

April 20, 2010
Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Fred Ferrell
Arlene Smith
Mike Holmes
Dinelia Santana
Pat Drosten
Caryn Miller
Doug Gutierrez
Don Findell
Jim Smith
Jim Kerr
Ric Goss
Bill McCord
John Dillard
Melissa Booker
Jon Cheney
Mary Schoelzel
Larry LaHue
Marian Ridgeway
Heather Blanck
Karl Welzenbach (non-voting)

Members Absent:

Chad Lingenfelter (excused)
Stewart Cruz
Aref Joulani

Others Present:

Pamela Blankenship, Recording Secretary
Jean Parlow
Bob Keeth
Stephan Harris
Lois Bollenback
Carole Hinkley
Karen Adamson
Courtney Miller

Representing:

Daytona Beach
DB Int'l Airport
DeLand
Deltona
Edgewater
Flagler Beach
Holly Hill
Lake Helen
Oak Hill/Pierson
Orange City
Ormond Beach
Port Orange
South Daytona
VC Traffic Engineering
VC Traffic Engineering
FDOT District V
VC EMS
VC School Board
Votran
MPO Staff

Representing:

New Smyrna Beach
Daytona Beach Shores
Ponce Inlet

Representing:

MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
MPO Staff
FDOT
reTHINK

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

The meeting of the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by Chairman Doug Gutierrez. The roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Consent Agenda

A) Approval of March 16, 2010 TCC Meeting Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. McCord moved to approve the March 16, 2010 TCC meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and carried unanimously.*

III. Action Items

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

Mr. Welzenbach explained that task 5.07, Traffic Engineering Assistance to Small Local Governments, has caused a great deal of controversy among the committees. The idea behind this task is to help the local communities that do not have the financial resources, aid them in developing project applications, help them identify the issues within their projects and work with them through the Work Program. He noted that the local governments that would be considered “small” include Flagler Beach, Beverly Beach, Oak Hill, Pierson and Lake Helen. The assistance that these cities would be provided would be at a reduced rate. He asked that the TCC 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.

Mr. Ferrell stated that he would abstain from the vote since he is a consultant and would be a conflict of interest.

MOTION: *Mr. Cheney moved to recommend approval of draft FY 2010/11 – 2011/12 Unified Planning Work Program with the caveat that there be a placeholder for task 5.07 until such time that the verbiage can be finalized. Mr. Holmes seconded the motion.*

Mr. McCord asked what the source of the funds would be.

Mr. Welzenbach responded that the funds would be PL funds.

The motion carried with one vote to abstain.

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, the bad and the 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 included as a small part of the reauthorization of the transportation bill and comes off the top of what the country receives which ultimately reduces the amount each state receives. The ugly earmarks are the ones that the local cities go after during the annual appropriations. If awarded, the money is then set aside and can only be used on the specific project that it is earmarked for. The money is initially removed from the total amount the state receives. The state then takes the money from the district, who in turn, takes it from the MPO or County which the project came from. The MPO will then lose a project already funded in order to fund the earmarked project. On page two of the resolution, the CAC recommended that the parenthetical phrase “with the exception of bicycle and pedestrian projects” be moved to the end of the sentence. They also recommended that the resolution only apply to the annual appropriation earmarks (ugly earmarks).

Mr. Goss stated that the Congress and the Senate had not been included among those the resolution would be transmitted to.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that they could be added.

Mr. Smith asked if the other MPOs have the same policy.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that he did not know.

Mr. Cheney commented that if earmarks are not an issue at this time, then why must we make it an issue. If Congress wants to help us, why should we have to say no?

MOTION: *Mr. Cheney moved to recommend not approving Resolution 2010-04 with the understanding that earmarks would be addressed on a case by case basis. Mr. McCord seconded the motion.*

Mr. Welzenbach asked Mr. McCord if he would be willing to give up a project in order for Volusia County to get a bridge.

Mr. McCord stated that he most likely would not.

Mr. Findell stated that it would depend on the merits of the project.

Mr. Cheney added that he felt that as long as it is a worthy project and it was in the LRTP, then no harm would be done.

Ms. Miller stated that she agreed with Mr. Cheney; Flagler Beach has received a lot of earmarked money in the last few years. She added that the elected officials in Flagler Beach would not agree with this resolution. On the other hand, she can also understand Mr. Welzenbach's position on limiting the appropriation earmarks.

Ms. Schoelzel suggested that prior to a city applying for an earmark, they should first discuss it with the MPO to see if it is a project that they support. She added that all of the MPOs in District Five were all asked to come up with a policy on earmarks.

Mr. Smith noted that a decision should not be made yet; the members should have time to discuss the issue with their local leaders.

Mr. Ferrell stated that he did not think this resolution would change the way things happen.

The motion to not approve Resolution 2010-04 carried with Mr. Smith voting in opposition.

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 amount of time it takes to process the answers.

MOTION: Mr. Cheney moved to recommend question #5 of Survey #2 be changed to say the "top 5" instead of the "two lowest" in order to be consistent with the other questions.

Ms. Bollenback stated that the intent of the LRTP Subcommittee was to find out which projects would come off the list. She noted that people get accustomed to answering questions a certain way and added that she would discuss the recommendation with the LRTP Subcommittee at their meeting tomorrow.

Ms. Miller seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Cheney moved to recommend approval of the LRTP online survey #2 with the above-noted change. The motion was seconded by Ms. Miller and carried unanimously.

IV. Presentation and Status Reports

A) Discussion on the Requirements Regarding Local Matches

[This item was presented after FDOTs presentation on the Commuter Assistance Program(CAP)]

Mr. Welzenbach stated that this item was originally discussed in February. The XU program initially required a 50% local match. Two years ago, the committees recommended that the local match requirement be reduced to 25%. Recently, he has been informed that even with the match requirement at 25%, it is difficult to come up with. He added that if the local match is reduced again, more XU funds will be needed to make up the difference and less projects will be funded. The minimum that the match requirement can be reduced to is 9.035%.

Ms. Miller stated that most grants and programs require a 25% match.

Mr. Cheney confirmed that Volusia County has also been hearing from the local cities that 25% is too high for the current economic condition. He asked if any city had a local match this year.

Mr. Harris replied that Holly Hill, DeBary, South Daytona had their local matches and the MPO is still waiting to hear from Port Orange.

Mr. Welzenbach added that, to date, only two cities have said they cannot meet the 25% match.

Mr. Holmes suggested a temporary reduction for one year.

Mr. Welzenbach noted that a large portion of XU funding has already been placed on SR 415.

Mr. Goss stated that he believed the 25% match was fair because it limits the number of projects submitted, while bringing out the good projects.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that the TIP Subcommittee had recommended the reduction in local match.

Ms. Schoelzel explained that last year there was a rescission for federal funds that were not programmed. This year we need to be very careful to spend the money prior to September 30.

Mr. Welzenbach commented that this year in the bill they removed the rescinded language. This is the first time that has happened.

Mr. Cheney suggested that the MPO could use a graduated scale according to what cities are able to afford.

The members expressed disagreement with the idea of a graduated scale.

Mr. Cheney recommended that the local match be reduced to 15%.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that the cities are not applying for projects, they are applying for feasibility studies in an effort to get a good cost estimate. The local match comes after that estimate is obtained.

Discussion continued.

MOTION: *Mr. Cheney moved to recommend that the local match requirement be reduced to 15% for the next two years. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holmes and carried with Mr. Goss voting in opposition.*

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

[This item was presented prior to the discussion on local matches]

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

Mr. McCord asked if this program would be replacing Votran’s Ride Share program.

Ms. Miller stated that Votran’s program would be absorbed by FDOTs reTHINK program.

C) 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.

D) 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 this document is available on the MPOs website and would come back to the TCC next month.

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

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

F) 2035 LRTP Update (Public Alternative)

Ms. Bollenback stated that the public alternative for the LRTP had been included in the agenda packet. The public alternative is the result of many Make Your Mark sessions. Many of the projects had been suggested more than once, but ultimately 70% were road projects, 17% transit and 8% bike/ped projects. She highlighted the transit portion of the public alternative and stated that there were three projects that came out of the Make Your Mark sessions that had not been on the technical alternative. There is also an expanded description to assist the modelers.

Ms. Bollenback referred to the road listing of the public alternative and highlighted the projects that were chosen by the public, but not included in the technical alternative. Among the projects included are those that were mentioned four times; The ones that were mentioned less than five times were not included because 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. She noted that the limits on the Airport Road project extend to SR 442, not SR 44.

Ms. Miller asked how Flagler Beach was involved in the Make Your Mark sessions.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that he would discuss that with her after the meeting.

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. Public comment is scheduled to take place in July.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Kerr stated that Rhode Island out to the beltway was already in the ground.

Mr. Cheney stated that Rhode Island ends at the beltway; he assumed that this project ended at the train station.

Ms. Bollenback stated that she would look into that.

G) FDOT Reports and Status of Work Program XU Funds

Ms. Schoelzel stated that due to the revenue estimating conference, the two SR 40 projects had been deferred from 2013 to 2014. She added that all of the stimulus projects were currently under construction and noted that there may be additional low bid enhancement funding for projects in the near future.

Ms. Miller stated that at the last meeting between FDOT staff and Flagler Beach, central office had no idea on how they were going to prioritize enhancement projects. She asked if Ms. Schoelzel had received an answer yet.

Ms. Schoelzel stated that District Five will still be responsible for prioritizing those projects and sending them to central office. Central office will then review the projects to see if they meet the criteria. If they do, they will then go by the priority list.

Mr. Welzenbach asked Ms. Schoelzel if she knew what the criteria were.

Ms. Schoelzel stated that safety was the first criterion, but she was unsure of the rest.

Ms. Miller requested that the criteria be emailed to the members.

Ms. Schoelzel agreed.

H) Volusia County Construction Report

There was nothing to report.

V. Staff Comments/Information Items

Mr. Welzenbach announced the MPOs new name, address and logo which will be effective July 1, 2010.

Mr. Welzenbach stated that the Revenue Estimating Committee identified a \$903 million shortfall in the statewide Work Program; this equates to about \$53 million impact on District Five. The House is working on a sweep of the Transportation Trust Fund for a total of \$360 million the first year, of which \$142 million would be recurring yearly. In addition, there is discussion on reassessing the administrative fee on local option gas taxes. This fee had been removed five years ago. The Senate is working on a sweep of the trust fund for \$160 million.

Ms. Schoelzel added that this means that many projects will be removed or deferred from the Work Program.

Ms. Schoelzel announced that Mr. Tom Moscoso, FDOT, will be retiring on Thursday.

VI. TCC Member Comments

Ms. Miller asked about the I-95 study presentation from Flagler County that she had requested last month.

Ms. Schoelzel stated that she would follow up with Mr. Zielinski.

VII. Press/Citizen Comments

There were no press or citizen comments.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.