPO planning area. FDOT and the MPOAC agree to use the National Performance Management Research Data Set as the source of travel time data and the defined reporting segments of the Interstate System and non-Interstate National Highway System for the purposes of calculating the travel time-based measures specified in 23 CFR 490.507, 490.607, and 490.707, as applicable.
- b) Each MPO will share with FDOT any locally generated data that pertains to the federally required performance measures, if applicable, such as any supplemental data the MPO uses to develop its own targets for any measure.
- c) Each provider of public transportation is responsible for collecting performance data in the MPO planning area for the transit asset management measures as specified in 49 CFR 625.43 and the public transportation safety measures as specified in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan. The providers of public transportation will provide to FDOT and the appropriate MPO(s) the transit performance data used to support these measures.

2. Selection of performance targets:

FDOT, the MPOs, and providers of public transportation will select their respective performance targets in coordination with one another. Selecting targets generally refers to the processes used to identify, evaluate, and make decisions about potential targets prior to action to formally establish the targets. Coordination will include as many of the following opportunities as deemed appropriate for each measure: in-person meetings, webinars, conferences calls, and email/written communication. Coordination will include timely sharing of information on proposed targets and opportunities to provide comment prior to establishing final comments for each measure.

The primary forum for coordination between FDOT and the MPOs on selecting performance targets and related policy issues is the regular meetings of the MPOAC. The primary forum for coordination between MPOs and providers of public transportation on selecting transit performance targets is the TIP development process.

Once targets are selected, each agency will take action to formally establish the targets in its area of responsibility.

- a) FDOT will select and establish a statewide target for each applicable federally required performance measure.
 - i. To the maximum extent practicable, FDOT will share proposed statewide targets at the MPOAC meeting scheduled in the calendar quarter prior to the dates required for establishing the target under federal rule. FDOT will work through the MPOAC to provide email communication on the proposed targets to the MPOs not in attendance at this meeting. The MPOAC as a whole, and individual MPOs as appropriate, will provide comments to FDOT on the proposed statewide targets within sixty (60) days of the MPOAC meeting. FDOT will provide an update to the MPOAC at its subsequent meeting on the final proposed targets, how the comments received from the MPOAC and any individual MPOs were considered, and the anticipated date when FDOT will establish final targets.
 - ii. FDOT will provide written notice to the MPOAC and individual MPOs within two (2) business days of when FDOT establishes final targets. This notice will provide the relevant targets and the date FDOT established the targets, which will begin the 180-day time-period during which each MPO must establish the corresponding performance targets for its planning area.
- b) Each MPO will select and establish a target for each applicable federally required performance measure. To the extent practicable, MPOs will propose, seek comment on, and establish their targets through existing processes such as the annual TIP update. For each performance measure, an MPO will have the option of either:
 - i. Choosing to support the statewide target established by FDOT, and providing documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) to FDOT that the MPO agrees to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishments of FDOT's statewide targets for that performance measure.
 - ii. Choosing to establish its own target, using a quantifiable methodology for its MPO planning area. If the MPO chooses to establish its own target, the MPO will coordinate with FDOT and, as applicable, providers of public transportation regarding the approach used to develop the target and the proposed target prior establishment of a final target. The MPO will provide FDOT and, as applicable, providers of public transportation, documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) that includes the final targets and the date when the targets were established.
- c) The providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will select and establish performance targets annually to meet the federal performance management requirements for transit asset management and transit safety under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d).
 - i. The Tier I providers of public transportation will establish performance targets to meet the federal performance management requirements for transit asset management. Each Tier I provider will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when it establishes targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date when the targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit-related performance targets. MPOs may choose

to update their targets when the Tier I provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).

- ii. FDOT is the sponsor of a Group Transit Asset Management plan for subrecipients of Section 5311 and 5310 grant funds. The Tier II providers of public transportation may choose to participate in FDOT's group plan or to establish their own targets. FDOT will notify MPOs and those participating Tier II providers following of establishment of transit-related targets. Each Tier II provider will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when it establishes targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date the final targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit-related performance targets. MPOs may choose to update their targets when the Tier II provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).
- iii. FDOT will draft and certify a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan for any small public transportation providers (defined as those who are recipients or subrecipients of federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5307, have one hundred (100) or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service, and do not operate a rail fixed guideway public transportation system). FDOT will coordinate with small public transportation providers on selecting statewide public transportation safety performance targets, with the exception of any small operator that notifies FDOT that it will draft its own plan.
- iv. All other public transportation service providers that receive funding under 49 U.S. Code Chapter 53 (excluding sole recipients of sections 5310 and/or 5311 funds) will provide written notice to the appropriate MPO and FDOT when they establish public transportation safety performance targets. This notice will provide the final targets and the date the final targets were established, which will begin the 180-day period within which the MPO must establish its transit safety performance targets. MPOs may choose to update their targets when the provider(s) updates theirs, or when the MPO amends its long-range transportation plan by extending the horizon year in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(c).
- v. If the MPO chooses to support the asset management and safety targets established by the provider of public transportation, the MPO will provide to FDOT and the provider of public transportation documentation that the MPO agrees to plan and program MPO projects so that they contribute toward achievement of the statewide or public transportation provider targets. If the MPO chooses to establish its own targets, the MPO will develop the target in coordination with FDOT and the providers of public transportation. The MPO will provide FDOT and the providers of public transportation documentation (typically in the form of meeting minutes, a letter, a resolution, or incorporation in a document such as the TIP) that includes the final targets and the date the final targets were established. In cases where two or more providers operate in an MPO planning area and establish different targets for a given measure, the MPO has the options of coordinating with the providers to establish a single target for the MPO planning area, or establishing a set of targets for the MPO planning area.

3. Reporting performance targets:

- a) Reporting targets generally refers to the process used to report targets, progress achieved in meeting targets, and the linkage between targets and decision making processes FDOT will report its final statewide performance targets to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as mandated by the federal requirements.

- i. FDOT will include in future updates or amendments of the statewide long-range transportation plan a description of all applicable performance measures and targets and a system performance report, including progress achieved in meeting the performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.216(f).
 - ii. FDOT will include in future updates or amendments of the statewide transportation improvement program a discussion of the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving the state's performance targets, linking investment priorities to those performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.218 (q).
 - iii. FDOT will report targets and performance data for each applicable highway performance measure to FHWA, in accordance with the reporting timelines and requirements established by 23 CFR 490; and for each applicable public transit measure to FTA, in accordance with the reporting timelines and requirements established by 49 CFR 625 and 40 CFR 673.
 - b) Each MPO will report its final performance targets as mandated by federal requirements to FDOT. To the extent practicable, MPOs will report final targets through the TIP update or other existing documents.
 - i. Each MPO will include in future updates or amendments of its metropolitan long- range transportation plan a description of all applicable performance measures and targets and a system performance report, including progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(f)(3-4).
 - ii. Each MPO will include in future updates or amendments of its TIP a discussion of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the applicable performance targets, linking investment priorities to those performance targets, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.326(d).
 - iii. Each MPO will report target-related status information to FDOT upon request to support FDOT's reporting requirements to FHWA.
 - c) Providers of public transportation in MPO planning areas will report all established transit asset management targets to the FTA National Transit Database (NTD) consistent with FTA's deadlines based upon the provider's fiscal year and in accordance with 49 CFR Parts 625 and 630, and 49 CFR Part 673.
4. Reporting performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of performance targets for the MPO planning area:
- a) FDOT will report to FHWA or FTA as designated, and share with each MPO and provider of public transportation, transportation performance for the state showing the progress being made towards attainment of each target established by FDOT, in a format to be mutually agreed upon by FDOT and the MPOAC.
 - b) If an MPO establishes its own targets, the MPO will report to FDOT on an annual basis transportation performance for the MPO area showing the progress being made towards attainment of each target established by the MPO, in a format to be mutually agreed upon by FDOT and the MPOAC. To the extent practicable, MPOs will report progress through existing processes including, but not limited to, the annual TIP update.

- c) Each provider of public transportation will report transit performance annually to the MPO(s) covering the provider's service area, showing the progress made toward attainment of each target established by the provider.
5. Collection of data for the State asset management plans for the National Highway System (NHS):
- a) FDOT will be responsible for collecting bridge and pavement condition data for the State asset management plan for the NHS. This includes NHS roads that are not on the State highway system but instead are under the ownership of local jurisdictions, if such roads exist.



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 9d

Item Title: 2021/22 List of Priority Projects (LOPP)

Item Origination: Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

UPWP Reference: Task 3.3 – Transportation Improvement Program

Requested Action: Adopt the draft 2021/22 LOPP, adopt with conditions, or do not adopt.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the projects in the draft 2021/22 LOPP are consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP and are prioritized in accordance with the adopted prioritization methodologies, it is recommended that the draft 2021/22 LOPP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board with the condition that the Easy Street Sidewalk Project is advanced from #37 to #2 on the TA Projects List.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Draft 2021/22 LOPP
- 2020/21 LOPP



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

FROM: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

DATE: May 25, 2021

SUBJECT: 2021/22 List of Priority Projects (LOPP)

BACKGROUND

As part of the annual development of the St. Lucie TPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the LOPP is developed for submittal to the Florida Department of Transportation District 4 (FDOT) for the allocation of funding to projects that are or will be programmed in the TIP. The projects identified in the LOPP subsequently are funded and included in the FDOT Work Program to the maximum extent feasible. The St. Lucie TPO's TIP for FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 then will be developed based on the LOPP and the FDOT Work Program.

To assist in developing the LOPP, an Informal Priority Projects Meeting was conducted with FDOT and local agency staffs on May 7th to receive the latest information on the TPO Priority Projects. This year, the LOPP is required to be submitted to FDOT by August 1st.

ANALYSIS

The draft 2021/22 LOPP is attached. The revisions to the draft 2021/22 LOPP as compared to the 2020/21 LOPP, which also is attached, are summarized in the following.

Master List: The Project Status/Notes were updated based on the FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP, and the Estimated Costs were updated based on the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (SmartMoves 2045 LRTP).

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects: The CMP Projects that were programmed in the FY 2021/22 – FY 2025/26 TIP were removed from the list, and three new projects from Phase 2 of the Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) Master Plan and the Congestion Management Process Major Update were added to the bottom of the list. The new projects consist of connecting and adding adaptive control to the traffic signals along Orange Avenue from US-1 to Kings Highway and along Midway Road from US-1 to Selvitz Road and constructing needed improvements to the intersection of Gatlin and Savona Boulevards.

Transit Projects: The Estimated Costs were updated based on information received from St. Lucie County Transit Staff.

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects: This list was updated to reflect the results of the 2021 TA grant cycle which prioritized the Kestor Drive Sidewalk Project, to remove projects programmed for construction with local funds based on input from local agency staffs, and to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP.

At their meetings during the week of May 17th, the TPO Advisory Committees recommended the adoption of the draft 2021/22 LOPP with the following conditions:

Committee	Condition(s)
Citizens Advisory Committee	Congestion on St. Lucie West Boulevard is addressed Easy Street Sidewalk Project is advanced from #37 to #2 on the TA Projects List Angle Road Sidewalk Project is advanced from #19 to #3 on the TA Projects List
Technical Advisory Committee	Easy Street Sidewalk Project is advanced from #37 to #2 on the TA Projects List
Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee	None

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the recommendations of the TPO Advisory Committees and because the projects in the draft 2021/22 LOPP are consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP and are prioritized in accordance with the adopted prioritization methodologies, it is recommended that the draft 2021/22 LOPP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board with the condition that the Easy Street Sidewalk Project is advanced from #37 to #2 on the TA Projects List.



DRAFT
2021/22 List of Priority Projects (LOPP)
(Adopted _____)

Master List

2021/22 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2020/21 Priority Ranking
			From	To					
1	N/A ³	St. Lucie TPO			Planning/administration as detailed in the Unified Planning Work Program		Yes	\$400,000	1
2	Yes	Midway Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Selvitz Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ underway, ROW ⁵ to start in FY 21/22, construction from Jenkins Road to Selvitz Road to start in FY 25/26	Yes	\$51,710,000 ⁶	2
3	Yes	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Becker Road	Paar Drive	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$16,409,000 ⁶	3
4	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange			New interchange at Midway Road for Florida's Turnpike		Yes	\$42,000,000 ⁷	4
5	Yes	Kings Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway	Yes	\$38,077,000 ⁶	5
6	Yes	Northern/Airport Connector	Florida's Turnpike	Kings Highway	New multimodal corridor with interchanges at Florida's Turnpike and I-95		Yes	\$137,110,000 ⁸	6
7	Yes	Jenkins Road	Midway Road	Orange Avenue	Add 2 lanes to existing segments, construct 4 lanes for new segments, and add sidewalks and bicycle lanes	PD&E ⁹ to start in FY 2024/25	Yes	\$51,890,000 ⁸	7

¹Landscape funding eligibility for capacity projects based on 2012 FDOT Landscape Policy

²LRTP: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

³N/A: Not Applicable

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

⁵ROW: Right-of-Way Acquisition

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: Florida Department of Transportation District 4, July 2020

⁷Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Public Works Department, June 2020

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

⁹PD&E: Project Development and Environment Study

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects

(The St. Lucie TPO's allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant funds to CMP projects is \$300,000 - \$400,000 annually)

2021/22 Priority Ranking	Facility/Segment or Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source	2020/21 Priority Ranking
1	St. Lucie Transportation Management Center (TMC)	Design, construction, and installation of equipment including communication servers, video displays, and workstations that was originally included in Phase 1 of the ATMS Master Plan ²	The design-build of Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan is underway without a TMC	\$400,000	ATMS Master Plan	6
2	Easy Street at US-1	Reconstruct the east leg of the intersection to consist of a narrow, consistent-width median with three lanes westbound and two lanes eastbound merging into the existing Easy Street roadway with the sidewalks extended east from US-1 along both sides of Easy Street to the terminus of the merge	Subject to St. Lucie County conducting public/stakeholder involvement to address FDOT concerns	\$400,000	CMP ³	7
3	Orange Avenue and South 7th Street (ATMS Master Plan Phase 2A)	Install fiber optic cable along Orange Avenue from US-1 to Kings Highway and along South 7th Street from Orange Avenue to Avenue A and traffic cameras/video detectors and adaptive signal control at the signalized intersections		\$700,000	ATMS Master Plan	NR ⁴
4	Midway Road (ATMS Master Plan Phase 2B)	Install fiber optic cable along Midway Road from US-1 to Selvitz Road and traffic cameras/video detectors and adaptive signal control at the signalized intersections		\$300,000	ATMS Master Plan	NR
5	Gatlin Boulevard at Savona Boulevard	Extend eastbound and westbound left turn lanes on Gatlin Boulevard and install dedicated northbound and southbound right turn lanes on Savona Boulevard	Right-of-way acquisition is not anticipated to be needed	\$750,000 ⁵	CMP	NR

¹Source of Estimated Cost is from the Project Source unless otherwise noted

²ATMS Master Plan: *Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) Master Plan for St. Lucie County*, February 2013

³CMP: *St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Congestion Management Process Major Update*, June 2018

⁴NR: Not Ranked

⁵Source of Estimated Cost: City of Port St. Lucie

Transit Projects

2021/22 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2020/21 Priority Ranking
1	Transit Operations Center	Centralized operation and maintenance facility to serve the transit system fleet.	Capital	Yes	\$15,453,566	1
2	Express Route Bus Service	Continuation of the express bus service linking the Port St. Lucie Intermodal Facility to the Fort Pierce Intermodal Facility along 25th Street to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$800,000	2
3	Vehicle Purchases	New/replacement buses as specified in the Transit Asset Management Plan ⁴ .	Capital	Yes	\$1,455,000	3
4	Micro-Transit	Expand the on-demand flex service to augment the fixed-route bus service with first and last mile connectivity to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$325,000 - \$450,000 ⁵	4
5	Jobs Express Terminal Bus Rapid Transit	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach to provide express commuter services.	Operating	Yes	\$460,500 ⁵	5
6	Expanded Local Services	Improve frequency to 30 minutes on high performing routes.	Operating	Yes	\$800,000	6
7	Bus Route Infrastructure	Miscellaneous locations along the fixed routes with priority at transfer locations.	Capital	Yes	\$200,000 (total for bus shelters)	7

¹LRTP: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

²TDP: *Bus Plus, St. Lucie County FY 2020-FY 2029 Transit Development Plan Major Update*, June 2019

³Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Transit Staff, May 2021, unless otherwise noted

⁴*Transit Asset Management Plan*, June 2017

⁵*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study*, June 2020

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2021/22 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2020/21 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	35.0	Kestor Drive	Darwin Boulevard	Becker Road	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	2021 TA Grant Application ³ and 2045 LRTP	\$953,917 ⁴	40
2	50.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Fort Pierce Downtown Retrofit	Georgia Avenue	North State Route A1A	Bicycle Boulevard, Roadway Section Connections, and Railroad Crossing Improvements	TIP, Florida SUN Trail Grant, and St. Lucie WBN ⁵	TBD ⁶	5
3	46.0	Rosser Boulevard	Openview	Daemon Street	Sidewalk-2.1 miles		\$708,889 ⁷	9
4	44.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Highwayman Trail Gap	Indian Hills Drive	Georgia Avenue	Multi-use trail and roadway section connections	TIP, Florida SUN Trail Grant and St. Lucie WBN	TBD	12
4	44.0	Paar Drive	Daemon Street	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles		\$1,136,495 ⁷	12
6	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk-1.3 miles		\$1,500,000 ⁸	16
6	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk-1.4 miles		\$1,650,000 ⁸	16
8	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airoso Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles		\$825,000 ⁷	18
8	42.0	Sandia Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Thornhill Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles		\$323,000 ⁷	18
8	42.0	Sandia Drive	Lakehurst Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles		\$516,000 ⁷	20
11	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk-0.2 miles		\$225,000 ⁸	22
12	41.0	Savage Boulevard	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.8 miles		\$1,448,383 ⁷	24
12	41.0	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Savage Boulevard	Sidewalk-2.3 miles		\$1,405,781 ⁷	24
12	41.0	West Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	California Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.6 miles		\$1,710,000 ⁷	24
12	41.0	Blanton Boulevard	East Torino Parkway	West Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-0.5 miles		\$690,000 ⁷	24
16	40.5	Volucia Drive	Blanton Boulevard	Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-1.0 mile		\$645,000 ⁷	28
16	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-2.6 miles		\$3,050,790 ⁸	28
18	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk-1.5 miles		\$1,323,840	30
19	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk-1.3 miles		\$1,461,595 ⁸	36
20	36.0	17th Street	Georgia Avenue	Delaware Avenue	Sidewalk-0.3 miles		\$74,268	37
20	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk-0.8 miles		\$123,200	37

2021/22 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2020/21 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
20	36.0	North Torino Parkway	East Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$652,000 ⁷	37
23	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles		\$575,000 ⁷	40
23	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles		\$323,000 ⁷	40
23	35.0	Cadima Street	Fairgreen Road	Galiano Road	Sidewalk-0.2 miles		\$96,000 ⁷	40
23	35.0	Fairgreen Road	Cadima Street	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles		\$523,000 ⁷	40
23	35.0	Galiano Road	Cadima Street	Import Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles		\$290,000 ⁷	40
28	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk-0.5 miles		\$445,220	50
29	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk-6.1 miles		\$5,300,000 ⁸	51
29	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk-5.0 miles		\$5,753,580 ⁸	52
31	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk-3.0 miles		\$2,600,000 ⁸	54
32	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk-2.8 miles		\$2,250,000 ⁸	55
33	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	2019 TA Grant Application and 2045 L RTP	\$411,836 ⁸	2
34	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk-5.2 miles		\$6,066,780 ⁸	57
35	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk-2.4 miles		\$2,830,390 ⁸	58
35	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁸	58
37	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,090,396 ⁸	60
37	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	South of Devine Road	Sidewalk-1.8 miles		\$562,202	60
39	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 41st Street	Sidewalk-1.3 miles		\$393,004	62
40	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk-1.8 miles		\$2,076,392 ⁸	64
41	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁸	65

¹Scores are based on the *St. Lucie TPO TA Project Prioritization Methodology*

²Project Source and Source of Estimated Cost: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021 (2045 L RTP), unless otherwise noted

³Project is anticipated to be programmed for construction in the FDOT FY 2022/23 - FY 2026/27 Work Program as a result of the 2021 TA Grant Cycle

⁴Source of Estimated Cost: 2021 TA Grant Application, February 2021

⁵WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁶TBD: To be Determined

⁷Source of Estimated Cost: *City of Port St. Lucie Sidewalk Master Plan (Design and Construction)*, July 2017

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Citing FDOT Cost Per Mile @ \$226,656

⁹Source of Estimated Cost: 2019 TA Grant Application



2020/21 List of Priority Projects (LOPP) (Adopted August 5, 2020)

Master List

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To					
1	N/A ³	St. Lucie TPO			Planning/administration as detailed in the Unified Planning Work Program	To start in FY 2022/23	N/A	\$400,000	1
2	Yes	Midway Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Selvitz Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ and ROW ⁵ underway	Yes	\$51,710,000 ⁶	3
3	Yes	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Becker Road	Paar Drive	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$16,409,000 ⁶	4
4	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange			New interchange at Midway Road for Florida's Turnpike	Included in PD&E ⁷ for Florida's Turnpike from Jupiter to Fort Pierce	No	\$42,000,000 ⁸	NR ⁹
5	Yes	Kings Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$38,077,000 ⁶	5
6 ¹⁰	Yes	Northern/Airport Connector	Florida's Turnpike	Kings Highway	New multimodal corridor with interchanges at Florida's Turnpike and I-95	Feasibility Study underway	Yes (Northern Connector)	\$122,580,000 ¹¹	6
7 ¹⁰	Yes	Jenkins Road	Midway Road	Orange Avenue	PD&E for project to add 2 and 4 new lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PD&E to start in FY 2024/25	Yes	\$2,135,000 ¹¹	NR

¹Landscape funding eligibility for capacity projects based on 2012 FDOT Landscape Policy

²LRTP: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*

³N/A: Not Applicable

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

⁵ROW: Right-of-Way Acquisition

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: Florida Department of Transportation District 4, July 2020

⁷PD&E: Project Development and Environment Study

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Public Works Department, June 2020

⁹NR: Not Ranked

¹⁰Any funding allocated to this project shall not reduce the funding to be allocated to higher-ranked projects that are not on the State Highway System

¹¹Source of Estimated Cost: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, adopted February 2016, amended October 2, 2019*

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects

(The St. Lucie TPO's allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant funds to CMP projects is \$300,000 - \$400,000 annually)

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Facility/Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source and Priority	2019/20 Priority Ranking
1	Gatlin Boulevard from West of I-95 to Port St. Lucie Boulevard Phase 1	Install traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at I-95, Brescia Street, and Savage Boulevard intersections	To be programmed for construction in FY 2022/23 with funding from FM#444706-1 after its deletion from Work Program.	\$300,000	CMP ² #7	NR ³ (#4 on 2018/19 CMP List)
2	Gatlin Boulevard from West of I-95 to Port St. Lucie Boulevard Phase 2	Install traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at Import Drive, Rosser Boulevard, Savona Boulevard, and Port St. Lucie Boulevard intersections	Programmed for construction in FY 2023/24 (FM#444707-1). Project limits need to be changed.	\$300,000	CMP #7	NR (#4 on 2018/19 CMP List)
3	Prima Vista Boulevard at Floresta Drive Phase 1	Install fiber optic cable along Prima Vista Boulevard from Airoso Boulevard to Floresta Drive and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP#2, ATMS Master Plan ⁴ Phase 2	2
4	Prima Vista Boulevard at Floresta Drive Phase 2	Install fiber optic cable along Prima Vista Boulevard from Floresta Drive to Naranja Avenue and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP #2, ATMS Master Plan Phase 2	2
5	Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Tulip Boulevard to Gatlin Boulevard	Install fiber optic cable along Port St. Lucie Boulevard and traffic cameras and adaptive traffic signal control at signalized intersections		\$400,000	CMP #8, ATMS Master Plan PSL Phase ⁵	3
6	St. Lucie Transportation Management Center (TMC)	Design, construction, and installation of equipment including communication servers, video displays, and workstations	The design-build of Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan is underway without a TMC.	\$400,000 ⁶	ATMS Master Plan Phase 1	NR
7	Easy Street at US-1	Reconstruct the east leg of the intersection to consist of a narrow, consistent-width median with three lanes westbound and two lanes eastbound merging into the existing Easy Street roadway with the sidewalks extended east from US-1 along both sides of Easy Street to the terminus of the merge	St. Lucie County is conducting public/stakeholder involvement to address FDOT concerns	\$400,000	CMP #1	1

¹Source of Estimated Cost: Local staffs, unless otherwise noted

²CMP: *St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Congestion Management Process Major Update, June 2018*

³NR: Not Ranked

⁴ATMS Master Plan: *Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) Master Plan for St. Lucie County, February 2013*

⁵PSL Phase: City of Port St. Lucie Phase

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: ATMS Master Plan

Transit Projects

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2019/20 Priority Ranking
1	Transit Operations Center	Centralized operation and maintenance facility to serve the transit system fleet.	Capital	Yes	\$14,712,200	1
2	Express Route Bus Service	Continuation of the express bus service linking the Port St. Lucie Intermodal Facility to the Fort Pierce Intermodal Facility along 25th Street to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$800,000	NR ⁴
3	Vehicle Purchases	New/replacement buses as specified in the Transit Asset Management Plan ⁵ .	Capital	Yes	\$1,455,000	3
4	Micro-Transit	Expand the on-demand flex service to augment the fixed-route bus service with first and last mile connectivity to sustain the existing service levels beyond the current FDOT Service Development Grant life of three years.	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$325,000 - \$450,000 ⁶	NR
5	Jobs Express Terminal Bus Rapid Transit	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach to provide express commuter services.	Operating	Yes	\$460,500 ⁶	5
6	Expanded Local Services	Improve frequency to 30 minutes on high performing routes.	Operating	Yes	\$800,000	6
7	Bus Route Infrastructure	Miscellaneous locations along the fixed routes with priority at transfer locations.	Capital	Yes	\$200,000 (total for bus shelters)	8

¹LRTP: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*

²TDP: *St. Lucie County FY 2020-FY 2029 Transit Development Plan Major Update, June 2019*

³Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Transit Staff, June 2020, unless otherwise noted

⁴NR: Not Ranked

⁵*Transit Asset Management Plan, June 2017*

⁶*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study, June 2020*

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	48.5	Walton Road	Lennard Road	Green River Parkway	Sidewalk-1.1 miles	2020 TA Grant Application ³ and St. Lucie WBN ⁴	\$1,628,446 ⁵	8
2	66	U.S. Highway 1	Southern Limit of MidFlorida Credit Union Event Center	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Install median landscaping and irrigation	City of Port St. Lucie	\$3,000,000 ⁶	NR
2	66	St. James Drive	Port St. Lucie Northern City Limit	Airosa Boulevard	Install median bio-swales, crosswalks, sidewalk landscaping, and canal trail connections	City of Port St. Lucie	\$2,500,000 ⁶	NR
4	50.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Fort Pierce Downtown Retrofit	Georgia Avenue	North State Route A1A	Install bicycle boulevard, roadway section connections, and railroad crossing improvements	Florida SUN Trail Grant and St. Lucie WBN	TBD ⁷	5
5	46.0	Rosser Boulevard	Openview	Bamberg Street	Sidewalk-2.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$708,889 ⁸	9
5	46.0	Torino Parkway	Cashmere Boulevard	California Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	9
7	44.0	Florida SUN Trail, Historic Highwayman Trail Gap	Indian Hills Drive	Georgia Avenue	Multi-use trail and roadway section connections	Florida SUN Trail Grant and St. Lucie WBN	TBD	12
7	44.0	Paar Drive	Bamberg Street	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,136,495 ⁸	12
9	43.5	Orange Avenue	Rock Road	North Kings Highway	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$500,000 ⁹	14
10	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,500,000 ⁹	16
10	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk-1.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,650,000 ⁹	16
12	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airosa Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$825,000 ⁸	18
12	42.0	Sandia Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Thornhill Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$323,000 ⁸	18
12	42.0	Sandia Drive	Lakehurst Drive	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$516,000 ⁸	20
12	42.0	North Kings Highway	North of I-95 State Project	Indrio Road	Sidewalk-5.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,219,982 ⁹	20
16	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$225,000 ⁹	22
17	41.0	Savage Boulevard	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,448,383 ⁸	24
17	41.0	Import Drive	Gatlin Boulevard	Savage Boulevard	Sidewalk-2.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,405,781 ⁸	24

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
17	41.0	West Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	California Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.6 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,710,000 ⁸	24
17	41.0	Blanton Boulevard	East Torino Parkway	West Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$690,000 ⁸	24
21	40.5	Volucia Drive	Blanton Boulevard	Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-1.0 mile	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	28
21	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-2.6 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$3,050,790 ⁹	28
23	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk-1.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,323,840	30
24	38.0	Emil Avenue	Oleander Avenue	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-1.7 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$347,487	34
25	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,461,595 ⁹	36
26	36.0	17th Street Sidewalk Gaps	Georgia Avenue	Avenue Q	Sidewalk-1.7 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$222,700	37
26	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$123,200	37
26	36.0	North Torino Parkway	East Torino Parkway	Blanton Road	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$652,000 ⁸	37
29	35.0	29th Street Sidewalk Gaps	Avenue I	Avenue Q	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$77,000	40
29	35.0	29th Street	Avenue Q	Avenue T	Sidewalk-0.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$197,000	40
29	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.9 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$575,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$323,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Cadima Street	Fairgreen Road	Galiano Road	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$96,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Fairgreen Road	Cadima Street	Crosstown Parkway	Sidewalk-0.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$523,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Galiano Road	Cadima Street	Import Drive	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$290,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Kestor Drive	Darwin Boulevard	Becker Road	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$865,000 ⁸	40
29	35.0	Volucia Drive	Blanton Boulevard	East Torino Parkway	Sidewalk-1.3 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$645,000 ⁸	40
38	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$445,220	50
39	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk-6.1 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,300,000 ⁹	51
39	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk-5.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$5,753,580 ⁹	52
41	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk-3.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,600,000 ⁹	54
42	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk-2.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,250,000 ⁹	55

2020/21 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source	Estimated Cost ²	2019/20 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
43	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk-0.5 miles	2019 TA Grant Application and St. Lucie WBN	\$411,836 ¹⁰	2
43	29.5	Fort Pierce Boulevard	Indrio Road	Sebastian Road	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$870,000 ⁹	56
45	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk-5.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$6,066,780 ⁹	57
46	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk-2.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,830,390 ⁹	58
46	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,160,000 ⁹	58
48	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,090,396 ⁹	60
48	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk-2.4 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,760,790 ⁹	60
50	24.5	Juanita Avenue	Bridge	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk-0.2 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,041,592 ⁹	62
50	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 25th Street	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,041,592 ⁹	62
52	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk-1.8 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$2,076,392 ⁹	64
53	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk-1.0 miles	St. Lucie WBN	\$1,160,000 ⁹	65

¹Scores are based on the *St. Lucie TPO TA Project Prioritization Methodology*

²Source of Estimated Cost: *Go2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, February 2016*, unless otherwise noted

³Project is anticipated to be programmed for construction in the FDOT FY 2021/22 - FY 2025/26 Work Program as a result of the 2020 TA Grant Cycle

⁴WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁵Source of Estimated Cost: 2020 TA Grant Application, May 2020

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: City of Port St. Lucie

⁷TBD: To be Determined

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: *City of Port St. Lucie Sidewalk Master Plan (Design and Construction), July 2017*

⁹Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Citing FDOT Cost Per Mile @ \$226,656

¹⁰Source of Estimated Cost: 2019 TA Grant Applications



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee: St. Lucie TPO Board

Meeting Date: June 2, 2021

Item Number: 10a

Item Title: Transit Representation on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB)

Item Origination: St. Lucie TPO Board

UPWP Reference: Task 1.1 - Program Management

Requested Action: Discuss and provide comments to Staff.

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended that the proposed transit representation on the TAC and LCB is discussed, and comments are provided to Staff.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Proposed Revision to the TAC By-Laws, Rules, and Procedures
- Rule 41-2.012 of the Florida Administrative Code



Coco Vista Centre
466 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd, Suite 111
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953
772-462-1593 www.stlucietpo.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: St. Lucie TPO Board

FROM: Peter Buchwald
Executive Director

DATE: May 25, 2021

SUBJECT: Transit Representation on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB)

BACKGROUND

Until July 2020, St. Lucie County contracted with the Council On Aging of St. Lucie, Inc. (COASL) to operate the public transportation system in St. Lucie County through COASL's Community Transit division. As the transit operator, COASL/Community Transit has served as members on the TPO Board, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the St. Lucie Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged (LCB). Effective July 1, 2020, MV Transportation, Inc. (MV) assumed the contract for the fixed-route and demand-response portions of the County's public transportation system necessitating a review of the transit representation on the TPO Boards and Advisory Committees.

This review was initiated at the TPO Executive Committee on July 30, 2020, and continued at the TPO Board Meetings on August 5, 2020, and October 7, 2020, when the Board approved a proposed plan in which the COASL/Community Transit would maintain its existing memberships on the Board, TAC, and LCB; MV would be added as a voting member to the TAC and LCB after July 1, 2021; the Census-related review of the TPO Board's composition would be initiated in July 2022; and any resulting amendments to the TPO Creation Agreement would be adopted by July 2023.

The TPO Staff and Attorney have completed additional reviews of the transit representation and membership on the TPO Boards and Advisory Committees and have identified several potential issues with the approved plan. Because of these potential issues, a revised plan is proposed to

address the transit representation and membership on the TPO Boards and Advisory Committees.

ANALYSIS

The TAC membership currently includes "St. Lucie County Transit Management" and "Community Transit". To minimize any potential conflicts among the membership and ensure the independence of the members in the performance of their duties and responsibilities, it is proposed to revise the TAC By-Laws, Rules, and Procedures (excerpt attached) to reclassify the Community Transit Representative to be a representative of an "Independent Public Transportation Operator" that is appointed by the TPO Board. It is intended for this representative to be providing for profit or non-profit public transportation and is independent of any of the local government members of the TPO Board and the TAC. While Community Transit with its current operations would qualify for this membership, MV would not qualify. However, it is intended for MV to be represented on the TAC by St. Lucie County Transit Management.

With regard to transit representation on the LCB, Community Transit has historically occupied the following membership position specified in the attached Rule 41-2.012 of the Florida Administrative Code (FAC):

"(k) In areas where they exist, the Chairperson or designee of the local Mass Transit or Public Transit System's Board, except in cases where they are also the Community Transportation Coordinator"

Since a "local Mass Transit or Public Transit System Board" currently does not exist in St. Lucie County, Community Transit should not represent it, and the membership position should be vacant until such time that such a Board is formed. Upon inquiry to the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged, it was confirmed that this membership position may remain vacant unless the situation changes. Therefore, it is recommended that this membership position be vacated.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the proposed transit representation on the TAC and LCB is discussed, and comments are provided to Staff.

2.1.5 Voting

As long as it does not constitute a conflict of interest, all members of the Board that are present, including the Chairperson, shall be required to vote on any question involving TPO action.

An affirmative vote of fifty percent (50%) of the quorum plus one will be required in order for a motion to pass. In the event of a tie vote, the motion will fail.

2.1.6 Quorum

A majority of the voting members of the Board must be present for the TPO to conduct business.

2.2 COMMITTEES

Committees are established that are advisory to the Board and include the following:

2.2.1 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

(a) Duties and Responsibilities

The responsibility of the TAC shall be to serve the TPO in an advisory capacity on technical matters including promoting communication among members, promoting coordination of transportation planning and programming, reviewing technical sufficiency, accuracy, and completeness of appropriate studies, making recommendations for the transportation plan and program implementation, and providing technical responses on other transportation planning issues.

(b) Membership

The TAC shall consist of the following voting members:

St. Lucie County Planning and Development Services
Department

Fort Pierce Planning Department

Port St. Lucie Planning Department

St. Lucie County Public Works Department

Fort Pierce Engineering Department

Port St. Lucie Public Works Department

Treasure Coast International Airport

St. Lucie County School District

~~Community Transit~~ Independent Public Transportation Operator

St. Lucie County Fire District

St. Lucie TPO Area Freight Representative

St. Lucie County Sheriff's Office

St. Lucie County Transit Management

In addition, the TAC shall include a non-voting advisor who is a representative of FDOT.

Each TAC member may designate an alternate to replace them in their absence.

(c) Officers

The TAC shall elect a Chairperson and a Vice Chairperson of the TAC at its first meeting of the calendar year. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall serve for a period of one (1) year or until a successor is elected. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be voting members of the TAC. The Chairperson of the TAC shall call and preside at all meetings of the TAC. The Vice Chairperson shall serve as Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson. In the absence of both the Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson from a meeting, a temporary Chairperson shall be elected by the TAC for the meeting. During joint meetings with the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the officers of the joint meeting shall rotate among the officers of the advisory committees.

(d) Minutes

The staff of the TPO shall maintain the minutes and other records of the TAC. The minutes shall accurately reflect the proceedings of the TAC.

(e) Quorum

A majority of the voting members of the TAC must be present for the TAC to conduct business.

During joint meetings with the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Advisory Committee, a majority of the

41-2.012 Coordinating Board Structure and Duties.

The purpose of the Coordinating Board is to identify local service needs and to provide information, advice, and direction to the Community Transportation Coordinator on the coordination of services to be provided to the transportation disadvantaged through the Florida Coordinated Transportation System (FCTS). Each Coordinating Board is recognized as an advisory body to the Commission in its service area. The members of the Coordinating Board shall be appointed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization or the Designated Official Planning Agency. A Coordinating Board shall be appointed in each county. However, when agreed upon in writing, by all Boards of County Commissions in each county to be covered in the service area, multi-county Coordinating Boards may be appointed. The structure and duties of the Coordinating Board shall be as follows:

(1) The Metropolitan Planning Organization or Designated Official Planning Agency shall appoint one elected official to serve as the official chairperson for all Coordinating Board meetings. The appointed chairperson shall be an elected official from the county that the Coordinating Board serves. For a multi-county Coordinating Board, the elected official appointed to serve as Chairperson shall be from one of the counties involved.

(2) The Coordinating Board shall hold an organizational meeting each year for the purpose of electing a Vice-Chairperson. The Vice-Chairperson shall be elected by a majority vote of a quorum of the members of the Coordinating Board present and voting at the organizational meeting. The Vice-Chairperson shall serve a term of one year starting with the next meeting. In the event of the Chairperson's absence, the Vice-Chairperson shall assume the duties of the Chairperson and conduct the meeting.

(3) In addition to the Chairperson, except for multi-county Coordinating Boards which shall have as a representative an elected official from each county, including the Chairperson, one of whom shall be elected Vice-Chairperson, the following agencies or groups shall be represented on the Coordinating Board, in every county as voting members:

- (a) A local representative of the Florida Department of Transportation;
- (b) A local representative of the Florida Department of Children and Family Services;
- (c) A local representative of the Public Education Community which could include, but not be limited to, a representative of the District School Board, School Board Transportation Office, or Headstart Program in areas where the School District is responsible;
- (d) In areas where they exist, a local representative of the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation or the Division of Blind Services, representing the Department of Education;
- (e) A person recommended by the local Veterans Service Office representing the veterans of the county;
- (f) A person who is recognized by the Florida Association for Community Action (President), representing the economically disadvantaged in the county;
- (g) A person over sixty representing the elderly in the county;
- (h) A person with a disability representing the disabled in the county;
- (i) Two citizen advocate representatives in the county; one who must be a person who uses the transportation service(s) of the system as their primary means of transportation;
- (j) A local representative for children at risk;
- (k) In areas where they exist, the Chairperson or designee of the local Mass Transit or Public Transit System's Board, except in cases where they are also the Community Transportation Coordinator;
- (l) A local representative of the Florida Department of Elderly Affairs;
- (m) An experienced representative of the local private for profit transportation industry. In areas where such representative is not available, a local private non-profit representative will be appointed, except where said representative is also the Community Transportation Coordinator;

- (n) A local representative of the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration;
- (o) A local representative of the Agency for Persons with Disabilities;
- (p) A representative of the Regional Workforce Development Board established in chapter 445, F.S.; and
- (q) A representative of the local medical community, which may include, but not be limited to, kidney dialysis centers, long term care facilities, assisted living facilities, hospitals, local health department or other home and community based services, etc.

(4) Except for the Chairperson, the non-agency members of the Board shall be appointed for three year staggered terms with initial membership being appointed equally for one, two, and three years. The Chairperson shall serve until elected term of office has expired or otherwise replaced by the Designated Official Planning Agency. No employee of a community transportation coordinator shall serve as a voting member of the coordinating board in an area where the community transportation coordinator serves. However, community transportation coordinators and their employees are not prohibited from serving on a coordinating board in an

area where they are not the coordinator. However, an elected official serving as Chairperson of the coordinating board, or other governmental employees that are not employed for the purpose of making provisions for transportation and are not directly supervised by the community transportation coordinator shall not be precluded from serving as voting members of the coordinating board.

(5) The Board shall meet at least quarterly and shall perform the following duties in addition to those duties specifically listed in section 427.0157, F.S.:

(a) Maintain official meeting minutes, including an attendance roster, reflecting official actions and provide a copy of same to the Commission and the Chairperson of the designated official planning agency.

(b) Annually, provide the Metropolitan Planning Organization or Designated Official Planning Agency with an evaluation of the Community Transportation Coordinator's performance in general and relative to Commission and local standards as referenced in rule 41-2.006, F.A.C., and the performance results of the most recent Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan. As part of the Coordinator's performance, the local Coordinating Board shall also set an annual percentage goal increase for the number of trips provided within the system for ridership on public transit, where applicable. In areas where the public transit is not being utilized, the local Coordinating Board shall set an annual percentage of the number of trips to be provided on public transit. The Commission shall provide evaluation criteria for the local Coordinating Board to use relative to the performance of the Community Transportation Coordinator. This evaluation will be submitted to the Commission upon approval by the local coordinating board.

(c) Appoint a Grievance Committee to process and investigate complaints, from agencies, users, transportation operators, potential users of the system and the Community Transportation Coordinator in the designated service area, and make recommendations to the Coordinating Board or to the Commission, when local resolution cannot be found, for improvement of service. The Coordinating Board shall establish a process and procedures to provide regular opportunities for issues to be brought before such committee and to address them in a timely manner. Rider brochures or other documents provided to users or potential users of the system shall provide information about the complaint and grievance process including the publishing of the Commission's TD Helpline service when local resolution has not occurred. All materials shall be made available in accessible format, upon request by the citizen. Members appointed to the committee shall be voting members of the Coordinating Board.

(d) All coordinating board members should be trained on and comply with the requirements of section 112.3143, F.S., concerning voting conflicts of interest.

Rulemaking Authority 427.013(9) FS. Law Implemented 427.0157 FS. History—New 5-2-90, Amended 6-17-92, 11-16-93, 1-4-94, 7-11-95, 5-1-96, 10-1-96, 3-10-98, 4-8-01, 12-17-02, 7-3-03, 6-14-18.