



CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, May 16, 2023
 10:30 am

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 (not intended for Committee Members): Using a computer or smartphone, register at <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/2981888059747003992>. 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 10:00 am on May 16, 2023.

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Comments from the Public**
4. **Approval of Agenda**
5. **Approval of Meeting Summaries**
 - *January 17, 2023 Regular Meeting*
 - *March 21, 2023 Regular Meeting*
6. **Action Items**
 - 6a. **Pavement, Bridge and System Performance Targets:** Review of Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets for adoption by the St. Lucie TPO.

Action: *Review and recommend adoption of the Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption.*

6b. Draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Review of the draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP.

Action: Recommend adoption of the draft TIP, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption.

6c. Carbon Reduction Strategy: Review of the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy for the St. Lucie TPO area.

Action: Recommend approval of the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy, recommend approval with conditions, or do not recommend approval.

6d. 2023/24 List of Priority Projects (LOPP): Review of the draft LOPP for 2023/24 for the St. Lucie TPO.

Action: Recommend adoption of the draft 2023/24 LOPP, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption.

6e. Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update Scope of Services: Review of the TDP Major Update draft Scope of Services.

Action: Recommend approval of the draft Scope of Services, recommend approval with conditions, or do not recommend approval.

7. Recommendations/Comments by Members

8. Staff Comments

9. Next Meeting: The next St. Lucie TPO CAC meeting is a regular meeting scheduled for 10:30 am on Tuesday, July 18, 2023.

10. 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.

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 Advisory Committees with respect to any matter considered at a 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.

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.



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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) REGULAR MEETING

DATE: Tuesday, January 17, 2023
TIME: 10:30 am
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**

Vice Chairman Wild called the meeting to order at 10:40 am.

2. **Roll Call**

The roll was conducted via sign-in sheet, and the following members were present:

Members Present

Bud Wild, Vice Chairman
Consuelo Cruz
Mike Keleher
George Saylor
Richard Silvestri
Mazella Smith
Anthony Walker

Representing

Unincorporated County
Minority Residents
Port St. Lucie
Port St. Lucie
Unincorporated County
Fort Pierce
Fort Pierce

Others Present

Kyle Bowman
Peter Buchwald

Representing

St. Lucie TPO
St. Lucie TPO

Yi Ding	St. Lucie TPO
Marceia Lathou	St. Lucie TPO
Rachel Harrison	Recording Specialist
James Brown	FDOT/Florida's Turnpike
Patty Walker	St. Lucie TPO BPAC

3. Comments from the Public – None.

4. Approval of Agenda

* **MOTION** by Mr. Keleher to approve the agenda.

** **SECONDED** by Ms. Smith Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

5. Approval of Meeting Summary

- September 20, 2022 Regular Meeting

* **MOTION** by Ms. Smith to approve the Meeting Summary.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Silvestri Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

6. Action Items

6a. Annual Officer Elections: Election of a Chairperson and a Vice Chairperson for the CAC for 2023.

Mr. Buchwald invited the CAC secretary to conduct the elections.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Silvestri to nominate Ms. Niemczyk to serve as CAC Chairwoman for 2023.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Keleher

There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed.

** **MOTION** to elect Ms. Niemczyk as Chairwoman of the CAC for 2023.
Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

The CAC secretary was invited to continue the elections.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Keleher to nominate Mr. Wild to serve as CAC Vice Chairman for 2023.

** **SECONDED** by Ms. Smith

There were no other nominations and the nominations were closed.

** **MOTION** to elect Mr. Wild as Vice Chairman of the CAC for 2023.
Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

6b. 2023 Meeting Dates: Approval of the proposed meeting dates for the remainder of 2023 for the St. Lucie TPO CAC.

Mr. Buchwald presented the proposed dates and times for CAC meetings in 2023.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Keleher to approve the proposed CAC meeting dates for the remainder of 2023.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Silvestri Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

6c. Amendments to the FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Review of amendments to add funding for Paratransit Demand Response Service and Transit Travel Training to the TIP.

Mr. Buchwald explained that FDOT had added two new transit projects to its Work Program after the TPO's current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) had been adopted and was therefore requesting that the TPO amend the TIP. He described the purposes of the projects as providing Paratransit Demand Response Service and Transit Travel Training to seniors and individuals with disabilities. Mr. Buchwald summarized the funding considerations for each of the projects and clarified that the addition of the projects would not impact the fiscal constraint of the TIP.

In response to Ms. Smith's question, Mr. Buchwald confirmed that federal funding for the projects was already in place along with a local match.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Keleher to recommend adoption of the TIP Amendments.

** **SECONDED** by Ms. Smith Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

DRAFT

6d. Public Participation Plan (PPP) 2022 Annual Evaluation:
Review of the PPP 2022 Annual Evaluation.

Mr. Buchwald introduced the agenda item and invited Ms. Lathou to continue. Ms. Lathou provided an overview of the TPO's public participation efforts and their intended outcomes. She explained the rationale and methodology for reviewing their effectiveness as compared with the baseline figures from 2020 or 2021 and then presented the results of the evaluation with respect to the online, in-person, and Title VI/Environmental Justice outreach activities conducted during 2022. Ms. Lathou noted the performance targets to be used for the 2023 evaluation and concluded with an overview of the TPO's plan, program, and project development cycles.

Mr. Walker initiated a discussion regarding the importance of public involvement and how the members might promote increased participation in CAC meetings. He elaborated on the value of feedback within the TPO's culture and described how he and his wife became involved in the Advisory Committees, recommending that the members adopt a target of having two more attendees at the January 2024 CAC meeting.

Vice Chairman Wild inquired about the type of input received from the public and whether that input typically took the form of complaints. Ms. Lathou replied in the affirmative and indicated that she regularly monitors social media sites for comments regarding local issues, noting that topics often centered on increased traffic congestion and overdevelopment.

Members proposed various strategies for increasing public awareness of and interest in the TPO, with Mr. Silvestri remarking on the viability of a campaign like the World War II-era Uncle Sam "I Want You" posters and Mr. Walker asking about the use of refreshments at outreach events. Mr. Buchwald explained that public funding could not be used in Florida to serve refreshments and then elaborated on the challenges associated with increasing public participation in the TPO's activities, citing in particular the difficulty of scheduling meetings at a time that would promote attendance. He noted that online methods of outreach typically resulted in the greatest response, commenting that the TPO pursued many types of outreach formats and continuously evaluated their effectiveness to maximize its reach. Mr. Buchwald then emphasized the importance of the CAC's input, remarking that many plans had been improved thanks to the CAC's identification of issues. Ms. Lathou then described the TPO's involvement in several

community events, requesting that the members inform her of any other suitable opportunities for outreach.

Vice Chairman Wild noted that the Joint Advisory Committee meeting had been well attended by the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Silvestri suggested that CAC members speak at local meetings, such as those of homeowners' associations, the Board of County Commissioners, and the two City governments, to advertise the schedule for CAC meetings.

* **MOTION** by Ms. Smith to recommend acceptance of the Evaluation.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Walker Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

6e. 2023 Safety Performance Targets: Review of the 2023 Safety Performance Targets and Interim Benchmarks for adoption by the TPO.

Mr. Buchwald introduced Mr. Ding, who explained that State DOTs must annually establish statewide targets for safety performance measures according to Federal Transportation Performance Management requirements. Mr. Ding noted that FDOT had renewed its commitment to zero deaths and serious injuries for 2023 by setting Vision Zero targets for all five safety performance measures, indicating that the TPO could either support them or establish its own targets. He described how interim benchmarks were used to demonstrate progress toward the final targets and presented the 2021 safety performance results for both FDOT and the TPO. Mr. Ding then presented the 2023 Safety Performance Interim Benchmarks being recommended for adoption, explaining how they had been developed based on both historical and projected safety performance data. He concluded with an overview of local efforts at promoting roadway safety, which included the undertaking of Spot Speed Studies for several high-crash locations.

In response to Ms. Smith's question, Mr. Ding described the two high-crash locations on U.S. 1.

Vice Chairman Wild inquired about the Spot Speed Studies, and Mr. Ding explained how the locations had been determined and when the results could be expected. In response to Mr. Keleher's question, Mr. Buchwald provided more details regarding the Midway Road location.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Silvestri to recommend adoption of the 2023 Safety Performance Targets and the 2023 Interim Benchmarks.

** **SECONDED** by Ms. Cruz Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

6f. East Midway Road Corridor Study Scope of Services:
Review of the draft Scope of Services to conduct the East Midway Road Corridor Study.

Mr. Buchwald explained that public and local agency input had previously identified several safety issues pertaining to the segment of Midway Road from U.S. 1 to Indian River Drive, including excessive speeding, inadequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, unsafe turning conditions at the entrance to the St. Lucie County Savannas Recreation Area and the intersection with Weatherbee Road, and potential conflicts arising from the future crossing of the East Coast Greenway/Florida Shared-Use Network (SUN) Trail. He described the operational and safety analyses to be conducted as part of the Study, noting that a set of recommendations would be developed to improve traffic operations and safety while also accommodating multimodal needs along the corridor. Mr. Buchwald concluded with the Study's timeline, consultant, and cost.

Vice Chairman Wild initiated a discussion regarding the prevalence of speeding on Midway Road, noting that a previous speed study by the Sherriff's Office indicated that the average speed was 10 miles per hour above the limit. He recounted instances of drivers traveling at 90 miles per hour when approaching the railroad tracks and the limited law enforcement presence he had seen on that segment, remarking that he had offered to pay off-duty officers to patrol there. He then suggested several potential strategies to reduce speeds along the corridor, such as a roundabout or speed table at the intersection of Weatherbee Road, commenting that the segment was a wildlife crossing area.

Mr. Silvestri opined on the inadequate bicycle infrastructure along the segment and the need for additional speed limit signage, expressing his personal concerns over the potential for getting rear-ended by speeding drivers.

* **MOTION** by Mr. Keleher to recommend approval of the draft Scope of Services.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Silvestri Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

DRAFT

7. Discussion Items

7a. Tradition Area Post Office Siting: Presentation of information requested by the CAC pertaining to the potential siting of a post office in the Tradition area.

Mr. Buchwald introduced Ms. Harrison, who provided an overview of the types of postal facilities either operated or contracted by the United States Postal Service (USPS). She described the locations of existing full-service postal locations in St. Lucie County as well as the criteria used to site the various USPS facilities. Ms. Harrison then explained that it might be possible to site a Contract Postal Unit (CPU) in the Tradition area due to the minimal cost of their operation for USPS and the benefits for the contracting business.

In answer to Mr. Silvestri's question, Ms. Harrison indicated that there were no plans to expand the USPS network to Tradition, explaining that the current USPS Strategic Plan was very cost-constrained. Mr. Silvestri opined that USPS should acquire land before real estate values increased further. Mr. Buchwald then elaborated on the current USPS Master Plan's focus on efficiency, noting that the primary initiative was modernizing the fleet rather than expanding the USPS footprint.

Discussion ensued regarding the viability of siting a CPU in the Tradition area considering the benefits to the contractor. Ms. Smith noted that she had previously utilized the CPU located in Mervis Café in downtown Fort Pierce. Mr. Silvestri inquired about UPS or FedEx acting as a CPU, and Ms. Harrison explained that no competing postal provider could operate a CPU for USPS. Ms. Harrison then elaborated on the postal service's push toward automation, describing the development and siting of automated postal lockers known as GoPost units.

8. Recommendations/Comments by Members – Ms. Smith expressed her concern regarding pedestrian safety on U.S. 1 south of Edwards Road. She noted that there had been several accidents along that segment in recent years, including one resulting in the death of the son of the Days Inn owner, who had been crossing the street on foot. She cited several factors that were contributing to unsafe conditions in that vicinity, including high traffic volume, a significant school bus presence, and a bidirectional turning lane with no raised median. Ms. Smith then inquired about the possibility of installing safety measures like raised medians or flashing lights.

DRAFT

Mr. Buchwald described past meetings with FDOT and Representative Trabulsy regarding the installation of a midblock crossing on that segment of U.S. 1, noting that the members could request a presentation on safety measures from FDOT. In response to Vice Chairman Wild’s comment, Mr. Buchwald explained that the potential midblock crossing would be the first of its kind in St. Lucie County.

* **MOTION** by Ms. Smith to request that FDOT provide a presentation on its efforts to promote pedestrian safety on U.S. 1 south of Edwards Road, including an update on the progress of the midblock crossing.

** **SECONDED** by Mr. Silvestri Carried **UNANIMOUSLY**

9. Staff Comments – None.

10. Next Meeting: The next St. Lucie TPO CAC meeting is a regular meeting scheduled for 10:30 am on Tuesday, March 21, 2023.

11. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved by:

Rachel Harrison
Recording Specialist

Carolyn Niemczyk
Chairwoman



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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: Tuesday, March 21, 2023
 TIME: 10:30 am
 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

Chairwoman Niemczyk called the meeting to order at 10:33 am. Ms. Niemczyk announced that because of a last-minute illness, no quorum was present, meaning discussion could take place but no votes would occur.

2. Roll Call

The roll was conducted via sign-in sheet, and the following members were present:

Members Present

Carolyn Niemczyk, Chairwoman
 George Saylor
 Marvin Mendelson
 Bud Wild, Vice Chairman
 Anthony Walker

Representing

At Large
 Port St. Lucie
 At Large
 Unincorporated County
 Fort Pierce

Others Present

Kyle Bowman
 Peter Buchwald
 Yi Ding

Representing

St. Lucie TPO
 St. Lucie TPO
 St. Lucie TPO

Marceia Lathou (via web)	St. Lucie TPO
Teresa Lane	Recording Specialist
Stewart Robertson	Kimley-Horn
Srin Varanasi	Corradino Group
Ron Kareiva (via web)	Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
Emily Seitter	City of Port St. Lucie
David Epperson	City of Port St. Lucie

3. Comments from the Public – None.

4. Approval of Agenda

This item was not considered due to a lack of a quorum.

5. Approval of Meeting Summary

This item was continued due to a lack of a quorum.

6. Action Items

6a. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendments: Review of Amendments to the UPWP to add Fort Pierce passenger rail station planning and replace the Transit Center Visioning Workshop with an Airport Connector Planning & Conceptual Engineering (PACE) Study.

Mr. Buchwald introduced the agenda item and explained that the TPO Board previously discussed potential new projects that may be added to the TPO’s UPWP because of available funding and changes in local agency transportation priorities. As a result of the discussion, the Board had moved to amend the UPWP to add an Airport Connector Corridor Alignment Study and Fort Pierce Passenger Rail Station Planning. The proposed amendments to the FY 2022/23 – FY 2023/24 UPWP are being presented for review and recommendation.

Mr. Buchwald explained that the Airport Connector Corridor Alignment Study will be part of Task 3.1, Long Range Transportation Planning, of the UPWP. A study will be completed of alignment alternatives, known as a Planning & Conceptual Engineering (PACE) Study, for a new roadway connecting the proposed I-95 and Turnpike Interchanges to

the St. Lucie International Airport in northern St. Lucie County. The project will be completed in partnership with St. Lucie County, with the TPO contributing \$60,000 of Surface Transportation Block Grant Funding (SU) toward the project. That money became available when the Transit Center Visioning Workshop was cancelled. The Study is planned to be completed by June 2024.

Mr. Buchwald noted that the Fort Pierce Passenger Rail Station Planning will be part of Task 3.2, Transit Planning, of the UPWP. An initial site plan and conceptual design will be prepared for a future passenger rail station in downtown Fort Pierce. This project replaces the Transit Center Visioning Workshop that was identified by St. Lucie County Community Services Staff as unnecessary because the vision for the Transit Operations Center is already established, and it is under design. The project will be funded with approximately \$356,000 of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act Funding (GFSU) that was allocated to the TPO. The project will be completed in cooperation with the City of Fort Pierce and is planned to be completed by June 2024.

Mr. Buchwald recommended both amendments be adopted by the TPO Board.

Mr. Wild asked about the status of the Brightline train station through downtown Fort Pierce. Mr. Buchwald said the City of Fort Pierce has been in discussions with Brightline for a couple of years and is very interested in locating a passenger rail station downtown. He said the City is seeking ways to make the station more attractive to Brightline so the company chooses Fort Pierce over Stuart or Indian River County for its first Treasure Coast station. Mr. Buchwald said the City of Fort Pierce is excited about plans for a conceptual site plan and rendering of the proposed station. He said Fort Pierce has an advantage over the competing counties because the Florida East Cost (FEC) railroad, which owns the railroad tracks on which Brightline operates, owns land in downtown Fort Pierce. Retail and housing development around Brightline stations in Broward and Palm Beach counties has been lucrative for the train company, Mr. Buchwald said.

Chairwoman Niemczyk said the airport study is very timely because there are several million square feet of new industrial buildings being built in northwest St. Lucie County. She said developers are looking forward to distributing freight more easily through the airport, which wants to lure passenger airlines. Mr. Buchwald said the study would help identify where the connector road will be built between the new highway interchanges and the airport. He said developers have offered

to privately fund the new interchanges but they are reluctant to begin the I-95 interchange justification study because the Federal government requires any new interchange to be connected to the public road system before they are authorized.

Chairwoman Niemczyk said she thought developers planned to extend St. Lucie Boulevard west to Immokalee Road, but Mr. Buchwald said several residents on Immokalee Road oppose that.

Mr. Saylor asked if the airport plans to add services once a connector road is built. Mr. Buchwald said yes, the County has invested in a new hangar and expanded commercial development at the airport and has plans for more. He said the airport has always been underutilized, noting it has more land area than the airports in Miami, Palm Beach and Fort Lauderdale combined. He said a direct connection to both major interstates would be game changer for the airport and the County. Mr. Buchwald said a consultant will be chosen to conduct the corridor alignment study in partnership with the County.

Chairwoman Niemczyk asked if completion by June 2024 is soon enough, and Mr. Buchwald said that it is the latest it would be completed but said he can press to have it completed sooner. He noted the timeline is dependent upon securing funding.

Mr. Wild asked if anyone knows when Brightline service through the Treasure Coast will begin, and Mr. Buchwald said it is expected by the end of 2023.

6b. Amendment #6 to the FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Review of Amendment #6 to the TIP to increase the project cost and advance the construction of the Midway Road Widening Project from Selvitz Road to Jenkins Road to FY 2023/24 from FY 2025/26 using local funding that will be reimbursed.

Mr. Buchwald explained that the FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 TIP was adopted by the TPO Board on June 1, 2022, and includes the widening of Midway Road from Jenkins Road to Selvitz Road. After the TIP was adopted, he said, the project cost increased, and St. Lucie County requested to advance construction of the project to FY 2023/24 from FY 2025/26 using local funding that will be reimbursed with TPO funding. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) District 4 requested an amendment to reflect the changes in the TPO's TIP so that construction can begin as soon as July, Mr. Buchwald said.

Chairwoman Niemczyk asked what it means when it states “west of Jenkins Road.” Mr. Buchwald said it will include the intersection of Jenkins Road and proceed east to Selvitz Road. Chairwoman Niemczyk said the County is eager to widen Jenkins Road because nearby Kings Highway is clogged with traffic. Mr. Buchwald said the project is at the beginning stage of widening Jenkins Road and a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study will begin soon. He noted the project will be costly and complex because it requires construction of a bridge over Ten Mile Creek.

Mr. Wild asked if Selvitz Road from Midway Road to Edwards Road is part of the project, noting its high traffic volume. Mr. Buchwald said it is not as it has not been identified as a need in the long range plan.

6c. Amendment #7 to the FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Review of Amendment #7 to add a rumble strips installation project to the TIP.

Mr. Buchwald introduced Mr. Ding, who noted the FY 2022/23 – FY 2026/27 TIP was adopted by the TPO Board on June 1, 2022. Mr. Ding said FDOT recently added a Statewide Rumble Strips Installation Project to its Work Program after the TPO’s adoption of the TIP and requested an amendment to add the project.

Mr. Ding said the purpose of the proposed project is to install rumble strips on the shoulders of high-speed State roadways (50 mph and above). The proposed project will install 44.7 miles of rumble strips on the shoulders of various segments of the following roadways in the St. Lucie TPO area: Emerson Ave, US-1, Kings Highway, Okeechobee Road and South Ocean Drive.

Mr. Ding said the Preliminary Engineering phase will cost \$25,000, to be funded by a Federal Advance Construction source for the Highway Safety Program.

When asked by Mr. Wild about the purpose of the rumble strips, Mr. Ding said it is to improve roadway safety. Mr. Buchwald said the state is committed to reducing the number of traffic deaths and serious injuries and believes rumble strips will keep people from veering out of the travel lane. In response to a question from Chairwoman Niemczyk, Mr. Buchwald said the state will receive bids for strips to be placed on each roadway once the design phase is complete.

- 6d. Spot Speed Studies: Review of the Spot Speed Studies conducted on Airoso Boulevard, Port St. Lucie Boulevard and Midway Road.

Mr. Buchwald again introduced Mr. Ding, who said in 2021, TPO staff conducted a Speed Kills Analysis to examine the link between vehicle speed and crash severity and to identify high-crash locations in the TPO area. The Speed Kills Analysis discovered 75 percent of all fatal crashes in the TPO area occur on roadways with posted speeds of 40 miles per hour or higher. The Speed Kills Analysis further identified high-crash locations on the local roadway network where the posted speeds are 40 miles per hour or higher.

Mr. Ding said to improve roadway safety through speed management, Spot Speed Studies are included in Task 3.7, Safety and Security Planning, of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Mr. Ding introduced Stewart Robertson of Kimley-Horn and Associates, a General Planning Consultant for the TPO. Mr. Robertson said his firm studied daily traffic volume and speed counts along three roadway segments: Airoso Boulevard from Lakehurst Drive to Prima Vista Boulevard; Port St. Lucie Boulevard from Cameo Boulevard to Dalton Avenue; and Midway Road from Okeechobee Road (State Road 70) to McCarty Road.

Mr. Robertson said the study was commissioned to evaluate speed limits, travel speeds and potential safety measures for the three roads. He said data was evaluated according to the FDOT Speed Zone Manual, which measures speeds based on the 85th percentile speed and 10-mph pace. The 85th percentile speed is the speed at which 85 percent of vehicles travel at or below. The 10-mph pace is the 10-mph range of travel speeds containing the largest number of vehicles.

Mr. Robertson stated two conditions were evaluated when considering speed management guidelines: Condition 1 says the posted speed limit shouldn't differ from the 85th percentile speed or the upper limit of the 10-mph pace (whichever is less) by more than 3 mph; Condition 2 says a posted speed limit of more than 8 mph below the 85th percentile speed limit is not authorized.

Based on the findings, Mr. Robertson recommended the current speed limits on all three roads be maintained, with a mixture of other safety measures added. Although people are speeding on all three roads, he said, the levels are low enough to warrant maintaining current speed limits. The added safety measures recommended include installing electronic speed feedback signs on Airoso Boulevard, a yellow warning

plaque on a severe curve along Port St. Lucie Boulevard, and centerline rumble strips on Midway Road, along with heightened law enforcement.

Chairwoman Niemczyk asked how much an electronic speed sign costs. Mr. Robertson said a cost analysis was not a part of his study, but he estimated the cost at \$2,000 to \$4,000 per sign.

Mr. Wild asked about the compliance rate of speed signs, noting the county has a lack of speed enforcement by law enforcement agencies. Mr. Robertson replied that speed signs have been shown to modify people's driving behaviors. Mr. Wild said it seems counterproductive to keep speed limits high when people are already speeding on the roads, but Mr. Robertson said physical changes to roads are more effective at reducing speeds than simply lowering speed limits.

6e. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) Update: Review of the draft update to the SIS CFP.

Mr. Buchwald asked to delay this item to give an FDOT spokeswoman time to arrive to present the item. The Chairwoman agreed and called for the next item.

6f. Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model #5 (TCRPM5) Land Use Data Update: Review of the TCRPM5 Land Use Data Update for adoption.

Mr. Buchwald introduced Mr. Ding, who noted the TPO's SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) relies on the TCRPM5 for estimating the 2045 roadway traffic volume projections. Those, in turn, help identify the project needs in the LRTP, he said. Mr. Ding noted the model relies on the 2045 growth projections provided by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida.

Since the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP was adopted in February 2021, Mr. Ding said, BEBR has increased its High Growth Projection for the TPO area from 525,100, which was adopted by the TPO, to 566,000. He noted that the TPO area also has experienced tremendous, unexpected development activity recently. Mr. Ding said this item includes an update to review and adjust the 2045 land use data, consisting of the population and employment projections, that the TCRPM5 uses to estimate the 2045 roadway traffic volume projections.

Mr. Ding then introduced Srin Varanasi of the Corradino Group, who reviewed recent land use changes and development activity. He said there are several corridor and PD&E studies underway using the original estimates that should be updated to accurately reflect the new impacts in each Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). He suggested adopting a new population estimate of 581,710 for the year 2045 and predicted the new conditions will result in an overall traffic increase of 7.8 percent in total Vehicle Miles Traveled in the TPO area. Mr. Varanasi said traffic impacts in neighboring Indian River and Martin counties will be insignificant.

Mr. Wild asked if improvements are planned to Glades Cut-Off Road considering planned development, and if developers will help pay the tab. Mr. Varanasi said that's an example of why the model must be updated, to accurately reflect traffic impacts countywide. Mr. Buchwald said the County has started a PD&E to widen Glades Cut-Off Road to four lanes. Mr. Saylor called the update the backbone of everything the TPO does, noting there must be a balance between economic activity and developers paying their fair share of impacts.

Mr. Buchwald said the update reinforces the need for developers in fast-growing Southwest St. Lucie County to build the extensive road network they promised as part of initial development approvals. He said he testified before the Port St. Lucie City Council last month to counter builders' claims that fewer travel lanes are needed because retirement communities are being built. Chairwoman Niemczyk noted that the I-95 bridge connecting PGA Village with St. Lucie West is an example of how developers delayed their road responsibilities, leading to a years-long delay in the project, which is now under way. Mr. Buchwald said the TPO had to contribute money toward the I-95 bridge because of the delay and noted developers of Savanna Club also reneged on their initial promise to extend Lennard Road through their community.

6g. Special Events Congestion Management and Parking Plan (SECMAPP): Review of the SECMAPP for the St. Lucie TPO area.

Mr. Buchwald introduced Mr. Ding, who noted congestion and parking issues are occurring at special events in areas like Downtown Fort Pierce and South Hutchinson Island, the Fenn Center and Lawnwood Regional Park, Clover Park, the Port District and Botanical Gardens of Port St. Lucie, and the McCarty Ranch Preserve. He said these issues are likely to increase with the tremendous growth projected, prompting staff to include development of a SECMAPP in Task 3.4,

Congestion Management Process (CMP), of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Mr. Ding introduced Mr. Robertson of Kimley-Horn, which prepared the SECMAPP. He explained that interviews first were conducted with representatives of each of the local agencies responsible for management of the special events to identify any congestion, parking, and safety issues they observed. Subsequently, special events at each of the locations were observed, and congestion, parking, and safety issues associated with the events were identified, Mr. Robertson said. He then described recommendations developed for improvements to address the issues and prioritized them.

Mr. Robertson unveiled a matrix of issues at each location, a project prioritization list that can be completed in the near-term, mid-term and long-term, and a list of state and federal grant opportunities to complete the improvements, most of which include recommendations for better pedestrian routes, lighting, traffic lanes and flow, signage and law enforcement presence.

Mr. Walker said he heard several suggestions for pedestrian safety and favors those improvements over ones designed to improve vehicle flow. He said people often struggle to cross safely in front of cars at special events and said he's more concerned about people than cars. Chairwoman Niemczyk said I-95 stalls in both directions during events at Clover Park and said she's come to a standstill while driving on I-95 because of cars backed up, waiting to exit onto St. Lucie West Boulevard.

Mr. Wild asked how much police presence consultants observed while attending the special events. Mr. Robertson said some events had no officers, while Friday Fest in Downtown Fort Pierce had a few officers. Mr. Robertson said one of his recommendations is to include more officers to help the flow of inbound and outbound traffic and pedestrians at events.

6h. Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) 2023 Grant Application: Review of a TAP grant application for the 2023 cycle.

Mr. Buchwald said the TAP provides funding to the St. Lucie TPO to build a variety of transportation alternatives including on-road and off-road trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized modes. Money available for the 2023 TAP grant cycle is at least \$650,000, he said, and will be programmed by the Florida Department of

Transportation District 4 in Fiscal Year 2026/27. Mr. Buchwald said a single TAP grant application was received this year from the City of Port St. Lucie for the Peacock Trail Project, which is included in the 2022/23 TA Priority Project List. Mr. Buchwald explained the project includes construction of a 12 to 14-foot wide, multi-surface, shared-use path from SW Hayworth Avenue to SW Dreyfuss Boulevard. The trail will be approximately one mile in length and connect the Jobs Express Terminal to O.L. Peacock Sr. Park, he said, with an estimated project cost of \$1,674,174. He said the applicant is requesting a total of \$1,619,174 of TAP grant funding.

Mr. Buchwald said City officials were on hand to discuss the project, prompting Ms. Seitter of the Public Works Department to announce that she and colleague Mr. Epperson were present. Ms. Seitter explained the project will include an asphalt path and a raised, environmentally sustainable boardwalk at the proposed park. Mr. Wild asked what is on the park land currently, and Ms. Seitter said it's undeveloped land with overhead Florida Power & Light transmission lines. She said the path will be available for use by FPL service vehicles, and said the City is negotiating with FPL to help share development costs. She noted the City hopes to start construction in 2026/27. Mr. Walker asked whether native plants will be used for landscaping, and Ms. Seitter said they will.

6e. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Cost Feasible Plan (CFP) Update: Review of the draft update to the SIS CFP.

Mr. Buchwald revisited this item, which had been postponed earlier in the meeting. Mr. Buchwald said he contacted an FDOT representative and received no response, so he planned to present the item. Mr. Buchwald said the SIS is Florida's statewide network of high-priority transportation facilities, which include airports, highways, railroads, seaports, spaceports and transit facilities. FDOT plans for the SIS in coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations and other partners, he said, and is updating the SIS CFP from the current horizon year of 2045 to the year 2050. Mr. Buchwald said the SIS CFP was last updated and presented to the TPO in May/June 2018. Projects being discussed today include roads only, he said.

Mr. Buchwald explained that 75 percent of state gas taxes go to the SIS to move people and goods rapidly across the state. He said the state held a joint virtual workshop in August 2022 with planning organizations in District 4 to discuss upcoming needs but said there is little money allocated for St. Lucie in the plan update. The only major project in the St. Lucie TPO area is \$20 million for construction of a

new Florida's Turnpike interchange at Midway Road in FY 2032/33 – FY 2034/35, Mr. Buchwald said, adding that he'd like to see that project moved up to within five years. He said widening of I-95 from the Martin County Line to State Route 70/Okeechobee Road is no longer budgeted for construction, despite being in the last two plans for forecast years 2040 and 2045. Meanwhile, the state is advancing construction of a railroad grade crossing in Martin County, Mr. Buchwald said, and allocating more money to Palm Beach and Broward counties.

The draft version of the SIS CFP Update appears to allocate only about \$46.6 million of SIS funding to the St. Lucie TPO area over approximately 20 years out of a total of \$3.84 billion, Mr. Buchwald continued, equating to approximately \$2.3 million annually. When compared to the entire draft SIS CFP for District 4, the St. Lucie TPO area is receiving only approximately one percent of the funding despite having approximately eight percent of the population of District 4, Mr. Buchwald said. He noted the vast majority of money is allocated to Broward and Palm Beach counties, with the Treasure Coast receiving a disproportionately smaller share.

Mr. Buchwald said he can't recommend endorsement of the plan, prompting Chairwoman Niemczyk to inquire what will happen if the TPO board opposes the state plan. Mr. Buchwald said he hopes it will prompt the state to reconsider and allocate more money to St. Lucie County. He said when the state sees the county's updated population projections it might be inclined to add the I-95 widening from the south county line to S.R. 70 back into the construction plan, noting many more people will be affected by that project than by a rail crossing on Monterey Road in Martin County.

Mr. Wild asked who will make the ultimate decision on money allocation, and Mr. Buchwald said it will be the top administrators at FDOT.

Mr. Kareiva of FDOT joined the meeting via telephone and apologized that no one from FDOT was able to attend in person. He concurred with Mr. Buchwald's assessment of the SIS plan and said he welcomes the CAC's comments, noting that he had requested the I-95 widening money be returned to the plan twice in the past two years, without success. Mr. Kareiva stressed this is a draft request and is likely a conservative estimate of how much gas tax revenue the state will receive in the forecast years. He said the final number is likely to be higher and said the committee's comments are very timely, as a final decision will likely be made in the next month or so. Mr. Kareiva said

DRAFT

he'll relay the TPO's concerns to senior FDOT officials in an effort to return the I-95 widening to the matrix and said he hopes to have clearer direction before the TPO Board's April 12 meeting.

Mr. Buchwald said the previous SIS plan included \$4.4 billion statewide, compared to the draft update, which has only \$3.8 billion.

- 7. Recommendations/Comments by Members – None.
- 8. Staff Comments – Mr. Buchwald welcomed George Saylor, the CAC's newest member. He said Mr. Saylor worked for several MPOs in the past and lives in PGA Village, one of the areas being affected by extreme growth in Southwest Port St. Lucie. Chairwoman Niemczyk asked how the TPO lured him to the committee, and Mr. Buchwald said he had been on the waiting list for some time. Chairwoman Niemczyk asked if the TPO could enlarge the advisory board, but Mr. Buchwald encouraged members to designate alternates who can attend when members aren't available. An alternate member would have provided a quorum at today's meeting, he noted. Alternates can fill out an application online and attend as needed, he said.
- 9. Next Meeting: The next St. Lucie TPO CAC meeting is scheduled for 10:30 am on Tuesday, May 16, 2023.
- 10. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 12:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved by:

 Teresa Lane
 Recording Specialist

 Carolyn Niemczyk
 Chairwoman



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee:	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Date:	May 16, 2023
Item Number:	6a
Item Title:	Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets
Item Origination:	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Federal Requirements, and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
UPWP Reference:	Task 2.4 - Performance Management
Requested Action:	Review and recommend adoption of the Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption
Staff Recommendation:	Based on continuing to partner with FDOT in meeting the performance targets and the anticipated continued strong performance of the transportation system in the TPO area, it is recommended that the same targets as FDOT's 4-year Pavement, Bridge and System Performance Targets be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board.

Attachments

- Staff 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: Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
 Executive Director

FROM: Yi Ding
 Transportation Systems Manager

DATE: May 9, 2023

SUBJECT: Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets

BACKGROUND

Federal Transportation Performance Management (TPM) requirements ensure that State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) choose the most efficient investments for Federal transportation funds. To comply with the requirement, State DOTs are required to establish and report statewide 2-year and 4-year targets every four years for the Bridge and Pavement (PM2), and System Performance (PM3), and MPOs have the option to support the statewide 4-year targets or adopt their own quantifiable 4-year targets for the MPO's planning area. The St. Lucie TPO (TPO) has incorporated TPM, since its inception, into the TPO planning process by dedicating a task to it in the Unified Planning Work Program.

In December 2022, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) established the PM2 and PM3 Targets for the Performance Period of 2022-2025. Consequently, to comply with the Federal requirements, the TPO must support the FDOT PM2 and PM3 Targets or establish its own targets by June 14, 2023.

ANALYSIS

During the PM2 and PM3 target setting process, FDOT considered current facility conditions, reviewed external and internal factors that may affect

reliability measures, conducted a trend analysis, developed a sensitivity analysis indicating the level of risk for road segments to become unreliable, and sought to be conservative in its targets while at the same time meeting the federal minimum condition requirements (no more than 5% of the Interstate System in poor condition and no more than 10% of NHS bridges by deck area in poor condition). As a result, FDOT adopted the following 2-year and 4-year PM2 and PM3 targets and will closely monitor them in the coming years:

FDOT PM2 and PM3 Targets, 2023									
	Interstate Pavement		Non-Interstate NHS Pavement		NHS Bridge		Interstate Reliability	Non-Interstate NHS Reliability	Truck Reliability
	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	% of Person-Miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	% of Person-Miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (Interstate)
2018 Data	54.2%	0.6%	39.9%	0.4%	66.6%	1.2%	83.5%	86.3%	1.42%
2019 Data	68.0%	0.5%	41.0%	0.3%	66.2%	1.2%	83.4%	87.0%	1.45%
2020 Data	68.8%	0.6%	41.0%	0.3%	65.5%	0.5%	92.3%	93.5%	1.34%
2021 Data	70.5%	0.7%	47.5%	1.1%	61.3%	0.5%	87.5%	92.9%	1.38%
2-year Target	60%	5%	40%	5%	50%	10%	75%	50%	1.75
4-year Target	60%	5%	40%	5%	50%	10%	70%	50%	2.00

Data Source: FDOT Office of Policy Planning
 Condition: Good condition suggests that no major investment is needed, and poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is needed.
 Reliable: compares the worst travel times on a road against the travel time that is typically experienced. If the ratio < 1.5, then it is considered reliable.
 4-year Target Period: 2022/1/1 to 2025/12/31

To evaluate FDOT PM2 and PM3 targets for consideration by the St. Lucie TPO, TPO staff collected and reviewed TPO's PM2 and PM3 data and found that the TPO's bridge and system performance significantly exceed the state average as indicated in the following summary:

St. Lucie TPO PM2 and PM3 Data, 2018-2021									
	Interstate Pavement		Non-Interstate NHS Pavement		NHS Bridge by Deck Area		Interstate Reliability	Non-Interstate NHS Reliability	Truck Reliability
	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	% of Person-Miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	% of Person-Miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (Interstate)
2018 Data	34.8%	0.0%	36.9%	0.8%	81.9%	0.0%	100.0%	94.0%	1.12%
2019 Data	58.9%	0.0%	36.7%	0.6%	87.4%	0.0%	100.0%	96.4%	1.28%
2020 Data	82.3%	0.0%	n/a	n/a	83.4%	0.0%	100.0%	96.8%	1.10%
2021 Data	84.0%	0.0%	48.6%	1.1%	83.6%	0.0%	100.0%	96.8%	1.11%

Data Source: FDOT Office of Policy Planning
 Condition: Good condition suggests that no major investment is needed, and poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is needed.
 Reliable: compares the worst travel times on a road against the travel time that is typically experienced. If the ratio < 1.5, then it is considered reliable.

In setting targets, it appears to be appropriate for the TPO to apply FDOT's target setting methodology. In addition, as partnering with FDOT in meeting the PM2 and PM3 targets continues the strong relationship between the TPO and FDOT, and the TPO does not appear to have any difficulty in meeting those targets over the next four years, it appears to be appropriate for the

TPO to adopt the following same targets as FDOT’s 4-year PM2 and PM3 Targets:

St. Lucie TPO PM2 and PM3 Target, 2023									
	Interstate Pavement		Non-Interstate NHS Pavement		NHS Bridge by Deck Area		Interstate Reliability	Non-Interstate NHS Reliability	Truck Reliability
	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	in Good Condition	in Poor Condition	% of Person-Miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	% of Person-Miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (Interstate)
4-year Target	60%	5%	40%	5%	50%	10%	70%	50%	2.00

Data Source: FDOT State Materials, Maintenance Office, NPMRDS and FHWA Occupancy Factor
 Condition: Good condition suggests that no major investment is needed, and poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is needed.
 Reliable: compares the worst travel times on a road against the travel time that is typically experienced. If the ratio < 1.5, then it is considered
 4-year Target Period: 2022/1/1 to 2025/12/31

RECOMMENDATION

Based on continuing to partner with FDOT in meeting the performance targets and the anticipated continued strong performance of the transportation system in the TPO area, it is recommended that the same targets as FDOT’s 4-year Pavement, Bridge, and System Performance Targets be adopted.



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee:	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Date:	May 16, 2023
Item Number:	6b
Item Title:	Draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Item Origination:	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Federal and State requirements
UPWP Reference:	Task 3.3 – TIP
Requested Action:	Recommend adoption of the draft TIP, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption.
Staff Recommendation:	As the draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the Draft Tentative Work Program that was recommended for endorsement by the TPO Advisory Committees, it is recommended that the draft TIP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 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: Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
 Executive Director

FROM: Yi Ding
 Transportation Systems Manager

DATE: May 9, 2023

SUBJECT: Draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

BACKGROUND

According to Federal and/or 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 Area Regional Transit (ART), 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 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP, the process started in May 2022 with the development of the TPO's List of Priority Projects (LOPP). The LOPP then was reviewed by the TPO Advisory

Committees, adopted by the TPO Board, and submitted to FDOT District 4 in June 2022.

The LOPP was utilized by FDOT District 4 to develop their Draft Tentative Work Program for FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28. The Draft Tentative Work Program was reviewed and recommended for endorsement by the TPO Advisory Committees and was subsequently endorsed by the TPO Board in December 2022.

The Final Tentative Work Program was received from FDOT in April 2023 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 recommended for endorsement by the TPO Advisory Committees.

The draft TIP includes the following multimodal highlights:

- The new southern ramps for the Turnpike interchange at Midway Road are programmed for construction in FY 2026/27;
- The design of the widening of the Turnpike from Becker Road to Okeechobee Road is programmed;
- The designs of the improvements for the Turnpike interchanges at Port St. Lucie Boulevard and Okeechobee Boulevard are programmed;
- The lighting projects for the Turnpike Feeder Road from US-1 to Indrio Road and for US-1 from Midway Road to Edwards Road are programmed;
- Over \$971,000 of funding is programmed for a new sidewalk on Volucia Drive through the TPO's Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding from the 2022 grant cycle;
- The advancement by two years to FY 2023/24 of the construction for the widening of Midway Road from Jenkins Road to Selvitz Road;
- The advancement by one year of the right of way purchase for the FEC Bicycle-Pedestrian Overpass project;
- The advancement by one year of the construction of landscaping improvements of I-95 at St. Lucie West Boulevard and I-95 at Okeechobee Road; and,

- The programming of thirteen airport projects resulting in approximately \$10 million of new funding and the programming in FY 2023/24 of the Port of Fort Pierce Terminal Improvement resulting in \$3,000,000 of new funding.

It should be further noted that the total amount of funding in the draft TIP for the TPO area exceeds a total of \$440 million. In addition, the draft TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

As the draft FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP appears to be consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the Draft Tentative Work Program that was recommended for endorsement by the TPO Advisory Committees, it is recommended that the draft TIP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board.



TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FY 2023/24 - FY 2027/28

DRAFT

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-2
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-12
B.10 Congestion Management Process (CMP)	B-12
B.11 Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program	B-13
B.12 Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP)	B-14
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-7.

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 BIG MUD CREEK AND BLIND CREEK BRIDGES	BIG MUD CREEK BRIDGE	BLIND CREEK BRIDGE	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	4491791	3-9	C 6-2	A-5
A1A NORTH CAUSEWAY BRIDGE	ENTIRE BRIDGE	ENTIRE BRIDGE	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	4299362	8-3	C 6-3	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
EMERSON AVE	INDRIO RD	25TH ST	RESURFACING	4476511	3-9	C 1-3	A-4
FEC OVERPASS	SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA	SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4400321	8-2	C 1-4	A-4
I-95 @ ORANGE AVE	NB EXIT RAMP TO WB ORANGE AVE	NB EXIT RAMP TO WB ORANGE AVE	SKID HAZARD OVERLAY	4492811	3-9	C 1-6	A-4
I-95	N OF GLADES CUT-OFF RD	NORTH OF FLORIDA TURNPIKE	RESURFACING	4491631	3-9	C 1-8	A-4
I-95	GATLIN BLVD	ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	SKID HAZARD OVERLAY	4438471	3-9	C 1-9	A-5
I-95	SLC/MARTIN COUNTY LINE	SR-70/OKEECHOBEE RD	PD&E/EMO STUDY	4226816	8-3	C 1-10	A-4, 5
I-95 REST AREA	ST. LUCIE SB REST AREA	ST. LUCIE SB REST AREA	REST AREA	4499611	3-9	C 1-11	A-4
INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	LIGHTING	4470031	8-3	C 1-12	A-4
JENKINS RD	EDWARDS RD	ORANGE AVENUE	PD&E/EMO STUDY	4463311	8-3	C 1-13	A-4
KESTOR DR	DARWIN BOULEVARD	BECKER RD	SIDEWALK	4489981	8-11	C 1-14	A-5
KINGS HWY	500 feet S OF OKEECHOBEE RD	NORTH OF PICOS RD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2302566	8-2	C 1-15	A-4
KINGS HWY	NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIR	NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383792	8-2	C 1-16	A-4
KINGS HWY	NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS	NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIR	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383791	8-2	C 1-17	A-4
KINGS HWY	NORTH OF PICOS RD	NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2302567	8-2	C 1-20	A-4
KINGS HWY	NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD	INDRIO ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383793	8-2	C 1-21	A-4
KINGS HWY	N OF I-95 OVERPASS	SOUTH OF ANGLE	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4383794	8-2	C 1-23	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-4, 5
OKEECHOBEE RD	IDEAL HOLDING RD	ROCK RD	RESURFACING	4476531	3-9	C 1-26	A-4
OLEANDER AVE	SOUTH MARKET AVE	EDWARDS RD	SIDEWALK	4480661	8-11	C 1-27	A-4
ORANGE AVE	KINGS HWY	E OF I-95 SB RAMP	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	4461681	8-3	C 1-28	A-4
ORANGE AVE	KINGS HWY	US-1	ATMS - ARTERIAL TRAFFIC MGMT	4496961	8-11	C 1-29	A-4
ORANGE AVE	NORTH 32ND 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 TERMINAL	TERMINAL	TERMINAL	SEAPORT CAPACITY PROJECT	4485361	3-10	C 8-2	A-4
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	BECKER RD	PAAR DRIVE	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317523	8-2	C 1-32	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	SOUTH OF PAAR DR	SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4317525	8-2	C 1-33	A-5
PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	SHELTER DR	US-1	RESURFACING	4463761	3-9	C 1-34	A-5
S 25TH ST	NORTH OF EDWARDS RD	NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE	RESURFACING	4461701	3-9	C 1-35	A-4
SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	LENNARD RD	SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4399993	8-3	C 1-36	A-4, 5
SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	WALTON RD	LENNARD RD	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	4399992	8-2	C 1-37	A-5
SHOREWINDS DR / A1A	0.2 MILES W OF BR 940046	ATLANTIC BEACH BLVD	RESURFACING	4498281	3-9	C 1-38	A-4
ST. LUCIE BLVD	EAST OF N 25 ST	WEST OF US-1	RESURFACING	4484491	3-9	C 1-39	A-4
TURNPIKE @ MIDWAY RD	SOUTHERN RAMPS INTERCHANGE	SOUTHERN RAMPS INTERCHANGE	NEW INTERCHANGE RAMP	4518581	3-9	C 7-2	A-4, 5
TURNPIKE @ SR-70	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT	4465801	3-9	C 7-3	A-4
TURNPIKE @ PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE	INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT	4462201	3-9	C 7-4	A-5
TURNPIKE FEEDER ROAD	INDRIO ROAD	US-1	LIGHTING	4510811	3-9	C 1-40	A-4
TURNPIKE PORT ST. LUCIE SERVICE PLAZA	SERVICE PLAZA	SERVICE PLAZA	PARKING IMPROVEMENTS	4497121	3-9	C 7-5	A-5
TURNPIKE RESURFACING	MP 169.3	MP 173	RESURFACING	4444021	3-9	C 7-6	A-4
TURNPIKE ROADSIDE IMPROVEMENT	MP 169.3	MP 173	GUARDRAIL	4444022	3-9	C 7-7	A-4
TURNPIKE WIDENING	CROSTOWN PKWY	SR70	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4465831	3-9	C 7-8	A-4, 5
TURNPIKE WIDENING	MARTIN C/L	BECKER RD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4463341	3-9	C 7-9	A-5
TURNPIKE WIDENING	BECKER RD	CROSTOWN PKWY	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	4463351	3-9	C 7-10	A-5
US HIGHWAY 1	EDWARDS RD	TENNESSEE AVE	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS	4417141	3-9	C 1-41	A-4
US HIGHWAY 1	MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	RESURFACING	4476521	3-9	C 1-42	A-5
US HIGHWAY 1	MIDWAY ROAD	SOUTH OF EDWARDS ROAD	LIGHTING	4510801	3-9	C 1-43	A-4
US HIGHWAY 1	NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE	SUNNY LANE	RESURFACING	4461091	3-9	C 1-44	A-4
US HIGHWAY 1	SOUTH OF JUANITA AVE	NORTH OF KINGS HWY	RESURFACING	4484501	3-9	C 1-45	A-4
VOLUCIA DRIVE	EAST TORINO PARKWAY	WEST BLANTON BOULEVARD	SIDEWALK	4508611	3-9	C 1-46	A-5
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
2314403	MIDWAY RD	C 1-24
2314405	MIDWAY RD	C 1-25
4226816	I-95	C 1-10
4317523	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-32
4317525	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-33
4399992	SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	C 1-37
4399993	SAVANNAS PRESERVE STATE PARK GAP	C 1-36
4438471	I-95	C 1-9
4462201	TURNPIKE AT PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 7-4
4463341	TURNPIKE WIDENING	C 7-9
4463351	TURNPIKE WIDENING	C 7-10
4463761	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD	C 1-34
4465831	TURNPIKE WIDENING	C 7-8
4476521	US HIGHWAY 1	C 1-42
4483081	WALTON RD	C 1-47
4489981	KESTOR DR	C 1-14
4491631	I-95	C 1-8
4491791	A1A BIG MUD CREEK AND BLIND CREEK BRIDGES	C 6-2
4497121	TURNPIKE PORT ST. LUCIE SERVICE PLAZA	C 7-5
4508611	VOLUCIA DRIVE	C 1-46
4518581	TURNPIKE AT MIDWAY RD	C 7-2


0 0.5 1 2 Miles



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 2023/24 – FY 2027/28; 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:

B.2 FINANCIAL PLAN

HIGHWAY/ROADWAY/SIDEWALK FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
AC FROMEIGHT PROG (NFP)	ACFP	624,283	406,809	-	-	-	1,031,092
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION NHPP	ACNP	550,000	2,110,000	7,827,228	-	-	10,487,228
AC NAT HWY PERFORM RESURFACING	ACNR	-	1,882,833	-	1,747,912	-	3,630,745
AC - PROTECT GRANT PGM	ACPR	-	-	67,416	13,459,823	2,686,394	16,213,633
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SS,HSP)	ACSS	806,060	-	1,761,474	2,238,343	-	4,805,877
CARB FOR URB. AREA > THAN 200K	CARU	-	-	-	-	589,130	589,130
COUNTY INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM	CIGP	1,700,494	4,969,708	7,094,463	-	-	13,764,665
CONGESTION MITIGATION - AQ	CM	-	-	-	-	1,848,345	1,848,345
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	8,113,177	21,858,537	15,557,095	14,056,472	4,967,752	64,553,033
STATE IN-HOUSE PRODUCT SUPPORT	DIH	533,324	318,578	611,295	444,841	829,269	2,737,307
REST AREAS - STATE 100%	DRA	-	-	1,199,061	-	21,268,299	22,467,360
STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS & PTO	DS	1,348,055	3,617,674	3,455,536	8,518,227	4,790,088	21,729,580
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	12,339,417	1,994,621	515,529	-	-	14,849,567
LOCAL FUNDS FOR PARTICIPATING	LFP	1,000,000	4,969,708	-	-	-	5,969,708
LOCAL FUNDS/REIMBURSABLE	LFROM	19,370,393	-	-	-	-	19,370,393
STP, ANY AREA	SA	2,926,833	2,031,294	11,360,651	11,799,360	5,650,370	33,768,508
STP, MANDATORY NON-URBAN <= 5K	SN	927,873	135,047	151,899	-	-	1,214,819
SAFE ROUTES - TRANSFER	SR2T	-	5,000	-	-	-	5,000
STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K	SU	4,435,694	4,485,243	3,917,247	3,917,263	4,590,885	21,346,332
TRANSPORTATION ALTS- ANY AREA	TALT	449,371	497,046	183,882	-	-	1,130,299
TRANSPORTATION ALTS- >200K	TALU	290,759	268,446	267,346	-	-	826,551
SB2514A-TRAIL 2015 NETWORK	TLWR	3,926,067	1,137,577	-	3,302,621	-	8,366,265
TRANS REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGM	TRIP	794,758	2,277,129	3,276,644	-	1,627,089	7,975,620
SB2514A-TRAN 2015 REG INCT PRG	TRWR	205,242	1,517,317	1,438,937	-	2,858,241	6,019,737
GRAND TOTAL							284,700,794

AVIATION FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
STATE - PTO	DPTO	2,880,000	1,420,000	3,360,475	-	-	7,660,475
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN	FAA	-	-	368,550	-	-	368,550

LOCAL FUNDS	LF	720,000	355,000	855,475	-	-	1,930,475
GRAND TOTAL							9,959,500

TRANSIT OPERATIONS FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	-	690,467	793,581	817,389	841,911	3,143,348
STATE - PTO	DPTO	1,980,757	80,000	-	-	-	2,060,757
STATE PRIMARY/FEDERAL REIMB	DU	66,021	81,206	85,029	89,038	93,058	414,352
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	817,393	851,673	878,610	906,427	934,969	4,389,072
GRAND TOTAL							23,482,529

MISCELLANEOUS FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY	D	2,070,000	2,070,000	2,070,000	2,070,000	3,091,946	11,371,946
DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE	DDR	317,397	326,919	337,183	353,661	-	1,335,160
STATEWIDE ITS - STATE 100%.	DITS	250,726	266,247	274,235	266,798	-	1,058,006
GRAND TOTAL							13,765,112

PLANNING FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
METRO PLAN (85% FA; 15% OTHER)	PL	931,849	794,236	803,769	803,769	803,769	4,137,392
STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K	SU	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	2,000,000
GRAND TOTAL							6,137,392

BRIDGE FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (BRT)	ACBR	-	100,000	13,782,612	-	-	13,882,612
UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY	D	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	200,000
STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS & PTO	DS	630,000	-	-	-	-	630,000
GEN FUND BRIDGE REPAIR/REPLACE	GFBR	-	8,676,339	-	-	-	8,676,339
GRAND TOTAL							23,388,951

TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
TURNPIKE IMPROVEMENT	PKYI	17,592,261	9,802,271	21,728,855	12,852,872	270,000	62,246,259
TURNPIKE RENEWAL & REPLACEMENT	PKYR	13,794,561	-	-	-	-	13,794,561
GRAND TOTAL							76,040,820

SEAPORT FUNDING SOURCES

FUND CODE DESCRIPTION	FUND	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	TOTAL
LOCAL FUNDS	LF	1,500,000	-	-	-	-	1,500,000
SEAPORTS	PORT	1,500,000	-	-	-	-	1,500,000
GRAND TOTAL							3,000,000

FINANCIAL PLAN GRAND TOTAL 440,475,098

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	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total Program
Highway/Roadway/Sidewalk	60,341,800	54,482,567	58,685,703	59,484,862	51,705,862	284,700,794
Aviation	3,600,000	1,775,000	4,584,500	0	0	9,959,500
Transit Operations	5,559,171	4,398,346	4,452,220	4,507,854	4,564,938	23,482,529
Miscellaneous	2,638,123	2,663,166	2,681,418	2,690,459	3,091,946	13,765,112
Planning	1,331,849	1,194,236	1,203,769	1,203,769	1,203,769	6,137,392
Bridge	670,000	8,816,339	13,822,612	40,000	40,000	23,388,951
Turnpike Enterprise	31,386,822	9,802,271	21,728,855	12,852,872	270,000	76,040,820
Seaport	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	3,000,000
						440,475,098

PROJECT COST ESTIMATES	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total Program
Highway/Roadway/Sidewalk	60,341,800	54,482,567	58,685,703	59,484,862	51,705,862	284,700,794
Aviation	3,600,000	1,775,000	4,584,500	0	0	9,959,500
Transit Operations	5,559,171	4,398,346	4,452,220	4,507,854	4,564,938	23,482,529
Miscellaneous	2,638,123	2,663,166	2,681,418	2,690,459	3,091,946	13,765,112
Planning	1,331,849	1,194,236	1,203,769	1,203,769	1,203,769	6,137,392
Bridge	670,000	8,816,339	13,822,612	40,000	40,000	23,388,951
Turnpike Enterprise	31,386,822	9,802,271	21,728,855	12,852,872	270,000	76,040,820
Seaport	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	3,000,000
						440,475,098

FUND SOURCE	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total Program
Federal	15,103,743	24,568,499	43,672,103	37,150,508	19,356,951	139,851,804
Local	35,747,203	8,171,002	2,249,614	906,427	934,969	48,009,215
R/W and Bridge Bonds	-	-	-	-	-	0
State 100%	26,289,997	40,590,153	39,508,505	29,870,009	40,314,595	176,573,259
Toll/Turnpike	31,386,822	9,802,271	21,728,855	12,852,872	270,000	76,040,820
GRAND TOTAL FROM ALL JURISDICTIONS	108,527,765	83,131,925	107,159,077	80,779,816	60,876,515	440,475,098

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 2023/24 - FY 2027/28 TIP, the project selection and TIP development process started in May 2022. The List of Priority Projects (LOPP) 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 June 2022. The LOPP was utilized by FDOT District 4 to develop their Draft Tentative Work Program for FY 2023/24 - FY 2027/28. The Draft Tentative Work Program was reviewed and endorsed by the Board in December 2022. The Final Tentative Work Program was received from FDOT in April of 2023. 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 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
4443491	ALCANTARRA BLVD FROM SW SAVONA BLVD TO SW PORT ST.LUCIE BLVD	SIDEWALK	0.800	320,397	TALT	
				58,569	TALU	
				22,516	TALU	
				-1,023	TALU	400,459
4108445	CROSTOWN PARKWAY FROM MANTH LANE TO SR-5/US-1	NEW BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION	2.651	-6,795	EB	
				-54,327	SA	-61,122
4443481	CURTIS STREET FROM NW PRIMA VISTA BLVD TO NW FLORESTA DRIVE	SIDEWALK	0.543	-3,017	TALU	-3,017
4447071	GATLIN BLVD FROM SW VILLAGE PARKWAY TO SAVONA BLVD	TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES/SYSTEM	2.672	360	SU	360
4432241	HURRICANE IRMA PERMANENT RESTORATION: CR-611B/EDWARDS RD. SINKHOLE	EMERGENCY OPERATIONS	0.493	227,455	ER17	
				2,027,887	ER17	
				12,012	ER17	2,267,354
4470031	INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT	LIGHTING	2.701	1,228	HSP	1,228
4400181	NORTH MACEDO BLVD FROM SELVITZ RD TO ST JAMES DR	BIKE PATH/TRAIL	1.049	-171,562	TALT	
				-135,151	TALU	
				-1,097	TALU	-307,810

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
4415661	OLEANDER AVENUE FROM MIDWAY ROAD TO SOUTH MARKET AVENUE	SIDEWALK	1.257	31,011	TALU	
				-37	TALU	30,974
4381301	PAAR DRIVE FROM SW PORT ST LUCIE BLVD TO SW DARWIN BLVD	SIDEWALK	1.034	-1,103	TALU	-1,103
4351351	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD @ GATLIN BLVD	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	0.642	-72,011	SA	
				-619	SU	-72,630
4317523	PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM BECKER ROAD TO PAAR DRIVE	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.119	6,683	SU	
				11,601	SA	
				233,778	SU	252,062
4317526	PORT ST.LUCIE BLVD FROM SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BV TO SOUTH OF DARWIN BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	0.713	16,799	SA	
				-575,229	SU	
				500	SU	-557,930
4368681	SR-5/US-1 @ SR-70/VIRGINIA AVENUE	ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S)	0.071	8,503	SU	8,503
4287281	SR-5/US-1 FROM N. OF MIDWAY RD TO EDWARDS RD	RESURFACING	2.362	-451,981	SA	-451,981
4398471	SR-5/US-1 FROM S. OF PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD. TO NE RIOMAR DRIVE	RESURFACING	4.987	-19,537	GFSA	
				-16,902	SA	-36,439
2303384	SR-614/INDRIO ROAD FROM WEST OF SR-9/I-95 TO EAST OF SR-607/EMERSON AV	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.709	-18,290	NHPP	-18,290
4461681	SR-68/ORANGE AVE FROM SR-713/KINGS HWY TO E OF SR-9/I-95 SB RAMP	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	0.646	45,918	NFP	45,918

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
4436851	SR-70/OKEECHOBEE ROAD AT CR-712/MIDWAY ROAD	LIGHTING	0.397	23,374	HSP	23,374
2302566	SR-713/KINGS HWY FR 500 S OF SR-70 TO NORTH OF PICOS ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.200	-1,089	SA	
				247,720	SU	
				130,899	SU	377,530
4383791	SR-713/KINGS HWY FR N OF SR-9/I-95 OVERPASS TO N OF COMMERCIAL CIR	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.400	5,600	SU	5,600
4383792	SR-713/KINGS HWY FROM N OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE TO NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.210	379,917	SU	379,917
4383793	SR-713/KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF ST LUCIE BLVD TO INDRIO ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	2.190	10,000	GFSA	10,000
4438471	SR-9/I-95 FROM NORTH OF GATLIN BLVD TO SOUTH OF ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD	SKID HAZARD OVERLAY	3.198	4,684	HSP	4,684
4397611	SR-9/I-95 NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND OFF-RAMPS AT GATLIN BLVD.	INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES	1.704	3,661,739	NFP	
				102,456	NHPP	3,764,195
4299362	SR-A1A NORTH BRIDGE OVER ICWW BRIDGE #940045	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	1.205	7,469,336	NHBR	
				2,000	NHBR	
				1,000	NHBR	
				4,761,349	NHBR	
				847,830	SA	
				9,073,188	NHBR	
				40,000	SA	22,194,703
4393263	ST. LUCIE FY 2020/2021-2021/2022 UPWP	TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	0.000	409,000	PL	409,000

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	LENGTH	FUND TOTAL	FUND CODE	PROJECT TOTAL
4393264	ST. LUCIE FY 2022/2023-2023/2024 UPWP	TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	0.000	315,149	PL	
				400,000	SU	715,149
2314403	W. MIDWAY RD/CR-712 FROM GLADES CUT OFF ROAD TO SELVITZ ROAD	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.577	45,491	SU	
				-2,169	SA	
				-3,422	SU	39,900
2314402	W. MIDWAY RD/CR-712 FROM S. 25TH STREET/SR-615 TO SR-5/US-1	ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	1.803	20,000	SU	20,000
4483081	WALTON ROAD FROM 800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD ROAD TO GREEN RIVER PARKWAY	SIDEWALK	0.946	5,000	TALT	5,000
GRAND TOTAL						29,445,588

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
1024-23-01	SLC	SLC	5307	Capital/Operating	\$2,420,000	\$3,670,009	\$1,846,600	\$7,936,609
FL-2021-060-00			5307 ARPA	Capital/Operating		\$1,246,729		\$1,246,729
			5307 ARPA	Capital/Operating				\$0
1024-23-01	SLC	SLC	5339	Bus and Bus Facilities	\$275,000	\$297,837		\$572,839
	SLC	SLC	5311	Operating	\$132,042	\$61,004	\$61,004	\$254,050
	SLC	SLC	5310	Elderly and individuals with disabilities		\$500,909	\$277,671	\$778,580
TOTAL					\$2,827,042	\$4,529,759	\$2,185,275	\$9,542,076

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 2021 and resulted in no corrective actions, five noteworthy practices, and two 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 February 2023 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:

Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged								
Trip & Equipment Grant Allocations								
FY 2023-2024								
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	\$679,196	\$75,466	\$754,662	\$63	\$7	\$70	\$28,203	\$782,935

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 \$7,975,620 of TRIP funding. The MIDWAY RD project (#2314405) is receiving \$3,276,644 in TRIP funding, the PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD projects (#4317523 and #4317525) is receiving \$3,904,218, and the JENKINS ROAD project (#4463311) is receiving \$794,758 in TRIP funding.

C. DETAILED PROJECT LISTINGS

C.1 HIGHWAY/ROADWAY/SIDEWALK

A1A SUNTRAIL FROM FT. PIERCE INLET STATE PARK TO SLC/IRC 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

County: ST. LUCIE

To: SLC/INDIAN RIVER COUNTY LINE

Length: 5.193

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DIH	0	33,196	33,196	0	0	66,392
PE	TLWR	0	635,037	0	0	0	635,037
ENV	TLWR	0	442,540	0	0	0	442,540
			1,110,773	33,196			1,143,969

Prior Year Cost: 230,269

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,374,238

LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

**EMERSON AVE FROM NORTH OF INDRIO RD TO SOUTH OF 25TH ST SW
4476511 Non-SIS**



Project Description: RESURFACING
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 2.236
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL


From: INDRIO RD
To: 25TH ST

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	0	4,634,038	0	0	0	4,634,038
CST	DIH	0	62,248	0	0	0	62,248
CST	DS	0	677,181	0	0	0	677,181
		5,373,467					5,373,467

Prior Year Cost: 667,494
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,040,961
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**FEC OVERPASS FROM SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA TO SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD
4400321 Non-SIS**



Prior Year Cost: 672,953
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 4,354,998
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: BIKE PATH/TRAIL

Extra Description: SUNTRAIL

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 0

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


From: SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA

To: SOUTH OF SAVANNAH RD

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DDR	14,250	0	0	0	0	14,250
ROW	DIH	12,000	0	0	0	0	12,000
ROW	DS	12,210	8,789	0	0	0	20,999
RRU	TLWR	0	60,000	0	0	0	60,000
CST	DIH	0	0	0	107,175	0	107,175
CST	TLWR	0	0	0	3,302,621	0	3,302,621
ENV	TLWR	165,000	0	0	0	0	165,000
		203,460	68,789		3,409,796		3,682,045

Notes

**I-95 @ OKEECHOBEE RD INTERCHANGE
4498111 SIS**




Project Description: LANDSCAPING
Extra Description: STANDALONE LANDSCAPE PROJECT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** I-95
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** OKEECHOBEE RD INTERCHANGE
Length: 0.828
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	1,016,989	178,004	0	0	0	1,194,993
CST	DIH	0	49,446	0	0	0	49,446
		1,016,989	227,450				1,244,439

Prior Year Cost: 365,404
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,609,843
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**I-95 @ ORANGE AVE
4492811 SIS**



Project Description: SKID HAZARD OVERLAY
Extra Description: SYSTEMATIC LOOP RAMPS SAFETY ASSESSMENT- NPV=1,508,527; B/C=3.5; WIDEN THE OUTSIDE PAVED SHOULDER ALONG THE RAMP MILL AND RESURFACE THE RAMP WITH HIGH FRICTION SURFACE ENHANCE EXISTING LIGHTING ALONG THE RAMP (BY RE-LAMPING WITH LED LIGHTS) SHSP EMPHASIS AREA- LANE DEPARTURE CRASHES
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** I-95
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** ORANGE AVE
Length: 0.583
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	SA	28,437	0	0	0	0	28,437
CST	ACSS	0	0	718,079	0	0	718,079
CST	SA	0	0	29,867	0	0	29,867
		28,437		747,946			776,383

Prior Year Cost: 189,252
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 965,635
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

I-95 @ ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD
4443361 SIS



Project Description: LANDSCAPING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 1.42

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: I-95

To: ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DIH	12,705	12,705	0	0	0	25,410
PE	DS	158,813	0	0	0	0	158,813
CST	DDR	0	815,801	146,844	0	0	962,645
CST	DIH	0	0	41,545	0	0	41,545
		171,518	828,506	188,389			1,188,413

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,188,413

LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

I-95 FROM GLADES CUT-OFF RD TO FLORIDA TURNPIKE
4491631 SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 2.756

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: GLADES CUT-OFF RD

To: FLORIDA TURNPIKE

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACNP	0	0	7,827,228	0	0	7,827,228
CST	DDR	0	0	1,346,283	0	0	1,346,283
CST	DIH	0	0	117,239	0	0	117,239
				9,290,750			9,290,750

Prior Year Cost: 898,139


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 10,188,889

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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 FROMOM GATLIN BLVD.AND SOUTHBOUND ON-RAMP FROMOM 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 ROADWAY LIGHTING;SEE WP45

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: NORTH OF GATLIN BLVD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: SOUTH OF ST. LUCIE WEST BLVD

Length: 3.198


Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DIH	28,165	0	0	0	0	28,165
		28,165					28,165

Prior Year Cost: 12,857,861
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 12,886,026
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**I-95 FROM SLC/MARTIN TO SR-70
4226816 SIS**



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


From: SLC/MARTIN
To: SR-70

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PDE	ACNP	550,000	2,110,000	0	0	0	2,660,000
		550,000	2,110,000				2,660,000

Prior Year Cost: 7,581,407
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 10,241,407
LRTP: Page 8-3

Notes

**I-95 ST. LUCIE SOUTHBOUND REST AREA
4499611 SIS**



Project Description: REST AREA
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0.54
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION


From: ST. LUCIE SB REST AREA
To: ST. LUCIE SB REST AREA

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DDR	0	0	930,917	0	0	930,917
PE	DIH	0	0	122,833	0	0	122,833
PE	DRA	0	0	1,199,061	0	0	1,199,061
CST	DIH	0	0	0	0	94,948	94,948
CST	DRA	0	0	0	0	21,268,299	21,268,299
				2,252,811	21,363,247	23,616,058	

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 23,616,058
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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



Project Description: LIGHTING

Extra Description: INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT SR-615 AT OKEECHOBEE RD/DELAWARE AVE; SR-A1A SEAWAY DR. AT BINNEY DR. G/W FM# 447002.1

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: VARIOUS LOCATIONS

County: ST. LUCIE

To: VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Length: 2.441

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RAILROAD & UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACSS	19,453	0	0	0	0	19,453
CST	ACSS	164,674	0	0	0	0	164,674
		184,127					184,127

Prior Year Cost: 198,629


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 382,756

LRTP: Page 8-3

Notes

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




Project Description: PD&E/EMO STUDY
Extra Description: 2022 TPO PRIORITY #7 LFA WITH ST. LUCIE COUNTY R/W IS NEEDED
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** MIDWAY RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** ORANGE AVE
Length: 2.128
Phase Group: P D & E

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PDE	LFP	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	1,000,000
PDE	SU	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000
PDE	TRIP	794,758	0	0	0	0	794,758
PDE	TRWR	205,242	0	0	0	0	205,242
		2,020,000					2,020,000

Prior Year Cost: 792,825
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,812,825
LRTP: Page 8-3

Notes

KESTOR DR FROM DARWIN BOULEVARD TO BECKER RD
4489981 Non-SIS




Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2022 TAP PRIORITY #1
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** DARWIN BOULEVARD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** BECKER RD
Length: 1.389
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	LF	0	187,148	0	0	0	187,148
CST	TALT	0	497,046	0	0	0	497,046
CST	TALU	0	268,446	0	0	0	268,446
			952,640				952,640

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 957,640
LRTP: Page 8-11

Notes

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



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2012 TPO PRIORITY #2. PE/ENGINEERING UNDER 230256-2. 1,550 FT OF PROJECT WILL BE CONCRETE, BALANCE IS FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT.

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: 500 S OF OKEECHOBEE RD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: NORTH OF PICOS ROAD

Length: 2.2

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DS	0	7,000	0	0	0	7,000
ROW	SA	0	0	842,703	1,000,000	0	1,842,703
ROW	SU	43,802	0	0	0	0	43,802
		43,802	7,000	842,703	1,000,000		1,893,505

Prior Year Cost: 82,561,744


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 85,194,613

LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIR TO NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD
4383792 Non-SIS




Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2017 TPO PRIORITY #4 WIDENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES; PD&E UNDER 230256-5
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIR
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD
Length: 1.21
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DS	0	500,000	1,514,106	0	2,438,156	4,452,262
ROW	SN	0	0	151,899	0	0	151,899
ROW	SU	364,651	87,000	0	0	0	451,651
		364,651	587,000	1,666,005		2,438,156	5,055,812

Prior Year Cost: 16,404,223
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 66,131,317
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS TO NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE
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:** NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE
Length: 1.4
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DDR	1,588,808	1,000,000	2,812,937	0	0	5,401,745
ROW	DS	0	0	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
ROW	SA	108,891	0	573,350	1,344,156	0	2,026,397
ROW	SN	0	135,047	0	0	0	135,047
ROW	SU	3,531,677	161,200	0	0	0	3,692,877
		5,229,376	1,296,247	3,386,287	1,344,156	1,000,000	12,256,066

Prior Year Cost: 16,404,223
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 66,131,317
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

**KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS TO NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE
4492911 Non-SIS**



Project Description: LANDSCAPING
Extra Description: STANDALONE LANDSCAPE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 1.4
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS
To: NORTH OF COMMERCIAL CIRCLE


Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DDR	0	0	141,293	0	0	141,293
PE	DIH	0	0	11,303	0	0	11,303
CST	DDR	0	0	0	0	811,922	811,922
CST	DIH	0	0	0	0	34,404	34,404
				152,596	846,326	998,922	

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 998,922
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

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

County: ST. LUCIE

To: NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS

Length: 1.576

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	854,350	0	0	0	0	854,350
CST	DIH	36,745	0	0	0	0	36,745
		891,095					891,095

Prior Year Cost: 157,674


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,048,769

LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF PICOS RD TO NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS
2302567 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2013 TPO PRIORITY #1 PE/ENGINEERING UNDER 230256-2 CONCRETE AT THE INTERSECTION OF ORANGE AVENUE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NORTH OF PICOS RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS
Length: 1.217
Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, RAILROAD & UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DS	0	205,832	0	0	0	205,832
		205,832					205,832

Prior Year Cost: 82,561,744
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 85,194,613
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

KINGS HWY FROM NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD TO INDRIIO ROAD
4383793 Non-SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2022 TPO PRIORITY #5 WIDENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES; PD&E UNDER 230256-5 R/W REQUIRED
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NORTH OF ST. LUCIE BLVD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** INDRIIO ROAD
Length: 2.19
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DDR	0	0	0	0	2,128,890	2,128,890
ROW	DIH	0	0	0	0	552,000	552,000
ROW	DS	0	0	0	0	1,351,932	1,351,932
						4,032,822	4,032,822

Prior Year Cost: 16,404,223
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 66,131,317
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

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
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** NORTH OF PICOS RD
Length: 1.397
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	503,727	0	0	0	0	503,727
CST	DIH	29,805	0	0	0	0	29,805
		533,532					533,532

Prior Year Cost: 82,561,744
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 85,194,613
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

**KINGS HWY NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS TO SOUTH OF ANGLE RD
4383794 Non-SIS**




Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2017 TPO PRIORITY #4 WIDENING 2 TO 4 LANES, PD&E UNDER 230256-5, DESIGN & ROW UNDER FM# 438379.1
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NORTH OF I-95 OVERPASS
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** SOUTH OF ANGLE RD
Length: 0.97
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	0	0	0	9,872,017	2,026,940	11,898,957
CST	DIH	0	0	0	116,421	116,421	232,842
CST	DS	0	0	0	7,944,135	0	7,944,135
CST	SA	0	0	0	4,489,197	0	4,489,197
CST	SU	0	0	0	3,817,263	0	3,817,263
					26,239,033	2,143,361	28,382,394

Prior Year Cost: 16,404,223
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 66,131,317
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

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



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2022 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROMOM 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 FROMOM ST.LUCIE CO \$2,108,000 PH32/37

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: GLADES CUT OFF RD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: SELVITZ RD

Length: 1.577

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	SA	0	468,500	1,000,000	0	0	1,468,500
		468,500	1,000,000				1,468,500

Prior Year Cost: 78,845,424


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 132,110,887

LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

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



Prior Year Cost: 78,845,424
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 132,110,887
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT

Extra Description: 2022 TPO PRIORITY #2 WIDENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES BASED ON PD&E COMPLETED UNDER 231440-3 DESIGN AND RIGHT OF WAY ON 231440-3 56-02: UWHCA WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE 66-01: UWHCA CEI FOR UTILITIES PROJECT ADVANCEMENT TO FY 24 PER AGREEMENT WST LUCIE COUNTY

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: WEST OF JENKINS RD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: SELVITZ RD


Length: 0.785

Phase Group: RAILROAD & UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTION, LOCAL ADVANCE REIMBURSE

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
RRU	LF	828,110	0	0	0	0	828,110
CST	CIGP	1,700,494	0	0	0	0	1,700,494
CST	LF	10,476,173	0	0	0	0	10,476,173
CST	LFROM	19,370,393	0	0	0	0	19,370,393
CST	SU	51,400	0	0	0	0	51,400
LAR	CIGP	0	0	7,094,463	0	0	7,094,463
LAR	SA	0	0	3,643,102	0	0	3,643,102
LAR	SU	0	0	3,917,247	0	0	3,917,247
LAR	TRIP	0	0	3,276,644	0	0	3,276,644
LAR	TRWR	0	0	1,438,937	0	0	1,438,937
		32,426,570		19,370,393			51,796,963

Notes

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



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 7.858

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: IDEAL HOLDING RD

To: SOUTH ROCK RD

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACNR	0	1,060,337	0	0	0	1,060,337
CST	DDR	0	14,163,227	848,399	0	0	15,011,626
CST	DIH	0	66,950	72,264	0	0	139,214
			15,290,514	920,663			16,211,177

Prior Year Cost: 1,360,557


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 17,571,734

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** EDWARDS RD
Length: 1.326
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	SR2T	0	5,000	0	0	0	5,000
			5,000				5,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 5,000
LRTP: Page 8-11

Notes

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



Prior Year Cost: 47,172
Future Year Cost: 5,621,289
Total Project Cost: 6,845,066
LRTP: Page 8-3

Project Description: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES

Extra Description: ADD EB RIGHT TURN LANE FROM ORANGE AVE/SR-68 TO I-95 SB ON-RAMP & ADD WB RIGHT-TURN LANE FROM ORANGE AVE/SR-68 TO NB KINGS HWY/SR-713 NB & WB PROTECTED RIGHT TURN PHASES TO BE ADDED AT INTERSECTION OF ORANGE AVE/SR-68 AND KINGS HWY/ SR-713 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

County: ST. LUCIE

To: EAST OF I-95 SB RAMP


Length: 0.646

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	ACFP	614,283	24,423	0	0	0	638,706
ROW	ACFP	0	382,386	0	0	0	382,386
ROW	DDR	0	145,513	0	0	0	145,513
ENV	ACFP	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000
		624,283	552,322				1,176,605

Notes

**ORANGE AVE FROM KINGS HWY TO US-1
4496961 Non-SIS**



Project Description: ATMS - ARTERIAL TRAFFIC MGMT

Extra Description: 2022 TPO CMP PRIORITY #3 INCLUDES SOUTH 7TH STREET FROM ORANGE AVE TO AVE A INSTALL FIBER OPTIC CABLE, TRAFFIC CAMERAS/VIDEO DETECTORS AND ADAPTIVE SIGNAL CONTROL AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS NO R/W NEEDED

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: KINGS HWY

County: ST. LUCIE

To: US-1

Length: 4.187

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DDR	0	0	0	320,627	0	320,627
PE	DIH	0	0	0	25,650	0	25,650
						346,277	346,277

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 346,277

LRTP: Page 8-11

Notes

**ORANGE AVE FROM NORTH 32ND ST TO WEST OF US-1
4461691 Non-SIS**




Prior Year Cost: 644,171
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,226,260
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: RESURFACING
Extra Description: 52-01: SU FUNDS PER TPO FOR DECORATIVE LIGHTING/ ADA BRICK PAVERS/ PAVER CROSSWALKS/ BRICK PAVER DETECTABLE WARNINGS/ ADA CURB RAMPS LF 52-02/LF W/ FT. PIERCE UTILITY AUTHORITY (FPUA) TPO PRIORITY
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NORTH 32ND ST
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** WEST OF US-1
Length: 1.915
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	425,707	0	0	0	0	425,707
CST	DDR	281,714	0	0	0	0	281,714
CST	DIH	126,136	0	0	0	0	126,136
CST	DS	792,047	0	0	0	0	792,047
CST	LF	90,007	0	0	0	0	90,007
CST	SA	2,765,720	0	0	0	0	2,765,720
CST	SN	927,873	0	0	0	0	927,873
CST	SU	172,885	0	0	0	0	172,885
		5,582,089					5,582,089

Notes

**OUTFALL FOR VIRGINIA AVE
4417151 SIS**



Project Description: DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS

Extra Description: OUTFALL WILL BE ROUTED FROMOM CANAL 7D (CITY CANAL EAST OF OLEANDER BLVD) ALONG VIRGINIA AVE, SOUTH ON SR-5/US-1 AND THEN EAST THROUGH INDIAN HILLS DR TO ULTIMATELY OUTFALL INTO THE SAND MINE LAKE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: OLEANDER BLVD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: INDIAN HILLS DR

Length: 0.177

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACPR	0	0	0	3,472,975	0	3,472,975
CST	DIH	0	0	0	0	31,496	31,496
CST	DS	0	0	0	574,092	0	574,092
CST	SA	0	0	0	4,665,931	0	4,665,931
					8,712,998	31,496	8,744,494

Prior Year Cost: 912,387


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 9,656,881

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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




Prior Year Cost: 30,880,246
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 70,893,244
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2022 TPO PRIORITY #3. WIDENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES.
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** BECKER RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** PAAR DR
Length: 1.119
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, RAILROAD & UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	SU	251,279	0	0	0	0	251,279
RRU	SU	0	0	0	100,000	0	100,000
CST	ACPR	0	0	0	0	2,686,394	2,686,394
CST	CARU	0	0	0	0	589,130	589,130
CST	CM	0	0	0	0	1,848,345	1,848,345
CST	SA	0	0	0	0	5,650,370	5,650,370
CST	SU	0	0	0	0	4,590,885	4,590,885
CST	TRIP	0	0	0	0	1,627,089	1,627,089
CST	TRWR	0	0	0	0	2,858,241	2,858,241
		251,279			100,000	19,850,454	20,201,733

Notes

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




Prior Year Cost: 30,880,246
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 70,893,244
LRTP: Page 8-2

Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Extra Description: 2020 TPO PRIORITY #2; WIDENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES. DESIGN AND RIGHT OF WAY ON 431752-2 DENING FROMOM 2 TO 4 LANES LFA WITH CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE. 56-02 LF UWHCA 62-03 LF FOR CEI FOR UWHCA CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE --NEW SEQUENCE 52-02 WAS CREATED TO PULL FROMOM APPROPRIATE BUDGET CATEGORY (NON-PROGRAM 87)
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTH OF PAAR DR
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** SOUTH OF ALCANTARRA BLVD
Length: 1.076
Phase Group: RAILROAD & UTILITIES, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
RRU	LF	0	1,807,473	0	0	0	1,807,473
CST	CIGP	0	4,969,708	0	0	0	4,969,708
CST	LF	32,887	0	0	0	0	32,887
CST	LFP	0	4,969,708	0	0	0	4,969,708
CST	SU	0	4,237,043	0	0	0	4,237,043
CST	TRIP	0	2,277,129	0	0	0	2,277,129
CST	TRWR	0	1,517,317	0	0	0	1,517,317
		32,887	19,778,378				19,811,265

Notes

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



Project Description: RESURFACING
Extra Description: G/W 447652-1
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 1.543
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION


From: WEST OF SE SHELTER DR
To: US-1

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACNR	0	822,496	0	0	0	822,496
CST	DDR	0	854,581	0	0	0	854,581
CST	DIH	0	0	117,634	0	0	117,634
CST	SA	0	1,562,794	0	0	0	1,562,794
		3,239,871	117,634				3,357,505

Prior Year Cost: 435,093
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,792,598
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 1.024

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: NORTH OF EDWARDS RD

To: NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DDR	3,129,332	0	0	0	0	3,129,332
CST	DIH	122,771	0	0	0	0	122,771
CST	DS	384,985	0	0	0	0	384,985
CST	LF	20,250	0	0	0	0	20,250
		3,657,338					3,657,338

Prior Year Cost: 550,506

Future Year Cost: 0


Total Project Cost: 4,207,844

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** LENNARD RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** SAVANNAS RECREATION AREA
Length: 4.171
Phase Group: RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	DDR	0	67,373	0	0	0	67,373
CST	TLWR	3,761,067	0	0	0	0	3,761,067
		3,761,067	67,373				3,828,440

Prior Year Cost: 12,365,148
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 16,225,274
LRTP: Page 8-3

Notes

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
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** WALTON RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** LENNARD RD
Length: 0
Phase Group: CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DIH	31,686	0	0	0	0	31,686
		31,686					31,686

Prior Year Cost: 12,365,148
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 16,225,274
LRTP: Page 8-2

Notes

SHOREWINDS DR/ A1A
4498281 Non-SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 1.301

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: 0.2 MILES W OF BR 940046

To: ATLANTIC BEACH BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DDR	298,300	0	0	0	0	298,300
PE	DIH	32,635	0	0	0	0	32,635
CST	DDR	0	0	0	2,162,288	0	2,162,288
CST	DIH	0	0	0	91,622	0	91,622
		330,935			2,253,910		2,584,845

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 2,584,845

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM EAST OF N 25 ST TO WEST OF US-1
4484491 Non-SIS




Project Description: RESURFACING
Extra Description: GOES WITH 448450.1
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** EAST OF N 25 ST
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** WEST OF US-1
Length: 0.523
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DIH	10,359	0	0	0	0	10,359
CST	DDR	0	0	104,150	0	0	104,150
CST	DIH	0	0	33,873	0	0	33,873
CST	DS	0	0	658,764	0	0	658,764
		10,359		796,787			807,146

Prior Year Cost: 260,547
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,067,693
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TURNPIKE FEEDER ROAD FROM INDRIO ROAD TO US-1
4510811 Non-SIS




Project Description: LIGHTING
Extra Description: B/C RATIO= 2.5 NPV \$2,646,838 SHSP EMPHASIS AREA(S): INTERSECTION & VULNERABLE ROAD USER CRASHES SEGMENT 1 (FROM INDRIIO ROAD TO STA 136+80, 540 FT NORTH OF INDRIO ROAD):PROPOSED LIGHTING CONSISTS OF LED LIGHT FIXTURES ON THE WEST SIDE AND EAST SIDE OF SR 713 SEGMENT 2 (FROM STA 136+80 TO S OF PALOMAR PKWY):PROPOSED...SEE WP45
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** INDRIO ROAD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** US-1
Length: 2.741
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,686,060
LRTP: Page 3-9

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	ACSS	361,084	0	0	0	0	361,084
PE	SA	13,785	0	0	0	0	13,785
CST	ACSS	0	0	0	2,238,343	0	2,238,343
CST	SA	0	0	0	72,848	0	72,848
		374,869			2,311,191		2,686,060

Notes

US HIGHWAY 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 ROAD, EMIL AVE. GARDENIA AVE. AND VIRGINIA AVE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: EDWARDS RD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: TENNESSEE AVE

Length: 1.124

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION, ENVIRONMENTAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	ACNR	0	0	0	1,747,912	0	1,747,912
CST	ACPR	0	0	0	9,986,848	0	9,986,848
CST	DDR	0	0	0	1,701,540	0	1,701,540
CST	DIH	0	0	0	58,673	0	58,673
CST	SA	0	0	0	227,228	0	227,228
					13,722,201		13,722,201

Prior Year Cost: 1,408,558


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 15,130,759

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

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



Project Description: RESURFACING

Extra Description: G/W 446376-1

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 0.605

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE

To: SE PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DIH	0	94,033	0	0	0	94,033
CST	DS	0	2,218,872	0	0	0	2,218,872
		2,312,905					2,312,905

Prior Year Cost: 425,833

Future Year Cost: 0


Total Project Cost: 2,738,738

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

US HIGHWAY 1 FROM MIDWAY RD TO SOUTH OF EDWARDS ROAD

4510801 Non-SIS



Project Description: LIGHTING

Extra Description: B/C RATIO = 2.8 NPV \$4,153,539 SHSP EMPHASIS AREA(S): INTERSECTION & VULNERABLE ROAD USER CRASHES RETROFIT TWO (2) DECORATIVE LIGHT POLES ON THE WEST SIDE OF W. MIDWAY RD; ONLY STREET LIGHTING LUMINAIRES. RETROFIT 38 EXISTING LUMINAIRES ATTACHED TO EXISTING UTILITIES POLES. PROPOSED 119 LUMINAIRES BRACKET ON EXISTING ...SEE WP45

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: MIDWAY RD

County: ST. LUCIE

To: SOUTH OF EDWARDS ROAD

Length: 2.513

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RAILROAD & UTILITIES

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	ACSS	260,849	0	0	0	0	260,849
PE	SA	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000
RRU	ACSS	0	0	1,043,395	0	0	1,043,395
		270,849		1,043,395			1,314,244

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 1,314,244

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

US HIGHWAY 1 FROM NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE TO SUNNY LANE
4461091 SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 2.963

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

From: NORTH OF VIRGINIA AVE

To: SUNNY LANE

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	DIH	17,708	0	0	0	0	17,708
		17,708					17,708

Prior Year Cost: 8,175,998


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 8,193,706

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

US HIGHWAY 1 FROM SOUTH OF JUANITA AVE TO NORTH OF KINGS HWY
4484501 Non-SIS



Project Description: RESURFACING
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 5.836
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

From: SOUTH OF JUANITA AVE
To: NORTH OF KINGS HWY

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	DIH	72,609	0	0	0	0	72,609
CST	ACPR	0	0	67,416	0	0	67,416
CST	DDR	0	0	9,226,272	0	0	9,226,272
CST	DIH	0	0	61,408	45,300	0	106,708
CST	DS	0	0	1,282,666	0	0	1,282,666
CST	SA	0	0	5,271,629	0	0	5,271,629
		72,609		15,909,391	45,300		16,027,300

Prior Year Cost: 2,174,598
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 18,201,898
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

VOLUCIA DRIVE TO NW EAST TORINO PARKWAY TO WEST BLANTON BLVD
4508611 Non-SIS




Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2023 TAP PRIORITY #1 LAP W/ CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** NW EAST TORINO PARKWAY
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** WEST BLANTON BLVD
Length: 1.003
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	TALT	5,000	0	0	0	0	5,000
CST	LF	0	0	515,529	0	0	515,529
CST	TALT	0	0	183,882	0	0	183,882
CST	TALU	0	0	267,346	0	0	267,346
		5,000		966,757			971,757

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 971,757
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

WALTON RD FROM 800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD RD TO GREEN RIVER PARKWAY
4483081 Non-SIS



Project Description: SIDEWALK
Extra Description: 2022 TPO TAP PRIORITY #1 CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALK, ELEVATED PEDESTRIAN BOARDWALK LAP WITH ST LUCIE COUNTY
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** 800 FEET EAST OF LENNARD RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** GREEN RIVER PARKWAY
Length: 0.946
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION


Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	LF	891,990	0	0	0	0	891,990
CST	TALT	444,371	0	0	0	0	444,371
CST	TALU	290,759	0	0	0	0	290,759
		1,627,120					1,627,120

Prior Year Cost: 5,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,632,120
LRTP: Page 8-11

Notes

C.2 AVIATION

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - 10 R SAFETY AREA DITCH
4515111 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: 10 R SAFETY AREA DITCH RELOCATION - DESIGN
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	120,000	0	0	0	0	120,000
CAP	LF	30,000	0	0	0	0	30,000
		150,000					150,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 150,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - ARFF TRUCK REPLACEMENT
4515571 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION SAFETY PROJECT
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
From:
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL


Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	640,000	0	0	640,000
CAP	LF	0	0	160,000	0	0	160,000
				800,000			800,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 800,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - CLEARING AND GRUBBING

4515121 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: 10 R SAFETY AREA CLEARING AND GRUBBING
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	80,000	0	0	0	0	80,000
CAP	LF	20,000	0	0	0	0	20,000
		100,000					100,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 100,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - ILS REPLACEMENT 10R/28L
4515561 Non-SIS




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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	400,000	0	0	400,000
CAP	LF	0	0	100,000	0	0	100,000
				500,000			500,000

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

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - TAXIWAY ALPHA RWY 14/32
4515361 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: INTERSECTION REHAB - DESIGN
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	120,000	0	0	0	120,000
CAP	LF	0	30,000	0	0	0	30,000
		150,000					150,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 150,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - TAXIWAY CHARLIE REALIGNMENT
4515371 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: DESIGN
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	100,000	0	0	0	100,000
CAP	LF	0	25,000	0	0	0	25,000
		125,000					125,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 125,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - TAXIWAY ECHO REHAB - DESIGN
4515551 Non-SIS




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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	100,000	0	0	100,000
CAP	LF	0	0	25,000	0	0	25,000
				125,000			125,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 125,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - WEST GA RAMP REHAB - DESIGN
4515601 Non-SIS



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


Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	200,000	0	0	200,000
CAP	LF	0	0	50,000	0	0	50,000
				250,000			250,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 250,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AEROWEST TAXIWAY (CONSTRUCTION)

4481151 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJECT

Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

From:

To:

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	1,200,000	1,200,000	0	0	0	2,400,000
CAP	LF	300,000	300,000	0	0	0	600,000
		1,500,000	1,500,000				3,000,000

Prior Year Cost: 0


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 3,000,000

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TAXIWAY REALIGNMENT B AND C DEMO
4496171 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: CONSTRUCTION
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	1,200,000	0	0	0	0	1,200,000
CAP	LF	300,000	0	0	0	0	300,000
		1,500,000					1,500,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,500,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WEST COMMERCE PARK TAXIWAY
4496341 Non-SIS



Project Description: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJECT
Extra Description: (DESIGN)
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL


From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	280,000	0	0	0	0	280,000
CAP	LF	70,000	0	0	0	0	70,000
		350,000					350,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 350,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT-10R SAFETY AREA DITCH RELOCATION
4515581 Non-SIS




Project Description: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJECT
Extra Description: CONSTRUCTION
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
To:
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	20,475	0	0	20,475
CAP	FAA	0	0	368,550	0	0	368,550
CAP	LF	0	0	20,475	0	0	20,475
				409,500			409,500

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 409,500
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TREASURE COAST INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT-10R SAFETY AREA DITCH RELOCATION
4515591 Non-SIS



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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	DPTO	0	0	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000
CAP	LF	0	0	500,000	0	0	500,000
				2,500,000			2,500,000

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,500,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

C.3 TRANSIT PROJECTS

**MICROTRANSIT EXPANSION IN PORT ST. LUCIE (CAPITAL)
4515891 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 71,106
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING FOR FIXED ROUTE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DPTO	71,106	0	0	0	0	71,106
		71,106					71,106

Notes

MICROTRANSIT EXPANSION IN PORT ST. LUCIE (OPERATING)
4515901 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 783,279
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING FOR FIXED ROUTE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DPTO	783,279	0	0	0	0	783,279
		783,279					783,279

Notes

**PALM TRAN 6-MONTH BUS PASSES
4515881 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 375,000
L RTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING FOR FIXED ROUTE
Extra Description: THIS IS FOR CITIZENS RETURNING FROM INCARCERATION
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DPTO	375,000	0	0	0	0	375,000
		375,000					375,000

Notes

PSL UZA - PSL COUNTY SECT 5339 CAPITAL FOR BUS & BUS FACILITIES

4345481 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 2,129,114

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 3,504,114

LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE

Extra Description: ST.LUCIE CNTY SECTION 5339 CAPITAL FOR BUS & BUS FACILITIES PROGRAM
16. CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE NON-BUDGET REVENUE

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

County: ST. LUCIE

To:

Length: 0

Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	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

Notes

**PSL UZA - ST. LUCIE COUNTY SECTION 5307 FORMULA FUNDS
4134941 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 36,194,273
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 48,294,273
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 FROMOM J. MELI 10/13/10. GRANT FL90-X765 EXECUTED 10/20/11 \$1,407,322 EMAIL FROMOM K. SCOTT/SLC 1-11-12 TO J. MELI. ST.LUCIE COUNTY SEC 5307 OPERATING ASSISTANCE NON-BUDGET REVENUE

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COA **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS, CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	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

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 18,940,218
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 26,889,658
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE
Extra Description: BILL (SB2502) SIGNED BY THE GOVERNOR ON 6/2/2021 NO MATCH REQUIREMENT FOR FY22 BLOCK GRANT FUNDS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST. LUCIE COUNTY **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DPTO	751,372	0	0	0	0	751,372
OPS	LF	751,372	0	0	0	0	751,372
		1,502,744					1,502,744

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 18,940,218
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 26,889,658
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DDR	0	690,467	793,581	817,389	841,911	3,143,348
OPS	DPTO	0	80,000	0	0	0	80,000
OPS	LF	0	770,467	793,581	817,389	841,911	3,223,348
			1,540,934	1,587,162	1,634,778	1,683,822	6,446,696

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 2,821,255
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,649,959
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DU	66,021	0	0	0	0	66,021
OPS	LF	66,021	0	0	0	0	66,021
		132,042					132,042

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 2,821,255
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 3,649,959
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DU	0	81,206	85,029	89,038	93,058	348,331
OPS	LF	0	81,206	85,029	89,038	93,058	348,331
		162,412	170,058	178,076	186,116	696,662	

Notes

C.4 MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

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

Prior Year Cost: 657,118
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,522,729
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY CITY OF FORT PIERCE
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: OPERATIONS

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DDR	99,251	102,229	105,509	129,117	0	436,106
OPS	DITS	107,445	110,668	113,988	97,404	0	429,505
		206,696	212,897	219,497	226,521		865,611

Notes

**CITY OF FT. PIERCE JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM
4515811 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 413,972
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Extra Description: NEW MSCA TARGET STARTING IN FY28
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	0	0	0	0	413,972	413,972
						413,972	413,972

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 352,036
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 891,852
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DDR	75,386	77,648	79,978	77,210	0	310,222
OPS	DITS	50,182	59,687	61,478	58,247	0	229,594
		125,568	137,335	141,456	135,457		539,816

Notes

**CITY OF PORT ST. LUCIE JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPS ON SHS
4515831 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 192,046
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Extra Description: NEW MSCA TARGET STARTING IN FY28
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	0	0	0	0	192,046	192,046
						192,046	192,046

Notes

**ST. LUCIE - PRIMARY MOWING AND LITTER CONTRACT
4480521 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 250,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,500,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	250,000	250,000	0	0	0	500,000
		250,000	250,000				500,000

Notes

**ST. LUCIE - PRIMARY MOWING AND LITTER CONTRACT
4480522 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 250,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,500,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	0	0	250,000	250,000	250,000	750,000
				250,000	250,000	250,000	750,000

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 6,126,542
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,251,542
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	100,000
		20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	100,000

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 681,005
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,668,744
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
OPS	DDR	142,760	147,042	151,696	147,334	0	588,832
OPS	DITS	93,099	95,892	98,769	111,147	0	398,907
		235,859	242,934	250,465	258,481		987,739

Notes

**ST. LUCIE COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE & OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM
4515821 Non-SIS**

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 390,928
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRAFFIC SIGNALS
Extra Description: NEW MSCA TARGET STARTING IN FY28
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWY/CONTRACT MAINT

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	0	0	0	0	390,928	390,928
						390,928	390,928

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 60,558,808
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 69,733,808
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWDY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	9,000,000
		1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	9,000,000

Notes

TREASURE COAST OPERATIONS- REPLACE TILE - SHOP & WAREHOUSE
4516331 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 25,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: BRDG/RDWDY/CONTRACT MAINT

From:
To:

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	0	0	0	0	25,000	25,000
						25,000	25,000

Notes

C.5 PLANNING PROJECTS

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

Prior Year Cost: 5,871,997
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 12,009,389
LRTP: Page 3-9

Project Description: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
Extra Description: 2023 TPO PRIORITY #1
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY ST LUCIE METRO **From:**
 PLANNING ORG **To:**
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0
Phase Group: PLANNING

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PLN	PL	931,849	0	0	0	0	931,849
PLN	SU	400,000	0	0	0	0	400,000
		1,331,849					1,331,849

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 5,871,997
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 12,009,389
L RTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PLN	PL	0	794,236	803,769	0	0	1,598,005
PLN	SU	0	400,000	400,000	0	0	800,000
			1,194,236	1,203,769			2,398,005

Notes

ST. LUCIE FY 2026/2027-2027/2028 UPWP
4393266 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 5,871,997
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 12,009,389
LRTP: Page 3-9


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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PLN	PL	0	0	0	803,769	803,769	1,607,538
PLN	SU	0	0	0	400,000	400,000	800,000
					1,203,769	1,203,769	2,407,538

Notes

C.6 BRIDGE

A1A AT BIG MUD CREEK AND BLIND CREEK BRIDGES #940003/940004
4491791 Non-SIS



Project Description: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Extra Description: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: BIG MUD CREEK BRIDGE

County: ST. LUCIE

To: BLIND CREEK BRIDGE

Length: 0.617

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
RRU	ACBR	0	100,000	0	0	0	100,000
CST	ACBR	0	0	13,782,612	0	0	13,782,612
			100,000	13,782,612			13,882,612

Prior Year Cost: 1,114,441


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 14,997,053

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

A1A NORTH CAUSEWAY BRIDGE
4299362 Non-SIS



Project Description: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

Extra Description: RISK WORKSHOP 32-02

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

County: ST. LUCIE

Length: 1.205

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

From: ENTIRE BRIDGE

To: ENTIRE BRIDGE

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
ROW	GFBR	0	8,676,339	0	0	0	8,676,339
INC	DS	630,000	0	0	0	0	630,000
		630,000	8,676,339				9,306,339

Prior Year Cost: 153,208,954

Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 162,515,293

LRTP: Page 8-3

Notes

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

Prior Year Cost: 6,126,542
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 6,251,542
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	25,000
		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	25,000

Notes

ST. LUCIE COUNTY STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM BRIDGES
2338592 Non-SIS

Prior Year Cost: 60,558,808
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 69,733,808
LRTP: Page 3-9

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

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
MNT	D	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	175,000
		35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	175,000

Notes

C.7 TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

TURNPIKE @ MIDWAY RD SOUTHERN RAMPS INTERCHANGE (MP 150)
4518581 SIS




Project Description: INTERCHANGE RAMP (NEW)
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SOUTHERN RAMPS INTERCHANGE
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** SOUTHERN RAMPS INTERCHANGE
Length: 0.8
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	1,600,000	0	0	0	0	1,600,000
ROW	PKYI	0	5,500,000	0	0	0	5,500,000
CST	PKYI	0	0	0	12,852,872	0	12,852,872
		1,600,000	5,500,000		12,852,872		19,952,872

Prior Year Cost: 10,246
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 19,963,118
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**TURNPIKE @ SR-70 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS (MP 152)
4465801 SIS**




Project Description: INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** INTERCHANGE
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** INTERCHANGE
Length: 0.8
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	0	0	2,643,562	0	0	2,643,562
				2,643,562			2,643,562

Prior Year Cost: 19,870
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,663,432
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**TURNPIKE @ SW PORT ST. LUCIE BLVD
4462201 SIS**



Project Description: INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT

Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT

From: INTERCHANGE

County: ST. LUCIE

To: INTERCHANGE

Length: 0.294

Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	0	4,302,271	0	0	0	4,302,271
		4,302,271					4,302,271

Prior Year Cost: 1,500


Future Year Cost: 0

Total Project Cost: 4,303,771

LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**TURNPIKE PORT ST. LUCIE SERVICE PLAZA PARKING IMPROVEMENTS (MP 142)
4497121 SIS**



Project Description: REST AREA
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 0.493
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING


From: SERVICE PLAZA
To: SERVICE PLAZA

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	0	0	0	0	270,000	270,000
						270,000	270,000

Prior Year Cost: 1,500
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 271,500
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

**TURNPIKE RESURFACING
4444021 SIS**




Project Description: RESURFACING
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT
County: ST. LUCIE
Length: 3.7
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION
From: MP 169.3
To: MP 173

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	PKYR	11,228,809	0	0	0	0	11,228,809
		11,228,809					11,228,809

Prior Year Cost: 1,126,745
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 14,921,306
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TURNPIKE ROADSIDE IMPROVEMENT FROM MP 169.3 - 173
4444022 SIS



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


From: MP 169.3
To: MP 173

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CST	PKYR	2,565,752	0	0	0	0	2,565,752
		2,565,752					2,565,752

Prior Year Cost: 1,126,745
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 14,921,306
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TURNPIKE WIDENING FROM CROSSTOWN PKWY TO SR70
4465831 SIS




Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** CROSSTOWN PKWY
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** SR70
Length: 8.412
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	0	0	18,660,293	0	0	18,660,293
				18,660,293			18,660,293

Prior Year Cost: 3,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 18,663,293
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TURNPIKE WIDENING FROM MARTIN C/L TO BECKER RD
4463341 SIS




Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** MARTIN C/L
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** BECKER RD
Length: 0.404
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY, CONSTRUCTION

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	4,555,375	0	0	0	0	4,555,375
ROW	PKYI	0	0	425,000	0	0	425,000
		4,555,375		425,000			4,980,375

Prior Year Cost: 3,980
Future Year Cost: 63,512,188
Total Project Cost: 68,496,543
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

TURNPIKE WIDENING FROM SW BECKER RD TO CROSTOWN PKWY
4463351 SIS



Project Description: ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT
Lead Agency: MANAGED BY FDOT **From:** SW BECKER RD
County: ST. LUCIE **To:** CROSTOWN PKWY
Length: 6.227
Phase Group: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING, RIGHT OF WAY

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
PE	PKYI	11,436,886	0	0	0	0	11,436,886
		11,436,886					11,436,886

Prior Year Cost: 3,980
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 11,440,866
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

C.8 SEAPORT PROJECTS

PORT OF FORT PIERCE TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS
4485361 Non-SIS



Project Description: SEAPORT CAPACITY PROJECT
Extra Description: SEQ 01 UTILITIES; SEQ 02 TERMINAL PAVING
Lead Agency: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE **From:**
County: ST. LUCIE **To:**
Length: 0
Phase Group: CAPITAL

Phase	Fund Code	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	Total
CAP	LF	1,500,000	0	0	0	0	1,500,000
CAP	PORT	1,500,000	0	0	0	0	1,500,000
		3,000,000					3,000,000

Prior Year Cost: 1,000,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 4,000,000
LRTP: Page 3-9

Notes

D. LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS
LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS



2022/23 List of Priority Projects (LOPP) (Adopted June 1, 2022)

Master List

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2021/22 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	Jenkins Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ underway, ROW ⁵ to start in FY 23/24	Yes	\$44,000,000 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	\$16,850,000 ⁶	3
4a	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Phase 1			New interchange with southbound on-ramp and northbound off-ramp		Yes	\$13,500,000 ⁶	4
4b	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Phase 2			New interchange with southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp		Yes	\$28,500,000 ⁶	4
5	Yes	Kings Highway	Angle Road	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway	Yes	\$119,077,000 ⁶	5
6	Yes	Northern/Airport Connector	Florida's Turnpike	Kings Highway	New multimodal corridor with interchanges at Florida's Turnpike and I-95	I-95 Interchange Justification Report to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$137,110,000 ⁷	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 ⁸ to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$51,890,000 ⁷	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, May 2022

⁷Source of Estimated Cost: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

⁸PD&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)

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Facility/Segment or Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source	2021/22 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	Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan was completed without a TMC	\$400,000	ATMS Master Plan	1
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	2
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	PE ⁴ to start in FY 2026/27	\$700,000	ATMS Master Plan	3
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	4
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	5

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

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

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

Transit Projects

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2021/22 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	\$90,000 - \$450,000	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 Regional Service	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach with 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*, November 2020

⁵*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study*, June 2020

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2021/22 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	40.5	Volucia Drive Trail	Blanton Boulevard	Torino Parkway	Sidewalk: 1.0 mile	2022 TA Grant Application ³ and 2045 LRTP	\$1,061,178 ⁴	17
2	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,090,396 ⁶	2
3	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 ⁷	3
4	42.5	Green River Parkway Trail	Martin County Line	Walton Road	Resurfacing of multi-use path: 2.5 miles	City of Port St. Lucie, Florida SUN Trail, and St. Lucie WBN	\$350,000	Not Ranked
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,500,000 ⁶	7
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.4 miles		\$1,650,000 ⁶	7
7	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airoso Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$825,000 ⁸	9
8	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk: 0.2 miles		\$225,000 ⁶	12
9	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk: 2.6 miles		\$3,050,790 ⁶	17
10	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.5 miles		\$1,323,840	19
11	38.0	Peacock Trail	Gatlin Boulevard	Dreyfuss Boulevard	Multi-use path: 0.9 miles	City of Port St. Lucie	\$900,000	Not Ranked
12	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,461,595 ⁶	20
13	36.0	17th Street	Georgia Avenue	Delaware Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.3 miles		\$74,268	21
13	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk: 0.8 miles		\$123,200	21
15	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.9 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$575,000 ⁸	24
15	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$323,000 ⁸	24
17	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$445,220	29
18	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk: 6.1 miles		\$5,300,000 ⁶	30
18	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk: 5.0 miles		\$5,753,580 ⁶	30
20	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk: 3.0 miles		\$2,600,000 ⁶	32
21	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk: 2.8 miles		\$2,250,000 ⁶	33

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2021/22 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
22	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$411,836 ⁹	34
23	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk: 5.2 miles		\$6,066,780 ⁶	35
24	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk: 2.4 miles		\$2,830,390 ⁶	36
24	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	36
26	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	South of Devine Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$562,202	38
27	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 41st Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$393,004	39
28	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$2,076,392 ⁶	40
29	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	41

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 LRTP), 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: 2022 TA Grant Application, February 2022

⁵WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Engineering

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: 2019 TA Grant Application

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 2022 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 April 2020, 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	
				2020	2021	2022	2 Year	4 Year				1 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⁾	100% ⁽¹⁾	75%	70%		70%	+	
		% of person miles traveled on the non Interstate NHS that are Reliable	✓	96.8% ⁽¹⁾	96.8% ⁽¹⁾	96.8% ⁽¹⁾	50%	50%		50%	+	
		The Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index - the average of the maximum TTTR calculated for each reporting segment on the Interstate	✓	1.10 ⁽¹⁾	1.11 ⁽¹⁾	1.11 ⁽¹⁾	1.75	2		2	+	
	Optimize the management and operations of the transportation system	TSM&O Strategic Network / ATMS Network Deployment		34% ⁽²⁾	34% ⁽²⁾	35.8% ⁽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)		10.9% ⁽³⁾	10.9% ⁽³⁾	11.5% ⁽³⁾				16%	+	
		Transit routes providing access to MACs		8 ⁽⁴⁾	8 ⁽⁴⁾	8 ⁽⁴⁾				10	+	
PROVIDE TRAVEL CHOICES	Encourage walking, cycling, and other micromobility options	% of roadways with sidewalks and bike lanes		29% ⁽²⁾	30% ⁽²⁾	30.5% ⁽²⁾				43%	+	
	Improve transit accessibility	% of transit stops with sidewalk access		90% ⁽²⁾	90% ⁽²⁾	90% ⁽²⁾				100%	+	
		Miles of fixed route transit service		206 ⁽⁴⁾	206 ⁽⁴⁾	206 ⁽⁴⁾				300	+	
MAINTAIN THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	Maintain condition of existing transportation assets	% of Interstate pavement in good condition	✓	82.3% ⁽¹⁾	84% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	60%	60%		60%	+	
		% of Interstate pavement in poor condition	✓	0% ⁽¹⁾	0% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	5%	5%		5%	+	
		% of non-Interstate National Highway System pavement in good condition	✓	n/a	48.6% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	40%	40%		40%	+	
		% of non-Interstate National Highway System pavement in poor condition	✓	n/a	1.1% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	5%	5%		5%	+	
		% of National Highway System bridges classified as in good condition	✓	83.4% ⁽¹⁾	83.6% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	50%	50%		50%	+	
		% of National Highway System bridges classified as in poor condition	✓	0% ⁽¹⁾	0% ⁽¹⁾	coming soon	10%	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	✓	57% ⁽⁴⁾	57% ⁽⁴⁾	57% ⁽⁴⁾			57%	0%	+	
		Rolling Stock - % of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have either met or exceeded their useful life benchmark (fixed route)	✓	0% ⁽⁴⁾	0% ⁽⁴⁾	61% ⁽⁴⁾			80%	0%		
		% of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale	✓	4.5% ⁽⁴⁾	4.5% ⁽⁴⁾	4.5% ⁽⁴⁾			4.5%	0%	+	
PROVIDE EQUITABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY	Support healthy living strategies, programs, and improvements to create more livable communities	Walking modal share		1.9% ⁽³⁾	1.4% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase		
		Bike modal share		0.3% ⁽³⁾	0.3% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase	+	
		Transit modal share		0.4% ⁽³⁾	0.3% ⁽³⁾	coming soon				Maintain or Increase		
	Ensure community participation is representative	Opportunities for engagement in traditionally underserved areas		7 ⁽²⁾	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		27.1% ⁽³⁾	27.3% ⁽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 ⁽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% ⁽⁵⁾				0%	+	
IMPROVE SAFETY AND SECURITY	Improve safety and security in the Highway System	Number of fatalities	✓	41 ⁽⁶⁾	44 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		38/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
		Fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	✓	1.18 ⁽⁶⁾	1.25 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		1.09/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
		Number of serious injuries	✓	145 ⁽⁶⁾	148 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		148/0 ⁽⁷⁾	+	
		Serious injury rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	✓	4.21 ⁽⁶⁾	4.23 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		4.04/0 ⁽⁷⁾		
	Improve safety and security in the Non-Motorized System	Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries combined		✓	28 ⁽⁶⁾	32 ⁽⁶⁾	coming soon	0	0		26/0 ⁽⁷⁾	
		Improve safety and security in the Transit System	Total number of reportable fatalities (fixed route)	✓	0 ⁽⁴⁾	0 ⁽⁴⁾	0 ⁽⁴⁾			0	SupportCounty Target	+
	Rate of reportable fatalities per total vehicle revenue miles by mode (fixed route)		✓	0 ⁽⁴⁾	0 ⁽⁴⁾	0 ⁽⁴⁾			0	SupportCounty Target	+	
	Total number of reportable injuries (fixed route)		✓	0 ⁽⁴⁾	3 ⁽⁴⁾	2 ⁽⁴⁾			1	SupportCounty Target		
	Rate of reportable injuries per total vehicle revenue miles by mode (fixed route)		✓	0 ⁽⁴⁾	0.51 ⁽⁴⁾	0.38 ⁽⁴⁾			0.34	SupportCounty Target		
	Total number of reportable safety events (fixed route)		✓	0 ⁽⁴⁾	3 ⁽⁴⁾	1 ⁽⁴⁾			1	SupportCounty Target	+	
Rate of reportable safety events per total vehicle revenue miles by mode (fixed route)	✓		0 ⁽⁴⁾	0.51 ⁽⁴⁾	0.18 ⁽⁴⁾			0.16	SupportCounty Target			
	Mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode (fixed route)	✓	10,410 ⁽⁴⁾	9,639 ⁽⁴⁾	6,613 ⁽⁴⁾			7,274	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 96 projects totaling \$440,475,098. 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 most recent Florida Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) was completed by FDOT on December 30, 2022. 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.
-



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee:	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Date:	May 16, 2023
Item Number:	6c
Item Title:	Carbon Reduction Strategy
Item Origination:	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
UPWP Reference:	Task 3.9 – Environmental Planning
Requested Action:	Recommend approval of the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy, recommend approval with conditions, or do not recommend approval.
Staff Recommendation:	Because the Carbon Reduction Strategy would facilitate the allocation of funding to projects and strategies which can be demonstrated to reduce carbon emissions in the TPO area consistent with the Federal Carbon Reduction Program and because the Carbon Reduction Strategy is consistent with Task 3.9 of the UPWP, it is recommended that the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy be recommended for approval by the TPO Board.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Draft Carbon Reduction Strategy



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
 Executive Director

FROM: Yi Ding
 Transportation Systems Manager

DATE: May 9, 2023

SUBJECT: Carbon Reduction Strategy

BACKGROUND

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Reducing carbon emissions in the transportation sector is a complex issue that demands innovative and locally-driven solutions which go beyond traditional transportation plans and projects.

The recently-enacted Infrastructure and Investment Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, includes a new program that provides \$6.4 billion in formula funding over five years for states and localities. Urbanized areas with an urbanized area population greater than 200,000, such as the TPO area, are included in the formula funding.

The purpose of the program is to fund projects and strategies that reduce carbon emissions and expand transportation options. As part of the program, states are required to develop a carbon reduction strategy in consultation with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) while MPOs are encouraged to develop their own strategies. Therefore, Task 3.9, *Environmental Planning*, of the TPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), includes the development of a Carbon Reduction Strategy for the TPO area.

ANALYSIS

The attached draft Carbon Reduction Strategy was completed by the Corradino Group, one of the TPO's General Planning Consultants. This strategy evaluates

various scenarios aimed at reducing the carbon footprint caused by vehicle traffic emissions, including mixed-use/multimodal neighborhoods, high-density neighborhoods, telecommuting, a multimodal/transit scenario, and sustainable transportation technologies. An air emissions tool has been developed to quantify the carbon emission reductions resulting from each of the five scenarios. In the report, the carbon emissions from each implementation scenario is evaluated and compared to the 2045 baseline scenario using the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model Version 5 (TCRPM5).

The report identifies the sustainable transportation scenario as providing the highest benefits. However, there is significant uncertainty with regard to the implementation of this scenario due to several factors such as the electric vehicle market, the availability of a clean electric grid and fast charging stations, and Federal government policies.

The telecommuting scenario provides the second-best benefits but with similar uncertainty with regard to its implementation, although some of these policies may be within the local government's authority. For example, local governments can collaborate with the public and private sector employers in developing remote working strategies and infrastructure necessary for implementing such a scenario.

Mixed-use and high-density developments, when provided with transit and multimodal services, can offer significant benefits in terms of reducing carbon footprints and improving community health. The increase in express buses and non-motorized trips under the multimodal scenario encourages transit improvements in the region.

RECOMMENDATION

Because the Carbon Reduction Strategy would facilitate the allocation of funding to projects and strategies which can be demonstrated to reduce carbon emissions in the TPO area consistent with the Federal Carbon Reduction Program and because the Carbon Reduction Strategy is consistent with Task 3.9 of the UPWP, it is recommended that the draft Carbon Reduction Strategy be recommended for approval by the TPO Board.

Development of Carbon Footprint Reduction Strategies for St. Lucie County Contract C19-09-696

May, 2023



PREPARED FOR
ST LUCIE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TPO)



St. Lucie

**Transportation
Planning
Organization**

SUBMITTED BY

THE CORRADINO GROUP

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Performance Measures..... 1
2.1 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) 2
2.2 Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) 2
2.3 Emissions..... 3
3. VMT\Air Quality Estimation Tool 3
4. GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies..... 5
4.1 Mixed-Use / Multimodal Neighborhoods 5
4.2 High-Density Neighborhoods 10
4.3 Telecommuting 14
4.4 Multimodal Scenario 16
4.5 Sustainable Transportation Technologies..... 19
5. Conclusions and Recommendations 20
Appendices..... 22
Appendix A – Emission Rates i
(Source: FDOT D4 FSUTMS models) i
PM 2.5 Emission Rates i
PM 10 Emission Rates iv
Carbon Monoxide Emission Rates vi
NOx Emission Rates ix
Carbon Di-Oxide Emission Rates.....xiv
Volatile Organic Compound Emission Rates.....xvi
Appendix B – Maps from the TPO Workshopxix
Fort Piercexix
Port St Luciexx
St Lucie County.....xxi

List of Figures

Figure 1: Air Quality Assessment Tool 3
Figure 2: Emission Rates of Carbon Dioxide for Car and Truck Modes 4
Figure 3: Mixed-Use TAZs 6
Figure 4: Household Distribution..... 7
Figure 5: Employment Distribution 8
Figure 6: High-Density TAZs..... 11
Figure 7: Household Comparison Between Revised and High-Density Scenario 12
Figure 8: Transit Express Lines..... 16

List of Tables

Table 1: Total Addition of Households and Employment for the Mixed-Use Scenario..... 7
Table 2: Comparing VMT of Mixed-Use Scenario with Baseline 2045 9
Table 3: Air Quality Emissions (tons) Comparison of 2045 Baseline with the Mixed-Use Scenario..... 10
Table 4: Household and Employment Comparison between the Baseline and High-Density Scenarios ... 11
Table 5: Comparing VMT of High-Density Scenario with Baseline 2045 13
Table 6: Air Quality Emissions Comparison of High-Density Scenario with the Baseline 2045..... 14
Table 7: TCRPM5 St. Lucie Person Trips Comparison of Baseline and Remote Work Scenario 15
Table 8: VMT Statistics Comparison of Baseline and Telecommuting Scenarios 15
Table 9: Air Quality Emissions Comparison of the Baseline and Telecommuting Scenarios..... 15
Table 10: Daily Ridership for the Express Scenario 17
Table 11: Air Quality Emissions compared with Transit-Express Scenario..... 18
Table 12: Comparing VMT of Multimodal Scenario with the Baseline 2045..... 18
Table 13: Air Quality Emissions of 2045 Baseline compared with Sustainable Transportation Scenario .. 19
Table 14: Comparison of GHG Reduction Scenario Performance Measures with the Baseline..... 20

1. Introduction

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) requires the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop Carbon Reduction Strategies to reduce transportation emissions from surface transportation.

Florida will receive \$320.4 million over the next five years (Source: FDOT: Carbon Reduction Strategy (fdot.gov)). The agencies are expected to follow the following guidelines in implementing the Carbon Reduction Strategies.

1. Support the reduction of transportation emissions in the state
2. Identify safe, reliable, and cost-effective options and strategies for projects
3. Consider the population density and context of the state

To support the Federal and State initiatives, St. Lucie TPO has undertaken this effort of testing various Carbon Reduction Strategies.

St. Lucie County is one of the fastest growing counties in the State of Florida, with some of the highest population growth rates to year 2045. The University of Florida's Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) estimates that by 2045, St. Lucie County's population can grow to a maximum projection over 570,000. In line with fast-growing population, the travel demand models are estimating congested conditions in 2045. The growing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) statistics are likely to contribute to the higher carbon footprint, primarily caused by the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, consisting of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) and Nitrous Oxide (N₂O). It is also noted that CO₂ accounts for 97% of the GHG emissions and is an important gas to measure.

With this background, St. Lucie TPO is pursuing the system wide carbon footprint reduction strategies, for the emissions generated by passenger vehicle travel. The purpose of this study is to primarily define and demonstrate strategies that will reduce carbon footprint caused by the GHG emissions generated by automobile traffic. It should be noted that the GHG emissions are generated by a variety of sources, including automobiles, industrial pollution, and the heating and cooling systems, etc. This study primarily focuses on the transportation related GHG emissions generated by automotive traffic.

2. Performance Measures

Air quality performance measure is used to evaluate the impact of transportation on air pollution. In the context of travel demand modeling, air quality performance measures are typically used to assess the effectiveness of different transportation policies and strategies in reducing emissions and improving air quality.

Some common air quality performance measures used in travel demand modeling include:

2.1 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is a transportation performance measure that is commonly used in travel demand modeling. It refers to the total number of miles traveled by all vehicles within a specific geographic area over a given period of time.

In travel demand modeling, VMT is used as an input to estimate future transportation demand and to evaluate the impact of various transportation policies and interventions on travel behavior and system performance. VMT is often disaggregated by vehicle type, roadway type, time of day, and other factors to provide a more detailed picture of travel patterns and to inform planning and investment decisions.

VMT can be influenced by a variety of factors, including population growth, economic development, land use patterns, and transportation infrastructure investments. It is also closely linked to other transportation performance measures, such as vehicle congestion, air pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions.

In recent years, there has been growing interest in reducing VMT as a strategy to address traffic congestion, air pollution, and climate change. This has led to the development of a range of transportation policies and programs aimed at promoting more sustainable transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and public transit, and at encouraging more efficient use of vehicles, such as through carpooling and the use of electric and hybrid vehicles.

2.2 Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)

Vehicle hours traveled (VHT) refers to the total amount of time that vehicles spend on the road within a given period. It is a measure of the cumulative travel time of vehicles and reflects the overall level of congestion and traffic delay within a transportation system. VHT considers both the distance traveled by vehicles and the average speed at which they are able to travel.

Reducing vehicle hours traveled is a desirable goal for several reasons. Firstly, high VHT indicates traffic congestion and inefficiencies within the transportation network. Congestion leads to delays, increased travel times, and frustration for commuters. Furthermore, reducing VHT contributes to improved air quality and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Vehicles consume more fuel and produce higher emissions when operating in congested conditions or idling in traffic.

By reducing VHT, transportation systems can become more efficient, resulting in smoother traffic flow and improved travel times. Reducing vehicle hours traveled is crucial for improving transportation system efficiency, reducing congestion, enhancing air quality, and mitigating greenhouse gas emissions.


2.3 Emissions

This measures the quantity of pollutants (such as Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), Nitrous Oxide (N₂O), and particulate matter) that are emitted from vehicles. Quantifying the emissions can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies that aim to reduce emissions. For certain strategies, trips can shift to other modes of transportation (such as driving, walking, or cycling). These strategies can be used to evaluate the shift in travel behavior towards more sustainable modes of transportation, which can help reduce emissions and improve air quality.

3. VMT\Air Quality Estimation Tool

Corradino developed an air quality emission tool (Figure 1) that allows for the calculation of various emissions for different transportation vehicle mixes. The tool automates the complex computations and provides a comprehensive and user-friendly way to estimate the emissions (in tons) of different modes of transportation over time. It can be used to inform policy decisions related to transportation and air quality, as well as to support research on emissions and their impact on the environment and public health. By providing accurate and up-to-date emissions estimates, this tool can help to reduce the environmental and health impacts of transportation and promote a more sustainable future.

Figure 1: Air Quality Assessment Tool




The tool utilizes rates for estimating the emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrous Oxide, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), Carbon Dioxide (CO₂), and particulate matter (less than 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5}), and less than 10 micrometers (PM₁₀)). The rates for each of the vehicle mixes (motorcycle, passenger car and truck) decrease every decade, starting from 2010 until 2040. The rates are developed for the use in FDOT D4 models using EPA’s MOVES air quality model. It should be noted that the rates were developed based on the 2010 Census base year as starting point and is the latest information available in FDOT D4. The tool forecasts year 2045 emissions burdens by extrapolating the emissions rates of 2040. For this effort, the quantity of the pollutant is not an important performance measure. It is the difference (delta) of the quantity of the pollutant between two different scenarios that is important. The tool uses emission rates, which are typically

expressed as grams of pollutants emitted per mile traveled. These rates vary depending on the speed and type of vehicle.

For example, a motorcycle may have a higher rate of carbon monoxide emissions than a passenger car, while a passenger truck may have higher emissions of nitrogen oxide and particulate matter (Appendix A).

To calculate the emissions for a given mode of transportation, the tool would need to know the VMT traveling through a link and the corresponding emission rates for the mode and the congested speed. The tool would then multiply the distance by the rate of emissions, for a particular speed bin to calculate the total emissions for each pollutant. An example of CO₂ emission rates from the tool is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Emission Rates of Carbon Dioxide for Car and Truck Modes



Fuel efficiency has been improving every passing year due to advancements in technology, changing consumer preferences, and government regulations. These improvements have resulted in reduced fuel consumption and lower emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants. To account for the decreasing rates over time, the tool accounts for decrease in emission rates, which involves estimating the rate for each year based on the known rates for the starting and ending years.

Overall, the tool would use basic mathematical operations, to calculate the emissions for each pollutant and mode of transportation. The accuracy of the tool would depend on the quality and reliability of the emission rates used, as well as the accuracy of the VMT traveled data.

4. GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies

There are several strategies that can be employed to reduce GHG emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change. The study team, in coordination with the TPO, has met with the Planning Directors of the City of Port St. Lucie, City of Fort Pierce and the St. Lucie County and strategically defined the strategies to be tested for the GHG emissions. The primary strategies included Mixed-Use development, High-Density development, telecommuting, and multimodal strategies. It should be noted that higher mode split of the use of non-motorized and sustainable transportation is assumed in the Mixed-Use and High-Density development strategies and the multimodal strategy.

Each of the strategies were tested against the 2045 baseline scenario, using the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model (TCRPM5). The following sections describe the strategies, the assumptions in implementing them using TCRPM5, and their results compared to the baseline scenario.

4.1 Mixed-Use / Multimodal Neighborhoods

Mixed-Use land development is a planning and design approach that combines different types of land uses within a single development or neighborhood. This approach contrasts with the traditional single-use development model, where residential, commercial, and industrial uses are separated into distinct areas. Mixed-Use development typically includes a mix of uses such as residential, commercial, office, and institutional uses in close proximity to one another. The goal is to create a more walkable, livable, and sustainable environment that provides a range of amenities and services within easy reach of residents.


The benefits of Mixed-Use development include reduced traffic congestion, increased walkability and accessibility, and a greater sense of community. This approach can also provide opportunities for local businesses and help to support a diverse range of housing options and lifestyles.

To develop a Mixed-Use scenario, Corradino hosted a workshop with the local planning directors at the St. Lucie TPO, to obtain input on areas that they envision as Mixed-Use neighborhoods (Appendix B). Note that this is a high-level scenario used for demonstration purpose of the strategies and by no means assumes the immediate implementation. By gathering insights from

multiple organizations, Corradino aimed to create a comprehensive modeling assumption that reflects the needs and vision of the organizations. This collaborative approach helped to ensure that the resulting Mixed-Use scenario makes reasonable geographic assumptions, promoting sustainable and vibrant communities that benefit all stakeholders.

Figure 3 shows the TAZs that were demarcated as Mixed-Use neighborhoods. TAZs highlighted in orange color were selected as medium density households (10 du/acre) and TAZs highlighted in blue color as High-Density households (15 du/acre). Only 20% of the area of the TAZs was assumed for density calculations, assuming plenty of space for utilities, roads, parks, and greenspace. Total of 34,563 households and 15,312 jobs (Table 1) were added to Mixed-Use TAZs. This includes TAZs in the downtown Fort Pierce, TAZs near and west of the Treasure Coast International Airport, and the TAZs at US-1 and Midway Road intersection.

Figure 3: Mixed-Use TAZs




In order to honor the County control totals of St. Lucie County population, a growth reallocation procedure was implemented. This procedure involves applying a factor to adjust the growth to TAZs that are envisioned to be Mixed-Use and reallocate growth from other TAZs. The factors used for growth reallocation is based on household growth between base year and horizon year.

Table 1: Total Addition of Households and Employment for the Mixed-Use Scenario.

TOTAL_TAZ	HH_Baseline	EMP_Baseline	HH_MXD	EMP_MXD
68	13,970	19,243	48,533	34,555
Total Growth			+34,563	+15,312


Figure 4: Household Distribution



The growth reallocation procedure is intended to provide a more accurate representation of the expected distribution of growth within the region, and to ensure that travel demand forecasts are consistent with St. Lucie County control totals. Since each of the scenario results are compared against the 2045 baseline scenario, the socioeconomic data control totals from baseline were used as the basis.

Figures 4 and 5 show household and employment difference between the baseline scenario and the Mixed-Use scenario. TAZs that are highlighted in light blue, purple color show where the household and employment growth was distributed to. TAZs highlighted in yellow color show where the additional households and employment was balanced to ensure travel demand forecasts are consistent with regional control totals.

Figure 5: Employment Distribution



After developing the baseline and Mixed-Use scenarios, key performance measures from TCRPM5 and the GHG tool were summarized. The Mixed-Use scenario included a combination of residential, commercial, and industrial land uses, and was designed to encourage walking, cycling, and transit use by providing a range of amenities and services within walking distance. The baseline scenario, on the other hand, assumed a continuation of existing land use patterns and transportation infrastructure investments.

The analysis showed that the Mixed-Use scenario led to a reduction in VMT of 0.67% (Table 2). This results in approximately 85,000 VMT reduction that roughly translates to 22.1 M reduction in vehicle miles travelled annually for 260 weekdays in a year.

Correspondingly, the reduction in VHT of 3% was observed, which translates to a total reduction of 10,000 vehicle hours. This is 2.6 M less vehicle hours travelled annually. These reductions are significant and suggest that Mixed-Use development can be an effective strategy for promoting more sustainable travel patterns.

Table 2: Comparing VMT of Mixed-Use Scenario with Baseline 2045

Statistics	Baseline Scenario	Mixed-Use Scenario	% Difference
Total Number of Directional Links	4,256	4,256	
Total Lane Miles	2,011	2,011	
Total Directional Miles	1,293	1,293	
Total Volume All Links	38,240,044	37,527,840	-1.86%
Average (Directional) Volumes of All Links	8,985	8,818	-1.86%
Total VMT All Links	12,368,345	12,285,592	-0.67%
Total VHT All Links	329,508	319,589	-3.01%
Original Speed (VMT/Free flow VHT)	48.39	48.56	
Congested Speed (VMT/Congested VHT)	37.54	38.44	
Walk Trips	171,104	221,984	29.74%
Bike Trips	43,772	42,924	-1.94%
Total Trips	2,272,728	2,270,888	0.36%

Biking and walking are highly sustainable modes of transportation that offer numerous benefits for individuals and communities. They promote a greener, healthier, and more vibrant transportation system while reducing dependence on fossil fuels and mitigating environmental impacts.

Mixed-use scenario, where residential, commercial, and recreational areas are integrated, the emphasis on walkability is even more pronounced. Analysis showed that there was a notable increase of 29.7% in walking trips, representing an additional 50,000 trips (Table 2). Additionally,

the overall increase of 0.36% in trips reflects the collective shift towards more sustainable transportation choices within the community.

Table 3 shows that the Mixed-Use scenario led to a 15-ton reduction in carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, as well as significant reductions in other gas categories. This was achieved by reducing the need for long-distance travel and encouraging more sustainable transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and transit use.

Table 3: Air Quality Emissions (tons) Comparison of 2045 Baseline with the Mixed-Use Scenario

Scenario	CO	NO _x	VOC	CO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Baseline Scenario	12.77	1.28	0.35	4,537	0.74	0.14
Mixed-Use Scenario	12.64	1.3	0.35	4,522	0.73	0.13

4.2 High-Density Neighborhoods

High-Density residential neighborhoods are areas characterized by a high concentration of housing units per unit of land area. These neighborhoods typically feature multi-family dwellings such as apartment buildings, condominiums, or townhouses, as well as some single-family homes.


High-Density residential neighborhoods are often found in urban or suburban areas and are designed to accommodate a large number of people in a relatively small space. They typically offer a range of amenities such as parks, community centers, and public transportation, which make them attractive to residents who value the proximity to urban amenities and services.

High-Density residential neighborhoods can have several benefits, including reducing the amount of land used for housing, promoting more efficient land use, and supporting public transportation and other sustainable transportation options. They can also foster a sense of community and encourage social interaction among residents.

To develop a High-Density scenario, Corradino gathered input on areas that the TPO envisions as High-Density residential neighborhoods (Appendix B). By gathering insights from multiple organizations, Corradino created a comprehensive approach that reflected the needs and vision of the local agencies in St. Lucie TPO. This collaborative approach helped to ensure that the resulting scenario is both feasible and desirable, promoting sustainable and vibrant communities that benefit all stakeholders. Note that this scenario was developed again as a demonstration of GHG emissions reduction strategy and is not envisioned at implementation without further studies.

Figure 6 shows the TAZs that were demarcated as High-Density neighborhoods. TAZs highlighted in orange color were selected as medium density households (20 du/acre) and TAZs highlighted in blue color as High-Density households (25 du/acre).

Figure 6: High-Density TAZs



Only 20% of the area of the TAZs was assumed for density calculations. Total of 10,724 households (Table 4) were added to High-Density TAZs. This includes TAZs in Fort Pierce downtown, and east I-95 interchanges in Port St. Lucie.

Table 4: Household and Employment Comparison between the Baseline and High-Density Scenarios


TOTAL_TAZs	HH_Baseline	EMP_Baseline	HH_HD	EMP_HD
52	6,310	19,594	17,034	19,594
Total Growth			10,724	-

In order to honor the County control totals of St. Lucie County population, a growth reallocation procedure was implemented. This procedure involves applying a factor to adjust the growth to TAZs that are envisioned to be Mixed-Use and reallocate growth from other TAZs. The factors

used for growth reallocation is based on household growth between base year and horizon year. The growth reallocation procedure is intended to provide a more accurate representation of the expected distribution of growth within the region, and to ensure that travel demand forecasts are consistent with St. Lucie County control totals. Since each of the scenario results are compared against the 2045 baseline scenario, the socioeconomic data control totals from baseline were used as the basis.

Figure 7 shows household difference between baseline scenario and the High-Density scenario. TAZs that are highlighted in light blue, purple color show where the growth was distributed to. TAZs highlighted in light orange color show where the additional households were balanced to ensure travel demand forecasts are consistent with regional control totals.

Figure 7: Household Comparison Between Revised and High-Density Scenario



The High-Density scenario results were evaluated using TCRPM5 to assess the impact of dense developments on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT). The High-Density scenario included a combination of residential uses and was designed to encourage

walking and cycling. The baseline scenario, on the other hand, assumed a continuation of existing land use patterns and transportation infrastructure investments.

The analysis showed that the High-Density scenario led to a reduction in VMT of 0.37% (Table 5). This results in approximately 46,000 VMT reduction that roughly translates to 11.96 M reduction in miles travelled annually for 260 weekdays in a year.

Reduction in VHT of 0.54%, which translates to a total reduction of 2,000 vehicle hours. This is 520,000 less vehicle hours travelled annually. These reductions are significant and suggest that High-Density development can be an effective strategy for promoting more sustainable travel patterns.

Table 5: Comparing VMT of High-Density Scenario with Baseline 2045

Statistics	Baseline Scenario	High-Density Scenario	% Difference
Total Number of Directional Links	4,256	4,256	
Total Lane Miles	2,011	2,011	
Total Directional Miles	1,293	1,293	
Total Volume All Links	38,240,044	38,225,340	-0.04%
Average (Directional) Volumes of All Links	8,985	8,981	-0.04%
Total VMT All Links	12,368,345	12,322,612	-0.37%
Total VHT All Links	329,508	327,726	-0.54%
Original Speed (VMT/Free flow VHT)	48.39	48.4	
Congested Speed (VMT/Congested VHT)	37.54	37.6	
Walk Trips	171,104	190,144	11.13%
Bike Trips	43,772	44,360	1.34%
Total Trips	2,272,728	2,269,408	0.30%

Walking and cycling are particularly advantageous modes of transportation for High-Density neighborhoods, offering numerous benefits for both residents and the community. In High-Density areas, where land is utilized more efficiently and distances between destinations are shorter, walking and cycling become even more viable and appealing options for daily travel.

In High-Density scenario, there was an increase of 11.13% in walking trips and 1.34% in bike trips (Table 5). This translates to an additional 20,000 walking trips and 600 more biking trips. These figures demonstrate the positive impact of the neighborhood's characteristics, infrastructure, and community support in encouraging active transportation choices.

Table 6 shows that the High-Density scenario led to an 8-ton reduction in Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) emissions, as well as slight reductions in other gas categories like carbon monoxide. This was achieved by reducing the need for long-distance travel and encouraging more sustainable transportation modes, such as walking, cycling, and transit use.

Table 6: Air Quality Emissions Comparison of High-Density Scenario with the Baseline 2045

Scenario	CO	NO _x	VOC	CO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Baseline Scenario	12.77	1.28	0.35	4,537	0.74	0.14
High-Density Scenario	12.72	1.28	0.35	4,529	0.74	0.14

4.3 Telecommuting

Telecommuting is a work arrangement in which employees can perform their job duties outside of the traditional office setting, using technology to communicate and collaborate with colleagues and complete tasks remotely.

With the advancement of technology and the increasing availability of high-speed internet, remote working has become more popular in recent years. It offers many benefits to both employees and employers, such as increased flexibility, improved work-life balance, reduced commuting time and costs, and access to a larger pool of talent.

Remote working has the potential to significantly impact trip patterns, as it reduces the need for daily commuting to and from the office, which can result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions. Employees who work remotely may have more flexible schedules and may be able to avoid rush-hour traffic, reducing congestion on roads and highways.

However, the impact of remote working on trip patterns can vary depending on the type of remote work arrangement and the characteristics of the individual. For example, employees who work from home full-time may have reduced commute trips, but they may also have more non-work trips, such as running errands during the day or traveling for leisure. Similarly, employees who work remotely part-time may still need to commute to the office for some portion of the workweek, which may not result in a significant reduction in VMT.

Overall, remote working has the potential to impact trip patterns by reducing the need for daily commuting and offering more flexibility in work schedules. This can result in reduced traffic congestion, improved air quality, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

To test the remote working scenario, the TCRPM5 input parameters were adjusted to reduce the home-based work trips and home-based school trips. The TCRPM model constants were adjusted so that the home-based work trips and school trips assumed increased activities from home. Table 7 presents the comparison of St. Lucie Person Trips between the Baseline and Remote Work Scenarios.

Table 7: TCRPM5 St. Lucie Person Trips Comparison of Baseline and Remote Work Scenario

Scenario	HBW	HB School	HBO	NHB	NHBW	Total
Baseline Scenario	295,280	196,552	1,203,688	383,680	183,528	2,262,728
Telecommuting Scenario	266,452	169,216	1,155,700	367,900	167,056	2,126,324
Trip Difference	28,828	27,336	47,988	15,780	16,472	136,404
% Diff	9.8%	13.9%	4.0%	4.1%	9.0%	6.0%

Table 8 presents the VMT statistics comparison between the Baseline and Remote Work Scenarios. It can be observed that this scenario produces significant reduction in VMT and VHT statistics.

Table 8: VMT Statistics Comparison of Baseline and Telecommuting Scenarios

Statistics	Baseline Scenario	Telecommuting Scenario	% Difference
Total Number of Directional Links	4,256	4,256	
Total Lane Miles	2,011	2,011	
Total Directional Miles	1,293	1,293	
Total Volume All Links	38,240,044	36,761,613	-3.87%
Average (Directional) Volumes of All Links	8,985	8,638	-3.87%
Total VMT All Links	12,368,345	11,943,924	-3.43%
Total VHT All Links	329,508	309,416	-6.10%
Original Speed (VMT/Free flow VHT)	48.39	48.57	
Congested Speed (VMT/Congested VHT)	37.54	38.6	

Table 9 presents the comparison of the Baseline and Telecommuting Scenarios. It can be noted that significant reduction of carbon emissions in the telecommuting scenario.

Table 9: Air Quality Emissions Comparison of the Baseline and Telecommuting Scenarios

Scenario	CO	NO _x	VOC	CO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Baseline Scenario	12.77	1.28	0.35	4,537	0.74	0.14
Telecommuting Scenario	12.28	1.26	0.33	4,372	0.69	0.13

4.4 Multimodal Scenario

As part of this scenario development, Corradino conducted discussions with the TPO and the St. Lucie County Transit division. While it was understood that robust changes to enhance transit are not yet planned, it was agreed that some testing of express buses in the area would be useful.

As part of this scenario, four express bus routes supported by park-and-ride lots were tested.

Express transit lines are public transportation routes that offer faster and more efficient service than local transit lines. These lines typically operate along major transportation corridors, such as highways or major streets, and provide limited stops and faster travel times than local transit lines.

Express transit lines often use specialized vehicles such as buses or trains, which are designed to provide a higher level of comfort and speed than regular transit vehicles. They may also offer features such as dedicated lanes, signal priority, and off-board fare collection to further improve travel times and reduce delays.

Express transit lines are often used for longer trips or for trips that require connections between different modes of transportation. They may also be used for commuting to and from work, where speed and efficiency are particularly important. Express transit lines can offer several benefits, including reduced travel times, increased reliability, and improved access to employment, education, and other important destinations. They can also support economic development by improving access to jobs and reducing the cost of transportation for residents.




Figure 8: Transit Express Lines

Express transit lines are designed to provide faster and more efficient transportation options for commuters traveling to and from high-demand areas. In St. Lucie County, express transit lines have been developed specifically to connect the southwest region (Figure 8) of the county with the Fort Pierce downtown area, as well as to provide access to neighborhoods in the northern region where high growth is anticipated.

These transit lines offer a convenient and reliable alternative to driving, with a headway of 30 minutes and connecting regions like Tradition Parkway to the downtown. The service frequency is also higher than traditional bus routes, allowing for greater flexibility and convenience for. These transit options provide a faster, more efficient, and more sustainable means of transportation, benefitting both commuters and the broader community.

Table 10: Daily Ridership for the Express Scenario

Route	Mode	Distance (miles)	Daily Ridership
Express1_In	451	21.98	105
Express1_Out	451	21.67	106
Express2_In	451	17.12	10
Express2_out	451	17.12	49
Express3_In	451	19.86	22
Express3_Out	451	19.86	53
Express4_In	451	14.02	207
Express4_Out	451	14.02	236

Express Line 1 is a transit line in St. Lucie County that serves as a convenient and efficient transportation option for commuters traveling between high-demand areas (from Traditions Parkway to Downtown Fort Pierce). This line has an average daily ridership of 211 (Table 10). Express Line 4 is a key transit line in St. Lucie County that provides residents with access to high-growth areas in the northern region near the airport. This line has an average daily ridership of 443 (Table 10). Express Line 3 originating from Downtown to Glades-Cut off road, and Express Line 2 from the Downtown area to connect Southwest part of the county show 78 and 59 average daily ridership respectively. The multimodal scenario led to a reduction in VMT of 0.71% (Table 12). This results in approximately 88,000 VMT reduction that roughly translates to 22.9 M reduction in miles travelled annually for 260 weekdays in a year.

Reduction in VHT of 3.23% (Table 12) is observed, which translates to a total reduction of 10,656 vehicle hours. This is 2.7 M less vehicle hours travelled annually. Table 11 shows that the multimodal scenario led to 18-ton reduction in carbon-do-oxide emissions, as well as some reductions in other gas categories like carbon monoxide.

In multi-modal scenario, there was an increase of 29.6% in walking (Table 12). This translates to an additional 50,000 walking trips. It can be noted that there is slight reduction in bike trips in this scenario. This can be regarded as the noise in the data as the walk and bike modes compete in the future scenarios. These figures demonstrate the positive impact of the neighborhood's characteristics, infrastructure, and community support in encouraging active transportation choices.

Table 11: Air Quality Emissions compared with Transit-Express Scenario

Scenario	CO	NOx	VOC	CO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Baseline Scenario	12.77	1.28	0.35	4,537	0.74	0.14
Multimodal Scenario	12.63	1.30	0.35	4,519	0.73	0.13

Compared to the High-Density and Mixed-Use scenarios, the transit scenario produced less impact on the VMT and greenhouse gases. However, as the region grows, in combination with the High-Density and Mixed-Use scenarios, transit options can become more effective.

Table 12: Comparing VMT of Multimodal Scenario with the Baseline 2045

Statistics	Baseline Scenario	Multimodal Scenario	% Difference
Total Number of Directional Links	4,256	4,256	
Total Lane Miles	2,011	2,011	
Total Directional Miles	1,293	1,293	
Total Volume All Links	38,240,044	37,507,504	-1.92%
Average (Directional) Volumes of All Links	8,985	8,813	-1.91%
Total VMT All Links	12,368,345	12,280,933	-0.71%
Total VHT All Links	329,508	318,852	-3.23%
Original Speed (VMT/Free flow VHT)	48.39	48.56	
Congested Speed (VMT/Congested VHT)	37.54	38.52	
Walk Trips	171,104	221,772	29.6%
Bike Trips	43,772	42,396	-3.14%
Total Trips	2,272,728	2,269,408	-0.16%

4.5 Sustainable Transportation Technologies

Sustainable transportation technologies encompass a range of innovations and practices that aim to reduce the environmental impact of transportation while maintaining efficiency and meeting mobility needs. Electric vehicles (EVs) are a significant component of sustainable transportation and have gained considerable attention in recent years.

Electric vehicles are automobiles powered by electric motors and use electricity stored in batteries as their primary energy source. They offer several environmental advantages over conventional internal combustion engine vehicles. Firstly, EVs produce zero tailpipe emissions, reducing air pollution and improving local air quality. This can have significant health benefits, particularly in densely populated areas.

Moreover, electric vehicles contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions when charged with electricity from renewable sources. They offer the potential for decarbonizing transportation and mitigating climate change impacts. By transitioning to an electric vehicle fleet, countries can reduce their dependence on fossil fuels and move towards a more sustainable and low-carbon transportation system.

In the sustainable transportation scenario, the adoption rates of electric vehicles (EVs) were considered based on age groups. The scenario assumed that individuals aged 18-34 had an EV adoption rate of 27%, those aged 35-50 had a rate of 40%, and individuals over 50 years old had a rate of 33% (Corradino's internet research included various data sources on the ongoing EV sales data). To calculate the weighted average adoption rate, each age group's adoption rate was multiplied by the proportion of the population it represented. If current trends continue, the weighted average EV adoption rate for St. Lucie County TAZ data age distribution came out to be 33%. The study team is aware of the much aggressive EV adoption goals of the current administration. If these aggressive goals are met, they will only improve the air quality in the region from the conservative scenario assumed herein. It should be noted that the EV penetration rates depend on the government's policy decisions over the next few decades and make this scenario result highly uncertain.

Table 13: Air Quality Emissions of 2045 Baseline compared with Sustainable Transportation Scenario

Scenario	CO	NOx	VOC	CO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Baseline Scenario	12.77	1.28	0.35	4,537	0.74	0.14
Sustainable Transportation Scenario	11.99	1.22	0.33	4,293	0.70	0.13

This weighted average EV adoption rate of 33% was then applied as a weighing factor to reduce the total emissions produced, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), by 33%. By encouraging a higher

adoption of electric vehicles, the scenario aimed to decrease the reliance on traditional gasoline-powered vehicles, resulting in reduced greenhouse gas emissions and improved air quality. Table 13 shows that there was a decrease in 44 tons of CO₂ emissions, as well as significant reductions in other gas categories like carbon monoxide.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

St. Lucie TPO has undertaken the testing of various strategies for the carbon footprint reduction. In this effort, the 2045 Baseline Model Scenario adopted in April 2023 was used as the basis for comparison. Mixed-Use, High-Density, Telecommuting, Multimodal and the Sustainable Transportation strategies were tested as part of this effort. The TCRPM5 and the Air Quality Assessment tool were run for quantifying the benefits of each scenario.

Table 144: Comparison of GHG Reduction Scenario Performance Measures with the Baseline

Statistics	Baseline Scenario	High-Density Scenario	% Diff	Mixed- Use Scenario	% Diff	Telecommuting Scenario	% Diff	Multimodal Scenario	% Diff	Sustainable Transportation Scenario	% Diff
Total VMT All Links	12,368,345	12,322,612	-0.37%	12,285,592	-0.67%	11,943,924	-3.43%	12,280,933	-0.71%	12,368,345	0.00%
Total VHT All Links	329,508	327,726	-0.54%	319,589	-3.01%	309,416	-6.10%	318,852	-3.23%	329,508	0.00%
CO ₂ Emissions	4,537	4,529	-0.18%	4,522	-0.33%	4,372	-3.64%	4,519	-0.40%	4,293	-5.38%

Note that there is high uncertainty involving the EV market penetration rates that highly influence the results of the sustainable transportation scenario. Majority of this is dependent on the infrastructure improvements, availability of clean electric grid, availability of fast charging stations, and the Federal government policies, that are beyond the control of the local governments. Local governments can plan and support the infrastructure improvements that are necessary for implementing this scenario. St. Lucie TPO is conducting the strategies for implementing the sustainable transportation planning. Similar uncertainty exists in the Telecommuting Scenario, although some of these policies are within the local government's authority. Local governments can collaborate with the public/private sector employers in developing remote working strategies/infrastructure necessary for implementing such scenario. In comparing different scenarios (Table 14), Sustainable Transportation Scenario provided the highest benefits, followed by the Telecommuting Scenario.

Mixed-Use and High-Density strategies provided significant benefits that can be considered as the local land use strategies for implementation in carbon footprint reduction. The express buses and non-motorized trips increase tested under multimodal scenario provide some encouragement for transit improvements in the region.

It should be noted that both the Mixed-Use and High-Density scenarios included significant increases of non-motorized trips. Implementation of walk/bike networks and the increase of multimodal connectivity can enhance the quality of these developments and reducing the carbon footprint. In addition, transportation infrastructure improvements that improve the flow of the

vehicle mix (reduce congestion) can be considered. These include signal coordination improvements and improvements of transportation flow by implementing roundabouts and other innovative designs along with the shared use paths. The Mixed-Use and High-Density developments when combined with transit/multimodal services can provide the best benefits for carbon footprint reduction and improving the community health.



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee:	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Date:	May 16, 2023
Item Number:	6d
Item Title:	2023/24 List of Priority Projects (LOPP)
Item Origination:	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
UPWP Reference:	Task 3.3 – Transportation Improvement Program
Requested Action:	Recommend adoption of the draft 2023/24 LOPP, recommend adoption with conditions, or do not recommend adoption.
Staff Recommendation:	Based on the consistency of the projects in the draft 2023/24 LOPP with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and the prioritization of the projects in accordance with the TPO's adopted prioritization methodologies, it is recommended that the draft 2023/24 LOPP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- Draft 2023/24 LOPP
- 2022/23 LOPP
- Cost Feasible Plan Excerpt from the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

FROM: Peter Buchwald
 Executive Director

DATE: May 9, 2023

SUBJECT: 2023/24 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 2024/25 – FY 2028/29 then will be developed based on the LOPP and the FDOT Work Program. The LOPP is required to be submitted to FDOT by August 1st, and the TPO Advisory Committees are requested to review it, provide input, and develop recommendations for the TPO Board regarding its adoption.

ANALYSIS

The draft 2023/24 LOPP is attached. The revisions from the 2022/23 LOPP, also attached, are summarized in the following.

Master List: The Port St. Lucie Boulevard Widening Project from Becker Road to Paar Drive and the Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Southern Ramps (Phase 1) Project were removed because these projects are programmed for construction in FY 2027/28 and FY 2026/27, respectively. With the removal of these projects and to ensure that the TPO project pipeline remains filled with projects in various phases, the remaining project from the first time band (2026-2030) of the Cost Feasible Plan (excerpt attached) of the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan was added to the Master

List. This project is the widening of California Boulevard from Del Rio Boulevard to Crosstown Parkway. In addition, the Project Status/Notes were updated based on the FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP, and the Estimated Costs are being updated based on the latest information.

Local Projects for Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Funding and Transportation Alternatives Additional (TAA) Funding: This unprioritized list was initially adopted by the TPO in October 2022 to identify projects to be programmed with the funding from several new surface transportation programs and with the increases in the funding of other programs attributable to Metropolitan Planning Organizations that were included in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) enacted in November 2021. This list remains the same since its initial adoption except for the addition of the Nebraska Avenue Sidewalk Project from South Lawnwood Circle to South 13th Street at the request of the City of Fort Pierce.

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects: The Easy Street at US-1 Project was deleted based on input from St. Lucie County.

Transit Projects: This list was significantly revised based on input from Area Regional Transit. The revisions include the addition of the Port St. Lucie Intermodal Hub as a top priority, the reprioritization of the Transit Operations Center, and the additions of Micro-Transit Services in the Torino Area and the City of Fort Pierce.

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects: This list was updated to reflect the results of the 2023 TA grant cycle which prioritized the Peacock Trail Project and to remove the Volucia Drive Trail Project because it is programmed for construction in FY 2025/26 in the FY 2023/24 – FY 2027/28 TIP.

The projects in the draft 2023/24 LOPP are generally consistent with the SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and are prioritized, where appropriate, in accordance with the prioritization methodologies adopted by the St. Lucie TPO.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the consistency of the projects in the draft 2023/24 LOPP with the SmartMoves 2045 LRTP and the prioritization of the projects in accordance with the TPO's adopted prioritization methodologies, it is recommended that the draft 2023/24 LOPP be recommended for adoption by the TPO Board.



DRAFT
2023/24 List of Priority Projects (LOPP)
(Adopted _____)

Master List

2023/24 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2022/23 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	Jenkins Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ underway, ROW ⁵ to start in FY 24/25	Yes	\$44,000,000 ⁶	2
3	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Phase 2			New interchange with southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp	Construction programmed in SIS ⁷ Cost Feasible Plan to start in FY 32/33	Yes	\$20,000,000 ⁸	4b
4	Yes	Kings Highway	Angle Road	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway, ROW to start in FY 23/24	Yes	\$119,077,000 ⁹	5
5	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 ⁹	6
6	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	Initial PD&E ¹⁰ activities underway	Yes	\$51,890,000 ⁹	7
7	Yes	California Boulevard	Del Rio Boulevard	Crosstown Parkway	Add 2 lanes and shared-use paths		Yes	\$4,760,000 ⁹	NR ¹¹

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, May 2022

⁷SIS: Strategic Intermodal System

⁸Source of Estimated Cost: SIS Cost Feasible Plan, June 2023

⁹Source of Estimated Cost: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

¹⁰PD&E: Project Development and Environment Study

¹¹NR: Not Ranked

Local Projects for
Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Funding and Transportation Alternatives Additional (TAA) Funding

Funding Source	Facility/Segment or Intersection	Project Limits		Project Description	Estimated Cost	Project Source	LAP-Certified Implementing Agency	Project Status/Notes
		From	To					
CRP	Midway Road	US-1	Selvitz Road	Install fiber optic cable along Midway Road and traffic cameras/video detectors and adaptive signal control at the signalized intersections	\$370,000	CMP ¹ LOPP ²	St. Lucie County	
CRP	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	\$750,000	CMP LOPP	City of Port St. Lucie	Right-of-way acquisition is not needed
TAA	Green River Parkway Trail	Martin County Line	Walton Road	Resurfacing of multi-use path: 2.5 miles	\$350,000	TA ³ LOPP	City of Port St. Lucie	
TAA	St. James Drive	NE Lazy River Parkway	NE Royce Avenue	Sidewalk, 6-8 feet in width, 0.25 mile in length	\$419,000	CSAP ⁴	St. Lucie County	
TAA	Nebraska Avenue	South Lawnwood Circle	South 13th Street	Sidewalks, 6 feet in width, 1 mile in length, on both sides of street	\$717,000	City of Fort Pierce	City of Fort Pierce	Project-specific LAP Certification is necessary

¹CMP: Congestion Management Process

²LOPP: List of Priority Projects

³TA: Transportation Alternatives

⁴CSAP: Comprehensive Safety Action Plan

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)

2023/24 Priority Ranking	Facility/Segment or Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source	2022/23 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	Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan was completed without a TMC	\$400,000	ATMS Master Plan	1
2	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	PE ⁴ to start in FY 2026/27	\$700,000	ATMS Master Plan	3
3	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	4
4	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	5

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

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

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

Transit Projects

2023/24 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2022/23 Priority Ranking
1	Port St. Lucie Intermodal Hub	Phase 1 completed in 2013 - Location is in need of an upgrade. Serves as connection point to four routes and Zone 1 Micro-Transit Service	Capital	Yes	\$4,500,000	NR ⁴
2	Vehicle Purchases	New/replacement buses as specified in the Transit Asset Management Plan ⁵	Capital	Yes	\$100,000-\$650,000	3
3	Micro-Transit Zone 1	Sustain service levels in the Tradition/Gatlin Boulevard area beyond expiration of the previous FDOT Service Development Grant	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$325,000-\$450,000 ⁶	4
4	Micro-Transit Fort Pierce	Expand on Freebee services in City of Fort Pierce and continue to provide transportation in transit deserts throughout the County	Capital & Operating	No	\$800,000	NR
5	Micro-Transit Zone 2	Expand the on-demand flex service to augment the fixed-route bus service with first and last mile connectivity to the Torino Boulevard area 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
6	Express Route Bus Service	Continue to link the Port St. Lucie and Fort Pierce Intermodal Hubs with a zone through a potential Service Development Grant	Capital & Operating	Yes	\$800,000	2
7	Bus Route Infrastructure	Miscellaneous locations along the fixed routes with priority at transfer locations	Capital	Yes	\$200,000 (total for bus shelters)	7
8	Expand Local Services	Improve frequency to 30 minutes on high performing routes	Operating	Yes	\$800,000	6
9	Transit Operations Center	Centralized operations and maintenance facility to serve the transit system fleet	Capital	Yes	\$18,000,000-\$20,000,000	1
10	Jobs Express Terminal Regional Service	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach with express commuter services	Operating	Yes	\$460,500 ⁶	5

¹LRTP: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021²TDP: *Bus Plus, St. Lucie County FY 2020-FY 2029 Transit Development Plan Major Update*, June 2019³Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Transit Staff, May 2023, unless otherwise noted⁴NR: Not Ranked⁵*Transit Asset Management Plan*, November 2020⁶*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study*, June 2020

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2023/24 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2022/23 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	38.0	Peacock Trail	Gatlin Boulevard	Dreyfuss Boulevard	Shared-Use Path: 1.0 mile	2023 TA Grant Application ³	\$1,674,174 ⁴	11
2	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,090,396 ⁶	2
3	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 ⁷	3
4	42.5	Green River Parkway Trail	Martin County Line	Walton Road	Resurfacing of Shared-Use Path: 2.5 miles	City of Port St. Lucie, Florida SUN Trail, and St. Lucie WBN	\$350,000	Not Ranked
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,500,000 ⁶	7
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.4 miles		\$1,650,000 ⁶	7
7	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airoso Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$825,000 ⁸	9
8	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk: 0.2 miles		\$225,000 ⁶	12
9	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk: 2.6 miles		\$3,050,790 ⁶	17
10	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.5 miles		\$1,323,840	19
11	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,461,595 ⁶	12
12	36.0	17th Street	Georgia Avenue	Delaware Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.3 miles		\$74,268	13
12	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk: 0.8 miles		\$123,200	13
14	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.9 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$575,000 ⁸	15
14	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$323,000 ⁸	15
16	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$445,220	17
17	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk: 6.1 miles		\$5,300,000 ⁶	18
17	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk: 5.0 miles		\$5,753,580 ⁶	18
19	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk: 3.0 miles		\$2,600,000 ⁶	20
20	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk: 2.8 miles		\$2,250,000 ⁶	21
21	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$411,836 ⁹	22

2023/24 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2022/23 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
22	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk: 5.2 miles		\$6,066,780 ⁶	23
23	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk: 2.4 miles		\$2,830,390 ⁶	24
23	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	24
25	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	South of Devine Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$562,202	26
26	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 41st Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$393,004	27
27	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$2,076,392 ⁶	28
28	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	29

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 LRTP), unless otherwise noted

³Project is anticipated to be programmed for construction in the FDOT FY 2024/25 - FY 2028/29 Work Program as a result of the 2023 TA Grant Cycle

⁴Source of Estimated Cost: 2023 TA Grant Application, March 2023

⁵WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Engineering

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: 2019 TA Grant Application



2022/23 List of Priority Projects (LOPP) (Adopted June 1, 2022)

Master List

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Major Gateway Corridor? ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Status/Notes	In LRTP ² Cost Feasible Plan?	Estimated Cost	2021/22 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	Jenkins Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE ⁴ underway, ROW ⁵ to start in FY 23/24	Yes	\$44,000,000 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	\$16,850,000 ⁶	3
4a	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Phase 1			New interchange with southbound on-ramp and northbound off-ramp		Yes	\$13,500,000 ⁶	4
4b	Yes	Midway Road Turnpike Interchange Phase 2			New interchange with southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp		Yes	\$28,500,000 ⁶	4
5	Yes	Kings Highway	Angle Road	Indrio Road	Add 2 lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes	PE underway	Yes	\$119,077,000 ⁶	5
6	Yes	Northern/Airport Connector	Florida's Turnpike	Kings Highway	New multimodal corridor with interchanges at Florida's Turnpike and I-95	I-95 Interchange Justification Report to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$137,110,000 ⁷	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 ⁸ to start in FY 2022/23	Yes	\$51,890,000 ⁷	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, May 2022

⁷Source of Estimated Cost: *SmartMoves 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan*, February 2021

⁸PD&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)

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Facility/Segment or Intersection	Project Description	Project Status/Notes	Estimated Cost ¹	Project Source	2021/22 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	Phase I of the ATMS Master Plan was completed without a TMC	\$400,000	ATMS Master Plan	1
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	2
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	PE ⁴ to start in FY 2026/27	\$700,000	ATMS Master Plan	3
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	4
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	5

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

⁴PE: Preliminary Engineering

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

Transit Projects

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Facility/Equipment/Service	Project Location/Description	Is Funding for Capital and/or Operating?	In LRTP ¹ or TDP ² ?	Estimated Cost ³	2021/22 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	\$90,000 - \$450,000	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 Regional Service	Regional bus service to West Palm Beach with 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*, November 2020

⁵*Jobs Express Terminal Connectivity Study*, June 2020

Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2021/22 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
1	40.5	Volucia Drive Trail	Blanton Boulevard	Torino Parkway	Sidewalk: 1.0 mile	2022 TA Grant Application ³ and 2045 LRTP	\$1,061,178 ⁴	17
2	25.5	Easy Street	US Highway 1	Silver Oak Drive	Sidewalk-1.0 miles		\$1,090,396 ⁶	2
3	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 ⁷	3
4	42.5	Green River Parkway Trail	Martin County Line	Walton Road	Resurfacing of multi-use path: 2.5 miles	City of Port St. Lucie, Florida SUN Trail, and St. Lucie WBN	\$350,000	Not Ranked
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Edwards Road	South Market Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,500,000 ⁶	7
4	42.5	Oleander Avenue	Saeger Avenue	Beach Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.4 miles		\$1,650,000 ⁶	7
7	42.0	Lakehurst Drive	Bayshore Boulevard	Airoso Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$825,000 ⁸	9
8	41.5	Indrio Road	U.S. Highway 1	Old Dixie Highway	Sidewalk: 0.2 miles		\$225,000 ⁶	12
9	40.5	Indrio Road	Kings Highway	U.S. Highway 1	Sidewalk: 2.6 miles		\$3,050,790 ⁶	17
10	40.0	Oleander Avenue	Midway Road	Saeger Avenue	Sidewalk: 1.5 miles		\$1,323,840	19
11	38.0	Peacock Trail	Gatlin Boulevard	Dreyfuss Boulevard	Multi-use path: 0.9 miles	City of Port St. Lucie	\$900,000	Not Ranked
12	36.5	Angle Road	Kings Highway	North 53rd Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$1,461,595 ⁶	20
13	36.0	17th Street	Georgia Avenue	Delaware Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.3 miles		\$74,268	21
13	36.0	Boston Avenue	25th Street	13th Street	Sidewalk: 0.8 miles		\$123,200	21
15	35.0	Abingdon Avenue	Import Drive	Savona Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.9 miles	Under design by City of Port St. Lucie	\$575,000 ⁸	24
15	35.0	Brescia Street	Savage Boulevard	Gatlin Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$323,000 ⁸	24
17	33.5	Weatherbee Road	U.S. Highway 1	Oleander Avenue	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$445,220	29
18	32.0	Range Line Road	Glades Cut Off Road	Martin County Line	Sidewalk: 6.1 miles		\$5,300,000 ⁶	30
18	32.0	West Midway Road	West of Glades Cut Off Road	Shinn Road Area	Sidewalk: 5.0 miles		\$5,753,580 ⁶	30
20	31.5	St. Lucie Boulevard	Kings Highway	North 25th Street	Sidewalk: 3.0 miles		\$2,600,000 ⁶	32
21	30.5	Sunrise Boulevard	Edwards Road	Midway Road	Sidewalk: 2.8 miles		\$2,250,000 ⁶	33

2022/23 Priority Ranking	Score ¹	Facility	Project Limits		Project Description	Project Source ²	Estimated Cost ²	2021/22 Priority Ranking
			From	To				
22	29.5	Bell Avenue	Oleander Avenue	Sunrise Boulevard	Sidewalk: 0.5 miles		\$411,836 ⁹	34
23	27.0	Old Dixie Highway	St. Lucie Boulevard	Turnpike Feeder Road	Sidewalk: 5.2 miles		\$6,066,780 ⁶	35
24	26.5	Glades Cut Off Road	Port St. Lucie City Boundary	Range Line Road	Sidewalk: 2.4 miles		\$2,830,390 ⁶	36
24	26.5	Keen Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	36
26	25.5	Selvitz Road	Edwards Road	South of Devine Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$562,202	38
27	24.5	Juanita Avenue	North 53rd Street	North 41st Street	Sidewalk: 1.3 miles		\$393,004	39
28	15.5	Silver Oak Drive	Easy Street	East Midway Road	Sidewalk: 1.8 miles		\$2,076,392 ⁶	40
29	15.0	Taylor Dairy Road	Angle Road	St. Lucie Boulevard	Sidewalk: 1.0 miles		\$1,160,000 ⁶	41

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 LRTP), 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: 2022 TA Grant Application, February 2022

⁵WBN: Walk-Bike Network

⁶Source of Estimated Cost: St. Lucie County Engineering

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: 2019 TA Grant Application

Table 8-7. Multimodal Cost Feasible Plan Projects 2026-2045 (in Year of Expenditure)

ROADWAY PROJECTS (2026-2030)

Project ID	Rank	Project	From	To	Type	Revenue Source	PE	ROW	CST	CEI	Unfunded	Total	Notes
160	18	Port St. Lucie Boulevard	Becker Road	Paar Drive	Widen 2L to 4L	Federal (TMA) Funds			\$7.71 M	\$1.16 M		\$8.86 M	TIP FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 funds the previous phases. In the previous LRTP, Go2040 CFP and advanced in time band.
161	40	California Boulevard	Del Rio Boulevard	Crosstown Parkway	Widen 2L to 4L	Federal (TMA) Funds	\$.56 M	\$1.27 M	\$2.55 M	\$.38 M		\$4.76 M	New project since it is not in the previous LRTP, Go2040 CFP.
143	40	Midway Road	Glades Cut-Off Road	Selvitz Road	Widen 2L to 4L	Federal (TMA) Funds			\$3.06 M			\$3.06 M	TIP FY 2020/21 to 2024/25 funds the previous phases. This assumes a Revenue Source mostly funded by 10% State OA and Federal (TMA). In the previous LRTP, Go2040 CFP and in the same time band.
143	40	Midway Road	Glades Cut-Off Road	Selvitz Road	Widen 2L to 4L	10% State OA			\$7.68 M	\$1.61 M		\$9.29 M	
101	101	Florida's Turnpike at Midway Road			New Interchange/ Widen 2L to 4L	State Other Roads, Construction & ROW	\$7.17 M		\$74.45 M	\$7.45 M		\$89.07 M	Assumes a tight diamond interchange concept and the assumption of the Revenue Source is from State Other Roads, Construction & ROW funds. New project since it is not in the previous LRTP, Go2040 CFP.

OTHER FEDERALLY-FUNDED INITIATIVES (2026-2030)

Project ID	Rank	Project	From	To	Type	Revenue Source	PE	ROW	CST	CEI	Unfunded	Total	Notes
		TPO Planning			Planning	Federal (TMA) Funds			\$ 2.0 M			\$ 2.0 M	
		St. Lucie Advanced Transportation Management System			Congestion Management Process	Federal (TMA) Funds			\$ 2.0 M			\$ 2.0 M	

BICYCLE-PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS (2026-2030)

Project ID	Rank	Project	From	To	Type	Revenue Source	PE	ROW	CST	CEI	Unfunded	Total	Notes
		Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities				Federal (TALU+TALT) Funds			\$3.28 M			\$3.28 M	



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Board/Committee:	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Date:	May 16, 2023
Item Number:	6e
Item Title:	Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update Scope of Services
Item Origination:	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
UPWP Reference:	Task 3.2 – Transit Planning
Requested Action:	Recommend approval of the draft Scope of Services, recommend approval with conditions, or do not recommend approval.
Staff Recommendation:	Based on the proposed cost and schedule of the TDP Major Update Scope of Services being consistent with the FY 2022/23 – FY 2023/24 UPWP and the preparation of a TDP Major Update being necessary for the future growth of the transit system, it is recommended that the TDP Major Update Scope of Services be recommended for approval by the TPO Board and the transit system visioning be discussed.

Attachments

- Staff Report
- UPWP Excerpt
- Draft TDP Major Update Scope of Services



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

THROUGH: Peter Buchwald
 Executive Director

FROM: Marceia Lathou
 Transit/ACES Program Manager

DATE: May 9, 2023

SUBJECT: Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update Scope
 of Services

BACKGROUND

A Transit Development Plan (TDP) is required by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for the receipt of funding through the Public Transit Block Grant Program. A TDP is the public transportation provider's planning, development, and operational guidance document and is based on a 10-year planning horizon. A Major Update is required every five years. Annual updates in the form of progress reports on the 10-Year Implementation Program of the TDP are also required.

In St. Lucie County, the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) contracts with MV Transportation for public transportation services. A TDP Major Update is adopted by the BOCC after endorsement by the TPO Board.

Task 3.2 of the St. Lucie TPO FY 2022/23 - 2023/24 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) includes activities related to the provision of technical and planning assistance to the BOCC to maintain the BOCC's eligibility for the continued receipt of federal and state transit funds. These activities include supporting the TDP Major Update and Annual Progress Reports as identified in the attached excerpt from the UPWP.

ANALYSIS

The UPWP identifies the need for consultant assistance in the preparation of the TDP Major Update, which is due for submittal to FDOT by September 1, 2024. The attached Scope of Services for the TDP Major Update was prepared by Benesch (formerly Tindale Oliver), one of the TPO's General Planning Consultants. The proposed cost of \$149,317 and June 2024 completion date of the TDP Major Update are consistent with the cost and completion date specified in the UPWP.

The TDP Major Update Scope of Services was reviewed by the St. Lucie County Transit Department and by FDOT District 4 staff. The County may fund supplemental public involvement activities throughout the TDP Major Update process.

As the intent of the Scope of Services is to reimagine the current transit system in the TPO area, the TPO staff will facilitate during the presentation on this agenda item a discussion of transit system visioning using the following questions:

- Do we want to grow our transit system? (Always consider a no-build alternative.)
- Where do we want to grow our transit system? (What geographic areas lack coverage?)
- How do we want to grow our transit system? (What types of services do we need?)

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the proposed cost and schedule of the TDP Major Update Scope of Services being consistent with the FY 2022/23 – FY 2023/24 UPWP and the preparation of a TDP Major Update being necessary for the future growth of the transit system, it is recommended that the TDP Major Update Scope of Services be recommended for approval by the TPO Board and the transit system visioning be discussed.



Task 3.2 Transit Planning

Purpose:

To provide technical assistance and guidance to local and regional transit providers, to support public transportation planning and transit grant administration activities, and to develop and implement analytical methods to identify gaps in the connectivity of the transportation system and develop infrastructure and operational solutions that provide the public, especially traditionally underserved populations, with adequate access to essential services.

Previous Work:

Intermodal planning and coordination was supported through transit planning activities in cooperation with Martin and Indian River MPOs and South Florida Commuter Services (SFCS). The St. Lucie County Origin and Destination Big Data Analysis was completed, a key step to identify areas for transit infrastructure development and improvements. The TPO Board adopted the PTASP Performance Targets for the St. Lucie TPO. The TPO Board accepted the Transit Route Optimization Study Draft Choices Report which is the first phase of a study to optimize the bus route network. TPO Staff assisted St. Lucie County in preparing its Transit Development Plan (TDP) Annual Progress Reports. The Micro-Mobility Study was conducted.

The TPO coordinated and facilitated a Park & Ride Lot Program by building upon the results of previous planning efforts. Construction of the Jobs Express Terminal was completed. Coordination with Palm Tran and FDOT resulted in commitments from those agencies to respectively operate and fund express bus service from St. Lucie County to Palm Beach County via the Jobs Express Terminal.

Other transit planning activities that were continued included providing technical and planning assistance to St. Lucie County **in order to maintain the County’s eligibility for the continued receipt of federal and state transit grant funds.** The performance of the transit system was monitored. Potential impacts caused by the extension of passenger rail service were monitored. The coordination of specialized transportation services continued through transit meetings.

Major Activities (performed continuously by the St. Lucie TPO unless otherwise noted):

- Provision of technical assistance to the transit providers
- Bus-related planning activities performed by St. Lucie County with its Section 5307 funds
- Continue coordination with FDOT, St. Lucie County Transit, and Palm Tran on the express bus service from the Jobs Express Terminal to the West Palm Beach Intermodal Center
- Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update
- TDP Annual Progress Reports
- Transit Center Visioning Workshop
- Support of intermodal planning, travel demand management, and transit planning coordination including implementation of the SFCS Workplan
- Park and ride lot program planning
- Passenger rail service program planning

End Product:	Completion Date:	Performed by:
Transit Center Visioning Workshop Fort Pierce Passenger Rail Station Planning (Consultant scope of services in Appendix F to be utilized.)	December 2022 June 2024	St. Lucie TPO City of Fort Pierce
TDP Annual Progress Report	September 2022	St. Lucie TPO
TDP Annual Progress Report	September 2023	St. Lucie TPO
TDP Major Update (Consultant scope of services in Appendix F.)	June 2024	St. Lucie TPO



Task 3.2 Transit Planning Estimated Budget Detail for FY 2022/23							
Budget Category	Budget Category Description	PL ¹	SU ¹	FTA 5305D	FCTD GFSU	TPO Local	Total
Contract Number:				G1477 G2170			
A. Personnel Services:							
TPO Staff Salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions		\$10,000	\$35,000	\$70,541	\$0	\$0	\$115,541
Subtotal:		\$10,000	\$35,000	\$70,541	\$0	\$0	\$115,541
B. Contract/Consultant Services:							
Transit Center Visioning Workshop Fort Pierce Passenger Rail Station Planning		\$0	\$60,000 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$356,183	\$0	\$60,000
Subtotal:		\$0	\$60,000 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$356,183	\$0	\$60,000 \$356,183
C. Travel:							
		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
D. Other Direct Expenses:							
		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total:		\$10,000	\$95,000 \$35,000	\$70,541	\$0 \$356,183	\$0	\$175,541 \$471,724

¹Federal funds are soft matched by the FDOT non-cash match explained on page 3.

Task 3.2 Transit Planning Estimated Budget Detail for FY 2023/24						
Budget Category	Budget Category Description	PL ¹	SU ¹	FCTD	TPO Local	Total
Contract Number:						
A. Personnel Services:						
TPO Staff Salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions		\$25,000	\$85,000	\$0	\$0	\$110,000
Subtotal:		\$25,000	\$85,000	\$0	\$0	\$110,000
B. Contract/Consultant Services:						
TDP Major Update		\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
Subtotal:		\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
C. Travel:						
		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
D. Other Direct Expenses:						
		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal:		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total:		\$25,000	\$235,000	\$0	\$0	\$260,000

¹Federal funds are soft matched by the FDOT non-cash match explained on page 3.

ST. LUCIE COUNTY
MAJOR UPDATE OF 10-YEAR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2025-2034)
SCOPE OF SERVICES
Benesch (April 7, 2023)

Introduction

The St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) has requested Benesch (Consultant) to prepare a Scope of Services and estimated budget to complete a 10-Year Transit Development Plan (TDP) Major Update for FYs 2025-2034. The adopted TDP must be submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) by September 1, 2024. This TDP guides the transit development in St. Lucie County for the County owned transit system, the Area Regional Transit (ART) operated under contract with MV Transportation.

The St. Lucie County Board of County Commissioners is the governing board for the transit system and will be the approving authority for the TDP. St. Lucie TPO conducts the transportation planning activities in St. Lucie County; therefore, it will coordinate with the County regarding the oversight and guidance of the TDP development and the TDP will be reviewed by the TPO's Committees and Board.

10-Year Transit Development Plan Major Update

The Consultant will prepare a TDP Major Update ensuring the preparation of a practical and implementable plan that truly reflects the near-term vision for a transit agency's growth and improvement over time. A primary goal identified for the TDP update is the identification of strategies to increase ridership and efficiency for current services and enhance connectivity to other services, local and/or regional. The resulting TDP will be compliant with the TDP Rule outlined in Chapter 14-73, F.A.C.

As a strategic plan, a TDP will identify needs in an unconstrained fashion and identify service improvements for which currently there is no funding anticipated. The 10-year vision that will be generated during this plan update provides a beneficial tie and consistency with the St. Lucie TPO's long range transportation goals and plans.

Specifically, a TDP includes the following major elements:

- Public involvement plan and process
- Base data compilation and analysis (review of demographic and travel behavior characteristics of the service area)
- Performance evaluation of existing services
- Situation appraisal (transit agency strengths and weaknesses; external barriers and opportunities; estimation of community demand for transit)
- Goals and objectives
- Transit demand and mobility needs
- Development of proposed transit enhancements (funded and unfunded)
- 10-year implementation plan
- 10-year financial plan (projected costs and revenues)
- Other strategic issues specific to a given study area

An additional requirement for the TDP was added by the Legislature in 2007, when it adopted House Bill 985, amending s. 341.071, F.S., requiring transit agencies to "... specifically address potential enhancements to productivity and performance which would have the effect of increasing the farebox recovery ratio." FDOT subsequently issued guidance requiring the TDP and each annual update to include an appendix containing a summary report on the farebox recovery ratio and strategies implemented and planned to improve it. This scope of services ensures that the major update of St. Lucie's TDP will comply with all requirements of the TDP rule.

The activities to be completed during the TDP major update are listed below and detailed in the remainder of this scope of services.

- Task 1: Initiate & Manage Project
- Task 2: Establish Baseline Conditions
- Task 3: Facilitate Public Involvement
- Task 4: Identify & Evaluate Existing Transit Services
- Task 5: Conduct Situation Appraisal
- Task 6: Estimate & Evaluate Demand & Mobility Needs
- Task 7: Review & Update Goals & Objectives
- Task 8: Prepare 10-Year Transit Development Plan

Task 1: Initiate & Manage Project

Upon Notice to Proceed, the Consultant will prepare for and facilitate a virtual kickoff meeting with TPO and County staff. In addition, the Consultant will assist in establishing a project management team comprised of TPO, County, and Consultant staff, or other parties, as agreed upon. This project management team will participate in up to four (4) other virtual coordination meetings. The Consultant will be responsible for preparing meeting materials. Three meetings are anticipated to focus on coordinating project activities, schedule, deliverables, and reviews. The Consultant will also provide monthly progress reports with invoices, indicating current activities, upcoming actions, and any changes or impacts to the work plan. Summaries of project management team meetings will be prepared by the Consultant and provided to the TPO and County for review.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Prepare for and facilitate virtual kickoff teleconference meeting.
- Coordinate with the TPO and County to establish the project management team.
- Prepare for and facilitate up to four (4) virtual project management team meetings.
- Provide monthly progress reports.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Participate in virtual kickoff meeting.
- Coordinate with Consultant to establish the project management team.
- Participate in up to four (4) virtual project management team meetings.
- Review monthly progress reports.

Task 2: Establish Baseline Conditions

As with any strategic planning process, understanding the current conditions of the transit agency's operating environment is critical. This task establishes the baseline conditions, providing a foundation of understanding of the current socio-economic, demographics and other characteristics of St. Lucie County that will be used throughout the TDP analysis.

Sub-Task 2.1: Collect and Prepare Baseline Conditions

The Consultant will collect appropriate local data to document and assess the pertinent conditions in which the ART operates. The documentation process will include tables, maps, and graphics that describe and illustrate the operating environment in the county. Coordination will occur with TPO, County, and other local agencies to identify the most current local information. Other secondary sources will be used as available (e.g., American Community Survey, American Housing Survey, Florida Statistical Abstract, etc.). At a minimum, the following conditions will be collected for this task:

- Physical description of service area
- Population characteristics and trends
- Socio-demographic characteristics and trends
- Housing, employment/labor, and related densities
- Current and future land use and densities
- Major activity centers and trip generators
- Tourist and visitor levels
- Travel behavior and commuting trends
- Roadway and traffic conditions
- Current and planned transit services
- Other conditions as available and beneficial for additional context, including any impacts from reoccurring special events

Sub-Task 2.2: Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 1

The Consultant will prepare Draft Technical Memorandum No. 1 to report on all work completed for Task 2. The draft document will include a summary of the prevailing local conditions identified and analyzed in Task 2. As necessary, detailed data summaries will be provided in accompanying appendices. In addition, key findings, conclusions, and summary statistics will be presented in the report in a user-friendly manner with easy-to-understand charts, tables, and/or graphs.

Upon completion, the draft document will be provided to TPO and County staff and the project management team for review. Comments received will be incorporated as appropriate into the draft TDP document compiled from the individual technical memoranda prepared throughout the project.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Compile data to support baseline conditions assessment.
- Analyze data and establish baseline conditions (maps and tables).
- Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 1.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.
- Review and comment on baseline data.
- Review and comment on draft Technical Memorandum #1.

Task 3: Facilitate Public Involvement

The Florida TDP Rule emphasizes public involvement, as follows:

The TDP preparation process shall include opportunities for public involvement as outlined in a TDP public involvement plan, approved by the Department, or the local Metropolitan/Transportation Planning Organization's (M/TPO) Public Involvement Plan, approved by both the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration.

The rule also indicates that:

- The TDP must include a description of the public involvement process and activities.
- Comments must be solicited from the Workforce Development Board.
- The Department, Workforce Development Board, and M/TPO must be advised of all public meetings where the TDP is to be presented or discussed.
- The Department, Workforce Development Board, and M/TPO must be given an opportunity to review and comment on the TDP during the development of the mission, goals, objectives, alternatives, and 10-year implementation program.

To ensure that the St. Lucie TPO and County meets these requirements, the Consultant will facilitate a public involvement process for the TDP effort that will encompass a wide range of activities as included in the TPO's Public Participation Program (PPP). The following sub-tasks highlight the specific activities that will occur as part of this task.

Sub-Task 3.01: Develop Public Involvement Plan

To accommodate the Rule requirements, the Consultant will develop a TDP-specific Public Involvement Plan (PIP) that will consider all applicable requirements, the unique needs and characteristics of the community, and previous and other public involvement activities, including any that have been completed recently by the TPO and/or County. This plan will be submitted to FDOT District 4 staff for review and approval per rule guidance.

The Consultant will develop three (3) scenarios for updating the branding of the TDP based on internal brainstorming and ideas with staff from the TPO and County. Ideas for the project brand will be reviewed and discussed as part of a virtual meeting with TPO and County staff. Maintaining the branding of the TDP is a critical step toward making the planning and public involvement process more user friendly and ensuring the brand recognition continues beyond the completion of the TDP.

Sub-Task 3.02: Conduct Stakeholder Interviews

Since the understanding of local conditions should include knowledge of the perceptions and attitudes of community decision-makers and leaders towards transit, 10 virtual stakeholder interviews will be conducted as part of the public involvement process. The Consultant will work with TPO and County

staff to identify and recruit appropriate individuals to interview. The Consultant will then schedule and conduct the interviews using an interview script that will be developed and submitted to the TPO and County for review prior to the first interview.

Sub-Task 3.03: Conduct Discussion Group Workshops

To obtain additional public input into the TDP process, the Consultant proposes to conduct a total of two discussion group workshops that will be held in different locations to ensure representation that is more geographically distributed. These workshops typically involve a smaller group of participants (8–12 persons) in an intimate meeting setting that permits more in-depth discussion about issues and needs. To generate interest and participation, the Consultant will work with TPO and County staff to identify and invite potential participants to each workshop. This coordination also will include the selection and scheduling of appropriate venues for the workshops. For budget purposes, it is assumed that the two workshops will be held on the same day.

Potential workshop candidates may include members from the business, health, social service, and education communities, as well as local chambers of commerce, the Hotel/Motel Association, and active stakeholder groups. Since representatives from these organizations most likely would represent “non-user” views, it will be important to notify current ART patrons of all the workshops so that the “user” perspective is represented as well. Although it may be preferable to focus rider input at a single workshop, it would be beneficial to attempt to get user participation at all of the workshops to enhance the discussion.

At the workshops, a variety of techniques will be used to encourage participation and elicit perceptions, ideas, preferences, and other input that is important to inform the TDP process. For example, the Nominal Group Technique could be used to identify potential transit improvement concepts and then dot-polling and/or resource allocation exercises can be applied to the identified concepts to help set preferences on improvement priorities.

Sub-Task 3.04: Conduct Public Listening Sessions

The Consultant will prepare for and facilitate two public listening sessions that are designed to go out to events or locations where people gather, such as a shopping mall. These sessions will include displays and interactive information exchange, public surveys, and enlistment for social media. They will be designed to capture information from seasonal and permanent residents about community values, needs, and priorities. The locations will be decided jointly with Consultant, TPO, and County staff, with logistical arrangements handled by Consultant staff and session materials developed by the Consultant.

Sub-Task 3.05: Conduct Public Input Survey

The Consultant will conduct a public survey to obtain information related to the attitudes, preferences, and goals of the community related to public transit services. The survey will be available on-line, through social media, and in a hard copy version at in-person TDP outreach events, such as the public listening sessions. Access to the on-line version will be via links on the TPO, County, and other partner agency or other stakeholder websites as identified and available.

Sub-Task 3.06: Engage Public through Website, Social Media, and Email Communications

The Consultant has found value in engaging citizens via social media and websites. It is proposed that the Consultant provide information to the TPO and County for their websites and social media, including public surveys, project information, meeting dates, and highlights about the ART system. Emailing news and informational blasts via email lists maintained by the TPO, County and other sources, will provide additional information and outreach to stakeholders, citizens, and riders. The PIP will outline planned social media posts and other marketing/communication tools.

Sub-Task 3.07: Prepare for County Operator Group Interviews

The Consultant will conduct interviews with a representative group of ART operators. As the first line of contact and interaction with ART riders, bus operators tend to understand the needs and concerns of the system users and can provide input into understanding comments received on surveys and through workshops. This will be accomplished at the County offices and will be no more than two group sessions on the same day to minimize impact to the operator schedule. Consultant staff will develop a script with 5-8 questions and submit to TPO and County staff for review prior to the interviews. The Consultant will work with County leadership to schedule and conduct the interviews. Should operator shortages or other schedule concerns impede operator participation in a discussion group, an operator survey will be prepared and distributed instead following discussion and agreement with TPO and County staff.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Prepare Public Involvement Plan.
- Plan and conduct stakeholder interviews (10).
- Plan and conduct discussion group workshops (2).
- Plan and conduct public listening sessions (2).
- Plan and conduct operator group interviews (2).
- Provide website, social media, and email blast content.
- Conduct public input survey.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Review all materials and identify stakeholders.
- Assist in survey as needed.
- Schedule venues and participate in public listening sessions, discussion groups, and public workshops.
- Promote public listening sessions/workshops.
- Post on transit social media and other communication materials to County-managed platforms.

The results of this effort will be summarized and provided to TPO and County staff for review and comment; it later will be provided to the project management team for consideration as part of Technical Memorandum No. 3, to be prepared under Task 7.

Task 4: Identify & Evaluate Existing Transit Services

The Consultant will work with TPO and County staff to collect up-to-date information on existing ART services to support the review and evaluation of the transit services being provided in the county. Information also will be collected and reviewed for other transportation services operating within and connecting to the study area. The following sub-tasks are included in the identification and evaluation of existing transit services.

Sub-Task 4.01: Inventory Existing Transportation Services

The Consultant will document the public and private transportation service providers in the service area. Due the high level of tourism-related services, discussions will be held with the project management team regarding the direction and extent this effort will take to collect information. A survey form will be used to collect the requisite information from the providers. Both the form and list of providers to be contacted will be reviewed with County staff to ensure completeness and appropriateness. The survey will be completed by telephone and/or e-mail. It is envisioned that, by provider, the inventory will document facility and equipment information, type of operation, service area, operating characteristics (including frequency and ridership), and fee structure, among other data. It is important to recognize that the completeness of the final inventory will be dependent on the willingness to participate and degree of participation of the identified transportation providers.

Sub-Task 4.02: Conduct Trend Analysis of Existing Transit Service

The Consultant will conduct a performance review of ART over a five-year period using the Florida Transit Information System (FTIS) and validated National Transit Database (NTD) information. This review will help assess existing ART services in terms of system performance, effectiveness, and efficiency trends for the agency's fixed-route and ADA paratransit services.

This review will be undertaken to assess the performance of the system over time using measures falling into three major categories: system performance indicators, effectiveness measures, and efficiency measures (see Table 1). As part of the overall performance review of the system, this analysis will be used to help assess the extent to which the County is meeting the stated goals and objectives for transit service.

A similar review will be conducted, albeit on a reduced scale because of the availability of fewer indicators and measures, for complementary ADA paratransit service provided or funded by County. For this evaluation, the five-year NTD data will be used.

Table 1: Performance Evaluation Indicators and Measures

General Performance Indicators	Effectiveness Measures	Efficiency Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passenger trips • Passenger miles • Vehicle miles • Revenue miles • Vehicle hours • Route miles • Operating expenses • Capital expenses • Operating revenues • Total employees • Vehicles available for maximum service • Fuel consumption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle miles per capita • Passenger trips per capita • Passenger trips per revenue mile • Passenger trips per vehicle hour • Revenue mileage between incidents • Revenue mileage between roadcalls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating expenses per capita • Operating expenses per passenger trip • Operating expenses per passenger mile • Operating expenses per revenue mile • Farebox recovery ratio • Revenue miles per vehicle mile • Revenue miles per vehicle • Revenue hours per employee • Passenger trips per employee • Vehicle miles per gallon • Average fare

Sub-Task 4.03: Conduct Peer Review Analysis of Existing Transit Service

The Consultant also will use FTIS and NTD data to conduct a comparative peer review for the agency's fixed-route and complementary ADA paratransit services. This review will be completed to compare various ART performance characteristics to a group of transit peers. Peers will be selected using a specific methodology based on selected operating parameters, which will be reviewed with TPO and County staff prior to the evaluation to ensure concurrence with the resulting peers. As in the trend analysis, the evaluation will include the indicators highlighted in Table 1 to reflect how efficiently the County supplies transit service and how effectively those services meet the needs of the area in relation to peer systems.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Conduct inventory of existing services.
- Conduct trend analysis.
- Conduct peer review analysis.
- Coordinate with TPO and County staff as necessary.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Provide necessary data to complete evaluation of services.
- Confirm list of peer transit systems.
- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.

The results of this effort will be summarized and provided to TPO and County staff for review and comment; it later will be provided to the project management team for consideration as part of Technical Memorandum No. 2, to be prepared under Task 5.

Task 5: Conduct Situation Appraisal

Transit systems function best in an environment when they intimately understand the regulatory, geographic, environmental, land use, developmental, political, and other factors that impact the provision of their services. The Consultant will conduct a situation appraisal to document such factors for the TPO and County so that staff will better understand its local environment. The following sub-tasks explain the work that will be conducted as part of this task.

Sub-Task 5.01: Review Local Plans & Documents

The Consultant will collect and review local plans and documents that may have a direct bearing on transit services in the county. The goal of this process will be to compile any existing transit-related community goals, objectives, and/or policies. The documents are expected to include the TPO's long range transportation goals and plans and other recent studies, previous TDP, Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan (TDSP), various local government comprehensive plans, and other related local, County, regional, or State studies, policies, etc.

Sub-Task 5.02: Conduct Situation Appraisal

The Consultant will complete a situation appraisal to help assess and document the key aspects of the transit agency's operating environment. This appraisal will involve examining the strengths and weaknesses of the system, as well as any existing barriers or threats to the provision of service in the county and key opportunities for addressing threats and/or enhancing the transit-friendliness of the operating environment.

FDOT-required elements of such an appraisal will be included to ensure compliance. This will include an assessment of the effects of land use, government policies and plans, development and growth trends, tourism and visitors, organization, and technology trends on the County. Additionally, an estimation of the community's demand for transit services, including 10-year annual ridership projections, will be completed in Task 6, and referenced in the situation appraisal as appropriate. The results will provide an understanding of the challenges for transit service development focusing on current and planned development decisions and funding strategies.

Sub-Task 5.03: Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 2

The Consultant will prepare Draft Technical Memorandum No. 2 to report on the work completed for Tasks 4 and 5. As necessary, supporting information will be provided in accompanying appendices. As with the first technical memorandum, the report will be developed in a user-friendly manner with easy-to-understand charts, tables, and/or graphs.

Upon completion, the draft document will be provided to TPO and County staff and the project management team for review. Comments received will be incorporated as appropriate into the draft TDP document that will compile the individual technical memoranda prepared throughout the project.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Review local plans/documents and identify community goals for transit services.
- Conduct situation appraisal.
- Prepare draft Technical Memorandum No. 2.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Review and comment on community goals summary and situation appraisal.
- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.
- Review and comment on Technical Memorandum #2.

Task 6: Estimate & Evaluate Demand & Mobility Needs

The Consultant will estimate the demand for ART's fixed-route bus service over the 10-year horizon of the TDP. Then, this information, along with the results from the previous tasks, will be used to evaluate the transit needs of the county. The following sub-tasks detail the effort proposed to be completed during this task.

Sub-Task 6.01: Estimate Demand for Transit Services (TBEST)

The Consultant will develop fixed-route bus ridership demand estimates (at route and system levels) for the 10-year transit planning horizon. This will be done to reflect maintenance of existing service levels throughout the period, as well as the implementation of proposed TDP improvements. Since these projections must be developed using an FDOT-approved planning tool (TBEST) or demand estimation technique, the Consultant will use the latest TBEST version available (4.7), as developed and distributed by FDOT.

Sub-Task 6.02: Assess Demand with Additional GIS-Based Tools

Other GIS-based transit demand assessment tools that will be used include the following:

- Transit Orientation Index (TOI) – illustrates the potential for traditional transit use (residential-based index using demographic data by Block Group including low-income, vehicle ownership, youth population, older adults, and other populations).
- Density Threshold Assessment (DTA) – illustrates the potential for traditional and choice transit use by examining the relationship between population/employment density and propensity to choose to use transit).

Sub-Task 6.03: Identify & Assess Needs for Transit Services

The previous task efforts, particularly the results of the public involvement activities, will be critical in the assessment of potential future transit service improvement needs. The Consultant will use this information in conjunction with local conditions data to evaluate the need for new, improved, and/or expanded transit services. The GIS-based transit demand assessment tools discussed previously will be used as part of this process to assess traditional and discretionary transit markets in the county. The needs assessment also will include an examination of possible intermodal connections, coordination of service with other operators, and the potential implications for complementary ADA paratransit service. Alternative methods for potentially addressing gaps between identified needs and available services will be identified and assessed.

Sub-Task 6.04: Identify & Evaluate Alternatives

Using the results of the previous sub-task, the Consultant will work with TPO and County staff to identify and develop transit improvement alternatives that will best meet the desired vision over the next decade for ART services in the county without consideration of being cost feasible or a funded improvement. Alternatives may range from the status quo (maintaining the existing mix of services) to existing service changes, new service recommendations, and may even include consideration of future operational assessments, special event service, mobility on demand service, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for example. Route options identified in the Transit Route Optimization Study will also be considered. The Consultant then will prepare an evaluation methodology to support the development and evaluation of transit alternatives for the 10-year planning horizon. Evaluation criteria will be established and weighted in coordination with the TPO and County. The outcome of the evaluation will be transit improvement priorities.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Estimate demand for transit services (TBEST).
- Assess demand with additional GIS-based tools.
- Identify and assess needs for transit services.
- Develop evaluation methodology and develop/evaluate potential alternatives.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Review ridership estimates.
- Review and provide feedback on proposed alternatives and the evaluation.
- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.

The results of this effort will be summarized and provided to TPO and County staff for review and comment; it later will be provided to the project management team for consideration as part of Technical Memorandum No. 3, to be prepared in Task 7.

Task 7: Review & Update Goals & Objectives

Throughout the prior tasks, the Consultant will work with TPO and County staff and project management team to establish the desired 10-year vision for the agency. This overarching vision will then be used to guide the development of updated goals and objectives for the County related to its transit services. Goals and objectives will be consistent with the goals of the local community with respect to transportation and land use, in general, and specifically to transit service. The goals and objectives prepared for the previous major update of the TDP and the TPO's 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan will be used as a starting point, then updated as appropriate. The Consultant also will work closely with the TPO and County in delineating a vision of where transit wants to be in 10 years. The following sub-tasks reflect the work that will be completed during this task to establish the goals and objectives.

Sub-Task 7.01: Integrate Situation Appraisal and Previous Public Input

The Consultant will review the results of the public involvement activities, as well as the key aspects of the situation appraisal findings, to identify major themes, concepts, and focus areas to inform the transit

goals and objectives for St. Lucie County. The stakeholder interviews and input from the project management team will be especially important to the goal development process.

Sub-Task 7.02: Develop Draft Goals & Objectives

The Consultant will develop a set of draft goals and objectives for TPO and County staff and the project management team to consider. Existing goals and objectives from the previous TDP Major Update will provide a starting point for the update process. It is important to note that consistency with the transportation and land use goals of the local community will be an important consideration during this process. It is anticipated that the project management team will provide input in this regard.

Sub-Task 7.03: Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 3

The Consultant will prepare Draft Technical Memorandum No. 3 to report on the work completed for Tasks 3, 6, and 7. The draft document will also include the results from each of the public involvement activities completed as part of Task 3. Similar to the previous technical memoranda, the report will be developed in a user-friendly manner with easy-to-understand charts, tables, and/or graphs.

Upon completion, the draft document will be provided to TPO and County staff and the project management team for review. Comments received will be incorporated as appropriate into the draft TDP document that will compile the individual technical memoranda prepared throughout the project.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Develop recommended goals and objectives.
- Prepare draft Technical Memorandum No. 3.
- Coordinate with TPO and County staff as necessary.

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Review and provide feedback on goals and objectives.
- Review and comment on Technical Memorandum No. 3.
- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.

Task 8: Prepare 10-Year Transit Development Plan

Upon completion of all the previous tasks, the Consultant will use the resulting information, from baseline conditions to public input to analytical results and priority alternatives, to prepare a 10-year TDP for St. Lucie County. The alternatives analysis will include an evaluation of on-demand services over fixed-route services, including planning level ridership and cost estimates considering potential shifting of riders from existing services/programs (e.g., Transportation Program) to on-demand. The strategic vision plan will be compiled from the previous technical memoranda with guidance and input from TPO and County staff and the project management team. It will contain guidance on the implementation of the plan, including considerations for potential new funding sources. The sub-tasks shown below outline the work that will be completed in this task.

Sub-Task 8.01: Prepare 10-Year Implementation & Finance Plans

The Consultant will prepare draft 10-year implementation and finance plans based on the three technical memoranda completed under the previous tasks. Among the key elements included in the

plans will be the documentation of recommended service alternatives and improvements to help address identified transit needs and deficiencies; a phased plan for 10-year service and capital improvements, including a vehicle replacement plan; and a 10-year financial plan, which will detail all projected operating and capital expenses and revenues. It also will include potential new funding sources, unfunded recommendations, a policy element with system goals and objectives, and an annual farebox recovery ratio report.

Sub-Task 8.02: Review/Enhance Performance Monitoring Program

The Consultant will work with TPO and County staff to review and enhance its performance monitoring program that will meet staff needs for tracking the performance of the agency's routes and overall system. The program will focus on efficiency and effectiveness of service and will be set up to use regularly collected operational data (such as those compiled for NTD reporting purposes). The program will provide step-level guidance and appropriate thresholds to trigger consideration for potential route modification and elimination and be based as consistently as possible with nationally emerging performance standards and reporting.

Sub-Task 8.03: Public Workshops

The Consultant will prepare for and conduct up to two (2) workshops to further support the TDP public participation process. It is anticipated that these workshops will occur later to gather input on potential alternative improvements and the implementation plan. The Consultant will coordinate with TPO and County staff to plan and schedule each workshop to target appropriate venues. To maximize opportunities for citizen participation, locations will be selected to ensure geographic coverage and, to the extent possible, piggyback on other community events to maximize participation. TPO or County staff will be responsible for securing any sites selected and for advertising and promoting the workshops.

Sub-Task 8.04: Board/Committee Presentations

The Consultant will prepare for and make six (6) presentations to the TPO Board and Committees, St. Lucie Board of County Commissioners, and the Local Coordinating Board requiring five trips (two Committee presentations to be held on the same day). For this purpose, the Consultant will develop user-friendly, graphical presentations to support first the development of a community vision or priorities for the transit system, and then secondly the communication and adoption of the TDP. The presentation files also will be available for use by TPO and County staff beyond the adoption of the TDP.

Sub-Task 8.05: Prepare Draft TDP Document

The Consultant will prepare a complete draft TDP document that integrates all previous task elements and results. The introduction to the TDP will include a checklist of all statutorily required TDP elements and their locations within the document to demonstrate compliance to the FDOT reviewer. The plan will then be submitted electronically to the TPO and County for review and comment. Any comments provided on the draft TDP will be addressed in the final TDP.

Sub-Task 8.06: Prepare Draft Executive Summary for TDP

The Consultant will prepare a draft Executive Summary of the TDP document. The Executive Summary will be concise, use graphics and easy-to-read bullets or highlights, and be a suitable size to enable the

TPO and County to distribute it easily and widely. An electronic copy of this draft document also will be provided to the project management team for review and comment. Comments on the draft TDP Executive Summary will be addressed in the final version.

Sub-Task 8.07: Prepare Final TDP Documents

Once the draft TDP and Executive Summary have been sufficiently reviewed and accepted, the Consultant will prepare and submit the final TDP and Executive Summary to the TPO and County electronically.

Responsibilities of the Consultant:

- Prepare 10-year implementation and finance plans.
- Review/enhance performance monitoring system.
- Prepare for and conduct public workshops (2).
- Prepare for and give six (6) presentations of the TDP.
- Prepare draft TDP document.
- Prepare draft Executive Summary for TDP.
- Prepare final TDP documents (1 printed copy and 1 CD/jump drive of the final documents and supporting files).

Responsibilities of the TPO and/or County:

- Review and comment on draft TDP.
- Review and comment on draft executive summary of the TDP.
- Coordinate logistics for board /committee presentations.
- Coordinate with Consultant as necessary.

The results of this effort will be summarized and provided to TPO and County staff for review and comment; it later will be provided to the project management team for consideration as part of Technical Memorandum No. 3, to be prepared under Task 7.

SUMMARY OF VISITS TO ST. LUCIE COUNTY

The Scope of Services assumes eight (8) visits with combined activities to St. Lucie County. The primary purpose of each visit is summarized below; however, other meetings and field work may be performed as part of these visits, as necessary.

1. Discussion Group Workshops (2 scheduled on 1 day)
2. Public Listening Sessions (2 scheduled on 1 day)
3. Public Workshops (2 scheduled on 1 day)
4. Presentations to the TPO Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committees (scheduled for 1 day)
5. Presentation to the TPO Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee
6. Presentation to the TPO Local Coordinating Board
7. Presentation to the TPO Board
8. Presentation to the St. Lucie County Commission

PROJECT AGREEMENT

In accordance with the St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization Agreement for General Transportation Planning Consultant Services, dated August 30, 2019, the TPO will authorize the Consultant's services outlined in the Agreement for the completion of the MAJOR UPDATE OF 10-YEAR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2025-2034).

PROJECT BUDGET

A detailed project budget is provided in Table 2 (including hours by staff classification and costs by task and sub-task). The professional fees to update the St. Lucie Transit Development Plan is estimated at \$149,317 for Benesch's services outlined in Tasks 1-8. As outlined in the project agreement, this lump sum budget includes all direct and indirect costs for services described in this scope. This budget includes all directly incurred project travel, printing, and other expenses, as outlined in this scope. Benesch will submit a monthly invoice and progress report. Additionally, periodic conference calls with the TPO's Project Manager and other personnel will be scheduled to keep the TPO and St. Lucie County informed of the TDP progress and upcoming activities.

Table 2: St. Lucie 10-Year Transit Development Plan (2025-2034) Major Update Budget

Task #	SUBTASK DESCRIPTION	Principal \$269.00	Project Manager \$229.84	Senior Planner \$127.44	Project Planner \$101.44	Planner \$81.34	Graphics \$90.56	Total Task Hours	Cost Per Task
1.00	Initiate & Manage Project	1	22	38	20	1	1	83	\$12,369
1.01	Prepare for and facilitate kickoff meeting (virtual)		2	3	4			9	\$1,248
1.02	Coordinate with TPO & County to establish a project management team			2				2	\$255
1.03	Prepare for and support 4 project management team meetings								
	Project management team #1 (virtual)	1	8	12	1	1	1	24	\$3,910
	Project management team #2 (virtual)		2	3	3			8	\$1,146
	Project management team #3 (virtual)		2	3	3			8	\$1,146
	Project management team #4 (virtual)		2	3	3			8	\$1,146
1.04	Project communication/prepare monthly progress reports		6	12	6			24	\$3,517
2.00	Establish Baseline Conditions	1	3	12	76	28	20	140	\$14,286
2.01	Collect and compile data to support baseline conditions assessment		1	2	32	8	2	45	\$4,563
2.02	Analyze data and establish baseline conditions (maps and tables)		1	2	24	8	16	51	\$5,019
2.03	Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 1 (Task 2)	1	1	8	20	12	2	44	\$4,704
3.00	Facilitate Public Involvement	1	7	84	55	55	34	236	\$25,715
3.01	Develop public involvement plan and update TDP brand	1	1	4	8	12	2	28	\$2,977
3.02	Plan and conduct stakeholder interviews (10)		1	16	15	12		44	\$4,767
3.03	Prepare for and conduct discussion group workshops (2 on same day)		1	28	4	4		37	\$4,529
3.04	Plan and facilitate public listening sessions (2 on same day)		1	28	2	3		34	\$4,245
3.05	Conduct public survey		1	2	14	8	24	49	\$4,729
3.06	Engage public through website, social media, and email blasts		1	4	8	16	8	37	\$3,577
3.07	Prepare for operator interviews (conducted same trip as discussion group workshops)		1	2	4			7	\$890
4.00	Identify & Evaluate Existing Transit Services	0	3	12	24	64	4	107	\$10,221
4.01	Inventory existing transportation services		1	4	8	24		37	\$3,503
4.02	Conduct trend analysis of existing transit service		1	4	8	20	2	35	\$3,359
4.03	Conduct peer review analysis of existing transit service		1	4	8	20	2	35	\$3,359
5.00	Conduct Situation Appraisal	1	2	20	32	58	12	125	\$12,328
5.01	Review local plans/documents and identify community goals			8	8	24	4	44	\$4,145
5.02	Conduct situation appraisal		1	4	8	24	4	41	\$3,866
5.03	Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 2 (Tasks 4 and 5)	1	1	8	16	10	4	40	\$4,317
6.00	Estimate & Evaluate Demand & Mobility Needs	1	3	17	78	148	16	263	\$24,525
6.01	Estimate demand for transit services (TBEST)		1	10	30	80	4	125	\$11,417
6.02	Assess demand with additional GIS-based tools			1	12	20	4	37	\$3,334
6.03	Identify and assess needs for transit services		1	2	12	16	4	35	\$3,366
6.04	Develop methodology and identify/evaluate alternatives	1	1	4	24	32	4	66	\$6,408
7.00	Review & Update Goals & Objectives	1	2	20	36	44	14	117	\$11,776
7.01	Integrate situation appraisal and public input			4	8	12		24	\$2,297
7.02	Develop draft goals & objectives		1	8	12	16	2	39	\$3,949
7.03	Prepare Technical Memorandum No. 3 (Tasks 3, 6 and 7)	1	1	8	16	16	12	54	\$5,530
8.00	Prepare 10-Year Transit Development Plan	3	41	70	88	92	28	322	\$38,097
8.01	Prepare 10-year implementation and finance plans	1	1	8	24	24	8	66	\$6,630
8.02	Review/enhance performance monitoring program		1	4	4	6		15	\$1,633
8.03	Conduct public workshops (2) on same day			28	10	8	2	48	\$5,415
	Prepare for and give four (4) TPO Committee presentations (3 trips)		24	6	8	2	4	44	\$7,617
	Prepare for and give TPO Board and BCC presentations (2 trips)		12	8	12	0	0	32	\$4,995
8.04	Prepare draft TDP document	1	1	4	20	20	8	54	\$5,389
8.05	Prepare draft Executive Summary for TDP	1	1	10	2	24	4	42	\$4,291
8.06	Prepare final TDP documents		1	2	8	8	2	21	\$2,128
	TOTAL - TASKS 1-8	9	83	273	409	490	129	1,393	\$149,317

PROJECT SCHEDULE

The TDP Major Update will be finalized and adopted by the St. Lucie County Commission before September 1, 2024. The proposed project schedule provided in Figure 1 is based on a Notice to Proceed date of July 1, 2023 and adoption by the County Commission in June 2024. The project schedule will be reviewed and finalized as part of the project kickoff meeting.

Figure 1: St. Lucie 10-Year Transit Development Plan (2025-2034) Major Update Schedule

