

Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Minutes
April 20, 2010

Members Present:

Donald Smart
Ferd Heeb
J. NeJame
Gilles Blais
Bob Storke
Peter Hauser
Susan Elliott
Don Romanik
Bobby Ball
Nadine Collard
Lary Galphin
Dan D'Antonio
Tomm Friend
Heather Blanck
Mary Schoelzel (non-voting)
Karl Welzenbach (non-voting)

Representing:

Daytona Beach
Edgewater
Flagler Beach
Holly Hill
Orange City
Ormond Beach
Pierson
Ponce Inlet
Port Orange
Volusia County
Volusia County
Volusia County
Volusia County
Votran
FDOT District V
MPO Staff

Members Absent:

Frank Kinsley
P.J. Arvidson, Chairperson (excused)

Representing:

DeLand
New Smyrna Beach

Others Present:

Pamela Blankenship, Recording Secretary
Karl Welzenbach
Lois Bollenback
Bob Keeth
Jean Parlow
Carole Hinkley
Stephan Harris
Melissa Booker
Jon Cheney
Courtney Miller
Karen Adamson

Representing:

MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
VC Traffic Engineering
VC Traffic Engineering
reTHINK (CAP)
FDOT

I. Call to Order / Roll Call / Determination of Quorum

The meeting of the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Peter Hauser. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Consent Agenda

A) Approval of March 16, 2010 CAC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. Smart moved to approve the March 16, 2010 CAC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Heeb and carried unanimously.*

III. Action Items

A) Review and Recommend Approval of Draft FY 2010/11 – 2011/12 Unified Planning Work Program

MOTION: *Mr. NeJame moved to recommend approval of the draft FY 2010/11 – 2011/12 Unified Planning Work Program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blais.*

Mr. Welzenbach explained that task 5.07, Traffic Engineering Assistance to Small Local Governments, has caused some controversy among the committees. He asked that this task be kept in the UPWP so that staff can have time to refine it and come up with a delineation of work elements that County staff can provide. The idea behind this task is to help the local communities that do not have the financial resources, aid them in developing project applications, identify the issues within their projects and to help them work through the Work Program. He noted that the local governments that would be considered "small" are Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, Oak Hill, Pierson and Lake Helen. The assistance that the smaller cities would have access to would be at a reduced rate. He asked that the CAC members include in their recommendation, that this task be left in the UPWP as a placeholder until the language can be refined. Mr. Welzenbach noted that Volusia County will only provide consultant services if the project is already in the Work Program. In addition, Volusia County is unable to help those cities that are in Flagler County.

The motion to recommend approval of the FY 2010/11-2011/12 UPWP with the understanding that Task 5.07 will be a placeholder until it is modified carried unanimously.

B) Presentation, Discussion and Recommend Approval of Resolution 2010-04 Regarding the MPOs Position on Earmarks

Mr. Welzenbach gave a presentation on the three types of earmarks, the good, bad and ugly. The MPO does not currently have an official policy on earmarks. The good earmarks come from discretionary funds and transit. No one is affected from these earmarks. The bad earmarks are a small part of the reauthorization of the transportation bill and the money comes off the top which reduces the amount every state receives. The ugly earmarks are the ones that the local cities go after during the annual appropriations. If awarded, the money is set aside and can only be used on the specific project that it is earmarked for. The money is removed from the total amount the state receives. The state then takes that money from the district, who in turn, takes it from the MPO or County which the project originated from. The MPO will then lose a project already funded in order to fund the one that is earmarked. Resolution 2010-04 states that the MPO Board will not support the latter two types of earmarks, the bad and the ugly. Going after an earmark circumvents the MPO process; the MPO can refuse to program the earmarked project into the TIP and the money will not be used.

Mr. Heeb asked about the bicycle and pedestrian projects exceptions.

Mr. Welzenbach explained that bicycle and pedestrian projects are a separate issue. By federal law, the MPO is required to put all capacity enhancement projects in the LRTP; bike/ped projects are not considered capacity projects and therefore do not have to be included in the LRTP.

Mr. Heeb expressed that the placement of the parenthetical phrase “with the exception of bicycle and pedestrian projects” is confusing as it is written.

Mr. Welzenbach agreed to change the language in the resolution to clarify that statement.

Mr. Cheney stated that he does not know if the MPO Board should be encouraged to say no to all earmarks, but perhaps just have them discourage ugly earmarks. There may be exceptions that come up that the Board may want to move forward on. He explained that the County is working to get an earmark on the Orange Avenue Bridge and one of the first questions on the application is “is the project identified in the MPOs LRTP”.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that the money for the bridge is a separate issue, and not an earmark. He added that some of the Board members requested that he write this resolution. The Board still has the right to say yes or no.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Friend suggested separating the bad and ugly earmarks and handling them differently.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that the wording of the resolution could be changed to reflect the earmark that is specifically being referred to, the annual appropriations earmark.

Ms. Schoelzel suggested that prior to a city applying for an earmark, they should discuss it with the MPO to see if it is a project that they want.

MOTION: *Mr. Galphin moved to recommend approval of Resolution 2010-04 amended to say that the MPO policy would only apply to the annual appropriations earmarks. The motion was seconded by Ms. Elliott and carried unanimously.*

C) Review and Recommend Approval of LRTP Online Survey #2

Ms. Bollenback stated that the second LRTP survey was designed by the LRTP Subcommittee, and is more detailed than the first survey. It follows up on some of the previous questions from the first survey. There are no open ended responses because of the length of time it requires to process the answers.

MOTION: *Mr. Galphin moved to recommend approval of the LRTP Survey #2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Storke.*

Mr. Cheney asked about question #5: it is not consistent with the other questions that ask for the top five of ... - question #5 asks for the lowest priorities. He recommended the question be changed in order to be consistent.

Ms. Bollenback responded that that suggestion had been considered by the LRTP Subcommittee and she went on to explain their reasoning for keeping it the way it is. She added that survey #2 would be available through both the MPO and LRTP websites.

The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Presentation and Status Reports

A) Presentation on the FDOT District 5 Regional Commuter Assistance Program (CAP)

Ms. Karen Adamson, FDOT, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the new commuter assistance program called "reTHINK". The program will be launched this summer and information can be obtained on their website: www.reTHINKyourcommute.com.

B) Presentation on the Development of FDOTs 2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP)

Ms. Schoelzel stated that the last time the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) was updated was in 2005. The FTP is the state's transportation plan that identifies goals, objectives and needs for the entire state of Florida. This year the FTP will look at transportation out to the year 2050. She announced the public meetings that were upcoming and urged the members to participate. The website is www.2060ftp.org and the project manager is Ms. Heather Garcia.

C) Presentation on the Draft Transportation Improvement Program for FY 2010/11 – FY 2014/15

Mr. Keeth gave a brief presentation on the draft TIP. He noted that this document is updated every year to reflect revenue and priorities, and to add the next year to it. He highlighted some of the changes to the TIP and announced that the document would come back to the CAC next month.

D) Presentation on the FDOT Local Agency Program (LAP)

This presentation was postponed until the May CAC meeting due to a lack of time.

E) 2035 LRTP Update (Public Alternative)

Ms. Bollenback stated that the public alternative for the LRTP had been included in the CAC agenda. These projects will go to FDOT for modeling. The results of the modeling will let us know the effect the projects will have on traffic in 2035. The public alternative is the result of many Make Your Mark sessions. Many of the projects suggested had been repeated, but ultimately 70% were road projects, 17% transit and 8% bike/ped projects. She highlighted the transit portion of the alternative and stated that there were only three projects suggested that had not been on the technical alternative.

Ms. Bollenback referred to the road listing of the public alternative and highlighted the roads that were chosen by the public but not included in the technical alternative. Among the projects included are those that were mentioned more than four times; The ones that were mentioned often were not included they would cause the plan to no longer be cost feasible. In addition, the MPO has yet to receive the estimate from Volusia County's local road program.

Ms. Bollenback stated that the next step in the process is to have the LRTP Subcommittee combine the public and technical alternatives into one list that is cost feasible.

Mr. Friend asked about the commuter rail expansion from the Amtrak station to US 1, which has a park and ride listed at I-95; he noted that there was no mention of the airport.

Ms. Bollenback replied that the rail line has not yet been determined, nor have the stops been chosen.

Mr. Friend stated that the airport needed to be included as part of the concept in the plan or it will never happen.

Mr. Cheney noted that the listing includes Airport Road ending at SR 44; he asked if that limit could be verified.

Ms. Bollenback answered that she believed the road actually ended at the restoration on SR 442, but would confirm that.

F) FDOT Reports and Status of Work Program XU Funds

Ms. Schoelzel stated that two SR 40 projects had been deferred from the year 2013 to 2014 in the Work Program. She added that all of the stimulus projects were under construction and that there may be additional low bid enhancement funding for projects in the near future.

G) Volusia County Construction Report

Mr. Cheney stated that there was nothing to report.

V. Staff Comments/Information Items

There were no staff comments.

VI. CAC Member Comments

There were no member comments.

VII. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press or citizen comments.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.