

AUGUST 2016

Contact: Vickie.Wyche@dot.state.fl.us

(386) 943-5185

LAKE COUNTY
CONSTRUCTION IN PROGRESS

430652-1-52-01

SR 50 from SR 33 to East of Lake Village Avenue - milling and resurfacing and minor drainage improvements.

Estimate completion date: July 16, 2016 - % complete

D.A.B. Constructors, Inc.

Project cost: \$4,888,000

LANE CLOSURES: (Time extension 51 days)

238422-1-52-01

SR 25/US 27 from N. Boggy Marsh Road to N. of Lake Louisa Road. Add lanes and reconstruct

Estimated completion date: 967 – October 2018 – 18%

Ranger Construction

Project cost: \$37,503,443.23

LANE CLOSURES: February 9, 2016 to October 18, 2018

SB inside lane closure on US 27 from south of Marguax Dr. to north of Lake Louisa Rd. – 24-hours a-day

April 25, 2016 to October 18, 2018

NB outside lane closure on US 27 from south of Margaux Dr. to north of Lake Louisa Rd. – 24-hours a-day

The single lane configuration on both NB and SB will remain until the project is complete in Winter of 2018.

435434-1-52-01

SR 25/US 27 and SR 50 Interchange – Landscaping in Lake County

Estimated completion date: August 2017 (Establishment period ends) – 53% complete

Dynamics Group, Inc.

Project cost: \$243,390

LANE CLOSURES: No lane closures anticipated

437058-1-52-01

Lake County Drainage Maintenance/Repair (Various locations) routine maintenance and repair on various state roads

Estimated completion date: August 2016 – 81%

Sheen-Line LLC

Project cost: \$773,285

LANE CLOSURES: No lane closures anticipated

AUGUST 2016

Contact: Vickie.Wyche@dot.state.fl.us

(386) 943-5185

LAKE COUNTY
Other Projects Pending

1. **SR 500 (US 441) from Lake Ella Road to Avenida Central** - Reconstruction project to 6-lane US 441 from Lake Ella Road to Avenida Central (FM 238395-5). Construction funded FY 2019 estimate \$33 million.
2. **SR 500 (US 441) from Perkins Street to SR 44** (FM238394-3) Construction not funded.
3. **SR 500 (US 441) from SR 44 to S. of SR 46** - Design FY 2014/16 and Right-of-Way FY 2018/2019. (FM 429356-1) Construction not funded.
4. **SR 44 (CR 44B) from SR 500 (US 441) to SR 44** - Design for four-laning the two miles from US 441 to SR 44 is in progress (FM No. 409870-1). Right of way FY 2014/16. Construction not funded.
5. **SR 19 from CR 48 to CR 561** - An environmental study (PD&E complete 4/2015) into possible widening along the 4.7 miles from CR 48 to CR 561 (FM No. 238319-1). Design estimate \$2.9 million in FY 2014/16. Construction not funded
6. **CR 466A (Miller St.) Lake-Sumter County Line US 27** - A \$8.7 million TRIP grant to Lake County Right-of-Way funds in FY 2014 (FM 430253-1). Construction on Segment (2). JPA with Lake County (ROW Acquisition began)
7. **CR 466A (Miller St.) from US 27 to Sunny Court** – A \$5.0 million grant for construction from US 27 to Sunny Court (FM No. 430253-2) in FY 2015. JPA with Lake County.
8. **CR 466A (Miller Street) Phase 3 from Cut-off Road to Sunny Court** - \$2.5 million grant for Right-of-Way in Fiscal Year 2016 (FM 430253-3). LAP with Lake County

AUGUST 2016

Contact: Vickie.Wyche@dot.state.fl.us

(386) 943-5185

**SUMTER COUNTY
CONSTRUCTION IN PROGRESS**

242626-2-52-01: I-75 Improvements from North of Hernando County Line to South of CR 470.

Widen I-75 from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes, complete interchange construct at State Road 48 (Exit 314) new ramps at the CR 476B/CR 673 (Exit 309 Interchange) Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) improvements. Drainage, guardrail, signing and pavement markings, signalization, milling and resurfacing, and miscellaneous structures.

Estimated completion date: August 2016 - 84% complete

The Middlesex Corporation

Project cost: \$76.9 million

LANE CLOSURES: August 19 to August 20, 2016

8:00 pm to 7:00 am

WB and EB flagging operations on CR 476B near I-75. Trucks will be entering and leaving the highway. Access to CR 476B will be maintained at all times.

242626-3-52-01:

I-75 from South of CR 470 to SR 91 (FL Turnpike) in Sumter County

Widening of 4-lane divided Highway to 6-lane divided Highway

Estimated completion date: September 2017 - 56% complete

Project cost: \$43.1 million

LANE CLOSURES: No lane closures anticipated

430188-1: US 301 at SR 44 – Add a Second Southbound Left Turn Lane on SR 35 and Intersection Improvements.

Project time/work began date: March 6, 2016

Estimated completion date: August 2016 – 94% complete

LANE CLOSURES: August 15 to August 29, 2016

7:00 pm to 7:00 am

Northbound and southbound lane closures. Contractor will be performing widening operations

240418-2: SR 48 from E. of I-75 Ramps to CR 475 (Main Street) – Add Lanes and Rehabilitate Pavement

Estimated completion date: July 2017 – 34%

LANE CLOSURES: August 15 to August 19, 2016

9:00 pm to 6:00 am

Flagging operations at the intersection of SR 48 and West Street

AUGUST 2016

Contact: Vickie.Wyche@dot.state.fl.us

(386) 943-5185

Other Projects Pending

1. **SR 35 (US 301) from CR 470 to SR 44** - Widening from two to four lanes Design Phase FY 2017/18 (FM No. 430132-1).
2. **I-75 at CR 514 from 0.5 miles W. of I-75 to US 301** – Environmental study (PD&E) FY 2017. (FM435476-1)
3. **CR 466W from CR 209 to US 301** – A \$1.6 million grant to Sumter County in FY 2015 for resurfacing existing pavement (Super Pave), remark Pavement and Sod. JPA with Sumter County (FM No. 428443-1).
4. **CR 475 from C-470 to CR 542** - A \$3.26 million grant to Sumter County in FY 2015/16 for construction of paved shoulders and resurfacing along the 3.7 miles from CR 470 to CR 542, including replacement of the timber column bridge at Jumper Creek with concrete box culverts (FM No. 429944-1). JAP with Sumter County
5. **CR 673** – A \$2.032 million construction grant (FY 2017/18) to Sumter County to widen lanes, pave shoulders and resurfacing from .8 miles west of US 301 to I-75. (FM 433670-1). JPA with Sumter County.

PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

PROJECT SUMMARY - August 23, 2016

SUMTER COUNTY ROADWAY PROJECTS UPDATE

ROADS	SCOPE	*PHASE	PROJECT BUDGET (FY 2016)
1 C-462 Widening	This roadway widening project includes reconstruction of approximately 2.3 miles of roadway from US 301 to C-466A, within the City limits of Wildwood. The final roadway configuration will include one travel lane in each direction, a bi-directional center turn lane, and a bike lane and sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. Roadway construction commenced on April 18, 2016. Project completion is 12 months from NTP, April 18, 2017. MOT Phase has C-462 closed at the 121 curve so the section of roadway between the CSX railroad line and the CR 121 curve can be completed. Contractor projects 30% completion of the entire project by 9/30/16.	C	\$5,333,000
2 C-466W Widening	This roadway widening project includes reconstruction of approximately one mile of roadway from CR 209 to US 301 within the City limits of Wildwood. The final roadway configuration will include one travel lane in each direction, bi-directional center turn lane, and a bike lane and sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. Utility work coordination progressing as DAB commences clearing and grubbing.	B/P	\$967,742
3 C-476 W Safety Improvements	The purpose of this project is to replace the existing edge and centerline striping with rumble striping for a 9.1± mile section of C-476 W from the Hernando County Line to US 301. Final design plans were submitted on 6/26/15. Agreements with FDOT for construction and inspection services funding are being executed. Project was to be re-bid and one bid was received. FDOT is reviewing proposal.	B/P	\$299,342
4 C-468 Widening from US 301 to CR 505	This roadway widening project includes reconstruction of approximately 1.7 miles of roadway from US 301 to CR 505. The final roadway configuration will include a four-lane divided urban typical section with sidewalks and bicycle lanes. The project is being coordinated with the Wildwood Springs DRI site planning process, and shared pond/developer access locations have been determined. The design was completed, and Rights-of-Way (R/W) acquisition started in January 2016. Plan updates occurring to accommodate City of Wildwood after main relocation request, and to address Village of Fenney access. A construction timetable has not yet been determined; however, it is expected to be completed in phases. Phase 1 is from US 301 to the planned entrance to The Village of Fenney inclusive of the left turn into the The Village of Fenney Entrance. Waterline design and utility coordination with TECO are underway.	R/W Acquisition	\$2,323,656
5 C-468 second bridge over the Florida Turnpike and widening from CR 505 to east of the Turnpike	This project involves the construction of a second bridge over Florida's Turnpike at C-468 and the widening, to four lanes, of C-468 between CR 505 to east of the Turnpike. Construction of bridge support structures is underway. Pile driving is completed, and the roadway widening is nearly complete. Completion of all project construction should be complete by end of August.	C	\$3,500,000
6 Partial construction of the Full Interchange at C-468 and the Florida Turnpike	The construction of the interchange and lighting portions of this project are on hold, pending release of construction by the Florida Turnpike (not expected before 2020). The portions of the project currently under construction are the stormwater detention ponds, the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS), and the interchange ramp turnouts; this work is scheduled to be completed in conjunction with the remaining work for the C-468 second bridge project in July 2016.	C	\$3,504,530
7 C-475 from C-470 E to CR 542	This project involves milling and resurfacing of C-475S from C-470 to CR 542. Scope also includes adding 4' paved shoulders and replacing the bridge over Jumper Creek and includes a 12 inch water main interconnection design. The design recommendation for Kimley-Horn and Associates will go before the BOCC for approval on 5/10/16 and includes a dry water main extension to interconnect the Bushnell water system. Funding of construction is expected to be through an FDOT SCOP grant.	D	\$400,000
8 C-470, C-475N, and C-575 Safety Improvements	The design recommendation for HDR will go before the BOCC 5/10/16 of safety improvements to C-470 between CR 424 and Wilderness Drive (0.6 miles); C-475N between SR 44 and the Marion County line (6.3 miles); and C-575 between C-476W and C-48W (along 0.8 miles of curves). These safety improvements include adding paved shoulders, installing raised pavement markers, installing edge line rumble strips, and other related safety improvements. The RFQ for design was advertised 1-15-16. Design is scheduled to begin in March 2016, and construction is scheduled to occur in FY 2018. This project is funded with FDOT Local Agency Program (LAP) funds. FDOT sent approval to proceed into design phase.	D	\$401,000
9 C-478 from US 301 to SR 471	This 5.5 miles of roadway is scheduled to be resurfaced once funding has been identified by FDOT. Funding of construction is expected to be through an FDOT CIGP grant.	PL	\$750,000
10 South Buena Vista Boulevard	This roadway will be milled and resurfaced from the North Odell Circle/Bailey Trail roundabout to the South Odell Circle roundabout (9000'). This work is scheduled to occur once funding has been identified by FDOT. Funding of construction is expected to be through an FDOT CIGP grant.	PL	\$750,000
11 CR 101 Improvements	To accommodate increased traffic volume, this project consists of matching the current curb and gutter section of roadway from the Villages of Parkwood to CR 104 (2640'); then transitioning to a typical rural section ending 3200' north of CR 104. Completion by September 30, 2016. C.W. Roberts is completing base north of CR 104 with roadway completed south of CR 104 already.	C	\$892,460
12 CR 219 between SR 44 and CR 238	This project involves the reconstruction and widening of the existing two-lane CR 219 to include two 12' lanes, paved shoulders, and turn lanes at SR 44 and the future southernmost Pike 75 driveway. It also includes the extension of a 12" potable water main to the north of the industrial park entrance. C.W. Roberts is the recommended contractor for this project and will await BOCC approval to award and approve the contract at their 8/23/16 meeting. Construction is scheduled to start after 10/1/16.	B	Bid Amount: \$1.028M (Budget Amount is \$1,300,000)
13 CR 747 Widening	This project widened CR 747 between C-48E and 1,200 feet south of C-48E. Turn lanes and access improvements were included. The project is now complete and final payment is being processed.	C	\$350,000
14 CR 525 Extension - Wade Industrial Park	The concept master plan of the industrial park and deed work is complete. The Nelson right-of-way is scheduled for closing and the Wade right-of-way closed. The design survey and delineation of wetlands is complete. The design will include the road plan, water line, gas line and limited improvements on CR 514. Construction bidding is planned for September 30, 2016. The 30% design plans were approved to proceed to the next design milestone.	D	Not yet determined
15 Capital Road Resurfacing 2016	This project involves resurfacing and other repairs to the County roads identified for improvement in 2016 as part of the County's pavement management program. Project was awarded to C.W. Roberts on 2/23/16. Construction is expected to begin May 11, 2016 and completed by September 30, 2016.	C	\$3,725,001
16 ITS Study	A Joint Participation Agreement (JPA) with FDOT was approved by the Board of County Commissioners on 1-12-16. A task order with Volkert & Associates for the performance of the study will be executed in January 2016. The study is expected to be completed by January 2017. Stakeholder meeting scheduled for Gainesville to view ATMS system.	PL	\$200,000
FUTURE PROJECTS			
A CR 673 from CR 674 west to I-75	This 3.5 miles of roadway will be reconstructed, and paved shoulders will be added to the roadway. The scope of the work is being finalized, and funding of the construction through an FDOT grant is expected to occur in FY 2017.	FY 2017	\$2,032,000
B C-48W Safety Improvements	C-48W from the Citrus County Line to CR 616 is a roadway safety upgrade project (adding 5' paved shoulders, audible edge line, and guardrail at the curves) approximately 7.5 miles in length. A public meeting was held on 4/16/2015 to discuss the 60% plans. 100% design plans were submitted to the County on 5/29/15. Construction is expected to begin in 2017, when FDOT grant funds are programmed.	FY 2017	\$450,000
C C-472 @ US 301 Intersection	A final FDOT signalization study and roundabout alternatives analysis was submitted to the County from FDOT on 10/2/15. A roundabout is the preferred alternative, and is tentatively scheduled for construction in FY 2020-2021. As an interim safety measure, modified the median to a directional type.	FY 2020	TBD
Saved as: S:\Public Works\Division-Admin\Project Update Reports Projects A, B, and C are future projects and not shown on the map.		B/P - Bid or Design Procurement C - Construction CD - Conceptual Design D - Design	PC - Post Construction PL - Planning TBD - To Be Determined WC - Waiting Construction

MINUTES

Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

**Wednesday, August 10, 2016
Regular Meeting, 4 p.m.**

**1616 South 14th Street
Leesburg, Florida 34748
Phone (352) 315-0170 – Fax (352) 315-0993**

OPENING

T.J. Fish called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.; Mr. Fish asked for a volunteer that would be willing to serve as Chairman for the meeting due to the resignation of Chairman Steve Ferrell. Susy Gibson volunteered to Chair the meeting. T.J. Fish asked for a motion and second. **Motion** was made by Doug Tharp to appoint Susy Gibson as Chairman for the meeting, seconded by John Schaller – **motion passed 7-0**. Susy Gibson confirmed the meeting was properly noticed and a quorum was present.

Members Present

Susy Gibson, Chairman	City of Clermont
Gregory Jones	Lake County, D5
Doug Tharp	Sumter County
Gerald Cobb	City of Eustis
John Schaller	City of Fruitland Park
Regis LeClerc	Town of Lady Lake
Stephen Stone	City of Wildwood

Members Absent

Ben Homan	Lake County, D2
Bradley W. Campbell	Lake County, D3
Natalie Werner	Lake County, D4
David Kilmartin	Town of Howey-in-the-Hills
David Clutts	City of Tavares
Steve Printz	Sumter County
Hal Lyons	City of Bushnell
Sam Slaughter	City of Minneola

Staff Present

T.J. Fish	Executive Director
Mike Woods	Transportation Planner
Francis Franco	GIS Manager
Doris LeMay	Executive Assistant
Robert Williams	Financial Analyst

Others Present

Vickie Wyche	FDOT
--------------	------

I. REPORTS

- A. Florida Department of Transportation
Vickie Wyche provided updates and lane closures.
- B. Florida's Turnpike Enterprise
T.J. Fish provided updates
- C. Lake County Report
Included in Agenda Package
- D. Sumter County Report
Reports included in Agenda Package.
- E. MPO Staff Reports
T.J. Fish provided a brief update of the status of the new MPO location. Mr. Fish also provided update on the operational audit findings. T.J. Fish introduced Robert Williams the newly hired financial analyst. Discussion continued.
- F. CAC Members Comments and Reports
None

II. AGENDA UPDATE

T.J. Fish recommended Action Item C be moved before Presentations.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC ON ANY AGENDA ITEMS

None

IV. PRESENTATIONS

- A. SR 44 (Dixie Avenue)
Mike Woods provided a project overview along with renderings of the changes to come to the SR 44 (Dixie Avenue) corridor.

V. ACTION ITEMS

- A. June 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Motion was made by Stephen Stone to approve the June 8, 2016 meeting minutes, seconded by Doug Tharp– **motion passed 7-0.**
- B. Recommend Approval of Policy 2016-6: Sidewalks Program
Mike Woods provided a brief explanation of Policy 2016-6: Sidewalks Program. Mr. Woods also provided wording suggested by the Technical Advisory Committee to be added to the policy.
Motion was made by Stephen Stone to approve Policy 2016-6: Sidewalks Program, seconded by Regis LeClerc – **motion passed 7-0.**

- C. Recommendation on FHWA/FTA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform
T.J. Fish provided a brief explanation of the recommendation on FHWA/FTA Notice of proposed rulemaking: Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform. Discussion Continued. **Motion** was made by Doug Tharp to strongly oppose the proposed rulemaking and to incorporate into the rulemaking process the statewide and regional coordination already happening in Florida, seconded by Regis LeClerc – **motion passed 7-0**.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Long Range Transportation Plan: Plan Draft Policy 2016-7: Safe Schools Emphasis Program
Mike Woods gave a brief update of the draft Policy 2016-7: Safe Schools Emphasis Program. Mr. Woods also provided the wording suggested by the Technical Advisory Committee to be added to the Draft Policy.
- B. Florida 511
Susy Gibson gave a brief update of Florida 511 service provided by FDOT.
- C. New MPO Location
T.J. Fish provided update at beginning of meeting. Susy Gibson made recommendations for providing the disclosure form needed to sign the new lease. Discussion continued.

VII. PROJECT UPDATES

Project updates included in the agenda package. Mike Woods also provided additional updates.

VIII. CONFIRMATION OF REPRESENTATIVE ATTENDING GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

Susy Gibson confirmed that she will be attending the August 24, 2016 Governing Board Meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT – Motion was made by Doug Tharp to adjourn meeting, seconded by Regis LeClerc **motion passed 7-0**. Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Susy Gibson, Chairman

**LAKE~SUMTER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

2016 MEMBER LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>APPOINTED</u>	<u>EXPIRATION</u>
(vacant)	Lake County, D1	vacant	vacant
Ben Homan	Lake County, D2	12/2/14	12/31/16
Bradley W. Campbell	Lake County, D3	2/16/16	12/31/17
Natalie Werner	Lake County, D4	12/2/14	12/31/16
Gregory Jones	Lake County, D5	3/15/16	12/31/17
Doug Tharp	Sumter County (1)	11/11/14 (re-appt.)	12/31/16
Steve Printz	Sumter County (2)	11/11/14	12/31/16
(vacant)	Town of Astatula	vacant	vacant
Hal Lyons	City of Bushnell	12/17/15	12/31/17
(vacant)	City of Center Hill	vacant	vacant
(vacant)	City of Coleman	vacant	vacant
Susy Gibson	City of Clermont	12/9/14 (re-appt.)	12/31/16
Gerald Cobb	City of Eustis	2/25/16	12/31/17
John Schaller	City of Fruitland Park	11/20/14 (re-appt.)	12/31/16
(vacant)	City of Groveland	vacant	vacant
David Kilmartin Vice-Chairman	Town of Howey-in-the-Hills	12/22/14	12/31/16
Regis LeClerc	Town of Lady Lake	11/16/15 (re-appt.)	12/31/17
Victoria Diaz	City of Leesburg	8/22/16	12/31/18
(vacant)	City of Mascotte	vacant	vacant
Sam Slaughter	City of Minneola	12/2/14	12/31/16
(vacant)	Town of Montverde	vacant	vacant
(vacant)	City of Mount Dora	vacant	vacant
David Clutts	City of Tavares	01/20/16 (re-appt)	12/31/17
(vacant)	City of Umatilla	vacant	vacant
Stephen Stone	City of Wildwood	12/21/15 (re-appt)	12/31/17
(vacant)	Lake County Schools	vacant	vacant
(vacant)	Sumter County Schools	vacant	vacant

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
=====

LAKE-SUMTER MPO

HIGHWAYS
=====

ITEM NUMBER:238275 7
DISTRICT:05
ROADWAY ID:11320000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR429/46(WEKIVA PKW) FROM W OF OLD MCDONALD RD TO E OF WEKIVA RIVER RD
COUNTY:LAKE
PROJECT LENGTH: 4.924MI

SIS
TYPE OF WORK:NEW ROAD CONSTRUCTION
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 6

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	642,494	2,518,120	0	0	0	0	0	3,160,614
DI	5,198,752	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,198,752
DIH	532,725	3,772	0	0	0	0	0	536,497
DS	476,263	0	0	0	0	0	0	476,263
PKYI	9,653	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,653
PHASE: RIGHT OF WAY / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	0	350,000	3,001,584	447,000	0	0	0	3,798,584
DIH	9,838	190,161	100,000	0	0	0	0	299,999
PKED	400,000	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	420,000
SL	0	0	3,923,382	0	0	0	0	3,923,382
WKOC	13,000,000	11,760,000	655,534	0	0	0	0	25,415,534
PHASE: RAILROAD & UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
DDR	406,884	0	0	0	0	0	0	406,884
DS	8,667	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,667
PKED	0	1,450,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,450,000
WKOC	75,000	22,099	0	0	0	0	0	97,099
PHASE: ENVIRONMENTAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKED	5,121,688	2,458,311	0	0	0	0	0	7,579,999
PHASE: DESIGN BUILD / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
ACNP	0	29,840,909	0	0	0	0	0	29,840,909
DDR	0	2,038,533	0	1,800,000	195,766	0	0	4,034,299
DI	0	5,476,403	0	0	0	0	0	5,476,403
DIH	0	1,375,778	0	0	0	0	0	1,375,778
PKED	0	38,053,144	0	0	0	0	0	38,053,144
STED	0	80,019,316	0	0	0	0	0	80,019,316
WKBL	0	25,257,538	0	0	0	0	0	25,257,538
WKOC	0	52,378,590	0	0	0	0	0	52,378,590
TOTAL 238275 7	25,881,964	253,212,674	7,680,500	2,247,000	195,766	0	0	289,217,904
TOTAL PROJECT:	25,881,964	253,212,674	7,680,500	2,247,000	195,766	0	0	289,217,904

ITEM NUMBER:430975 2
DISTRICT:05
ROADWAY ID:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:LAKE-WEKIVA TRAIL FROM TREMAIN STREET TO SR 46
COUNTY:LAKE
PROJECT LENGTH: .000

NON-SIS
TYPE OF WORK:BIKE PATH/TRAIL
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY LAKE COUNTY								
SE	0	613,396	0	0	0	0	0	613,396
SN	0	867,000	0	0	0	0	0	867,000
TALT	0	141,604	0	0	0	0	0	141,604
TOTAL 430975 2	0	1,622,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,622,000

ITEM NUMBER:430975 3
DISTRICT:05
ROADWAY ID:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:LAKE-WEKIVA TRAIL FROM SR 46 TO HOJIN STREET
COUNTY:LAKE
PROJECT LENGTH: .000

NON-SIS
TYPE OF WORK:BIKE PATH/TRAIL
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY LAKE COUNTY								
ACTN	0	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	300,000

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
 MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
 =====
HIGHWAYS
 =====

ITEM NUMBER:438338 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER STATE HIGHWAYS EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:SUMTER TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438338 2	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202

ITEM NUMBER:438338 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER OFF STATE ON FED EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:SUMTER TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438338 3	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202

ITEM NUMBER:438338 4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER OFF STATE OFF FED EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:SUMTER TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438338 4	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202

ITEM NUMBER:438338 5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER INTERSTATE EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:SUMTER TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438338 5	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:	0	202	0	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL DIST: 05	26,367,224	284,933,884	7,735,500	5,000,018	195,766	0	0	324,232,392
TOTAL HIGHWAYS	26,367,224	284,933,884	7,735,500	5,000,018	195,766	0	0	324,232,392

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
 MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
 =====
TURNPIKE
 =====

LAKE-SUMTER MPO

ITEM NUMBER:427144 2		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:THERMOPLASTIC FOR RE SURFACING MAINLINE MP274- 275 NB MP274-275.5 SB					*SIS*	
DISTRICT:05		COUNTY:LAKE					TYPE OF WORK:SIGNING/PAVEMENT MARKINGS	
ROADWAY ID:		PROJECT LENGTH: .000					LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0	
FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYR		0	1,000	0	0	0	0	1,000
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYI		21,493	0	0	0	0	0	21,493
PKYR		0	1,010	0	0	0	0	1,010
TOTAL 427144 2		21,493	2,010	0	0	0	0	23,503
TOTAL PROJECT:		21,493	2,010	0	0	0	0	23,503

ITEM NUMBER:433830 3		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:HANCOCK RD EXTENSION AT MINNEOLA INTERCHANGE					*SIS*	
DISTRICT:05		COUNTY:LAKE					TYPE OF WORK:INTERCHANGE (NEW)	
ROADWAY ID:11470000		PROJECT LENGTH: .400MI					LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 0/ 0	
FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYI		705	795	0	0	0	0	1,500
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYI		0	1,000	0	0	0	0	1,000
TOTAL 433830 3		705	1,795	0	0	0	0	2,500
TOTAL PROJECT:		705	1,795	0	0	0	0	2,500

ITEM NUMBER:435787 1		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:WIDEN TPK- LEESBURG NORTH INTCHG TO LAKE/SUMT ER C/L (MP 289.3 - 297.9					*SIS*	
DISTRICT:05		COUNTY:LAKE					TYPE OF WORK:ADD LANES & RECONSTRUCT	
ROADWAY ID:11470000		PROJECT LENGTH: 8.549MI					LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 3/ 3/ 1	
FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: P D & E / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYI		0	1,500	0	0	0	0	1,500
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
PKYI		0	1,500	0	0	0	0	1,500
TOTAL 435787 1		0	3,000	0	0	0	0	3,000
TOTAL PROJECT:		0	3,000	0	0	0	0	3,000

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
 MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
 =====
AVIATION
 =====

ITEM NUMBER:434306 2
 DISTRICT:05
 ROADWAY ID:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:LAKE-LEESBURG INTL TAXIWAY ALPHA REALIGNMENT & RAMP EXTENSION
 COUNTY:LAKE
 PROJECT LENGTH: .000

NON-SIS
 TYPE OF WORK:AVIATION CAPACITY PROJECT
 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CAPITAL / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY:		RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	NOT AVAILABLE					
DDR	0	0	0	0	240,000	0	0	240,000
DPTO	0	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	0	44,000
FAA	0	247,500	0	247,500	2,700,000	0	0	3,195,000
LF	0	5,500	0	5,500	60,000	0	0	71,000
TOTAL 434306 2	0	275,000	0	275,000	3,000,000	0	0	3,550,000
TOTAL PROJECT:	0	275,000	0	275,000	3,000,000	0	0	3,550,000
TOTAL DIST: 05	0	275,000	0	275,000	3,000,000	0	0	3,550,000
TOTAL AVIATION	0	275,000	0	275,000	3,000,000	0	0	3,550,000

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
 MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
 =====
MISCELLANEOUS
 =====

LAKE-SUMTER MPO

ITEM NUMBER:438326 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER LAKE COUNTYWIDE *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:LAKE TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	303	0	0	0	0	303
FEMA		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438326 1		0	707	0	0	0	0	707
TOTAL PROJECT:		0	707	0	0	0	0	707

ITEM NUMBER:438327 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER LAKE COUNTYWIDE EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR *NON-SIS*
 DISTRICT:05 COUNTY:LAKE TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS
 ROADWAY ID: PROJECT LENGTH: .000 LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0

FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438327 1		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:		0	202	0	0	0	0	202

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 OFFICE OF WORK PROGRAM
 MPO ROLLFORWARD REPORT
 =====
MISCELLANEOUS
 =====

LAKE-SUMTER MPO

ITEM NUMBER:438337 1		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER COUNTYWIDE					*NON-SIS*	
DISTRICT:05		COUNTY:SUMTER					TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS	
ROADWAY ID:		PROJECT LENGTH: .000					LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0	
FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	303	0	0	0	0	303
FEMA		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438337 1		0	707	0	0	0	0	707
TOTAL PROJECT:		0	707	0	0	0	0	707

ITEM NUMBER:438338 1		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NATURAL DISASTER SUMTER COUNTYWIDE EMERGENCY SIGN REPAIR					*NON-SIS*	
DISTRICT:05		COUNTY:SUMTER					TYPE OF WORK:EMERGENCY OPERATIONS	
ROADWAY ID:		PROJECT LENGTH: .000					LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 0/ 0/ 0	
FUND CODE	LESS THAN 2017	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	GREATER THAN 2021	ALL YEARS
PHASE: MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT								
D		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL 438338 1		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL PROJECT:		0	202	0	0	0	0	202
TOTAL DIST: 05		0	1,818	0	0	0	0	1,818
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS		0	1,818	0	0	0	0	1,818

GRAND TOTAL	26,389,422	288,305,942	7,735,500	5,275,018	3,195,766	0	0	330,901,648
-------------	------------	-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---	---	-------------





LAKE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

DRAFT

**2017 - 2021
Transportation Construction
Program**






Prepared By The Department of Public Works
Road Operations Division

Lake County Florida





COMMISSIONER DISTRICTS




Commissioner

-  DISTRICT 1, TIMOTHY I. SULLIVAN
-  DISTRICT 2, SEAN M. PARKS
-  DISTRICT 3, JIMMY CONNER
-  DISTRICT 4, LESLIE CAMPIONE
-  DISTRICT 5, WELTON G. CADWELL

Lake County Florida



ROAD IMPACT FEE DISTRICTS

-  NORTH DISTRICT
-  CENTRAL DISTRICT
-  SOUTH DISTRICT



LAKE COUNTY
FLORIDA

**Lake County Board of County Commissioners
Transportation Construction Program
Fiscal Year 2017 through 2021**

Table of Contents

Federal/State Grants - Local Agency Program Projects (Fund 1300)..... Page 1
Road Impact Fees Benefit District 3 (Fund 1153) Page 3
Road Impact Fees South District (Fund 1157) Page 4
Road Impact Fees Central District (Fund 1158) Page 6
Road Impact Fees North District (Fund 1159)..... Page 7
Renewal Sales Tax Capital Projects - Roads – Transportation Improvements (Fund 3040) Page 8
Renewal Sales Tax Capital Projects – Resurfacing & Sidewalk Program (Fund 3040)..... Page 10

Legend

BD.....	Benefit District
COR.....	Corridor Study
CST	Construction
DSN.....	Design
FDOT.....	Florida Department of Transportation
FE.....	Final Engineering
IMF	Road Impact Fee Fund
IST	Infrastructure Sales Tax Fund
LAND.....	Land
LF	Linear Feet
PD&E.....	Project Development & Environment Study
PE	Preliminary Engineering
PER	Permitting
PR PD&E	Preliminary Project Development & Environment Study
ROW	Right-of-Way
RSF	Resurfacing
SDY	Study
SUR.....	Surveying

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS

Local Agency Program and County Incentive Grant Projects to be reimbursed by the Florida Department of Transportation

* in thousands

Project Name	Scope of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
455 Intersection with CR-50 <i>INT97033-CD2</i>	Intersection improvements and install traffic signal, FM# 436150	\$ 308,000			308 CST \$307,634		
466A Phase III from Timbertop Lane to Sunny Court <i>SDY03008-CD5</i>	Widen to 4-lane, FM# 430253	\$ 5,250,000	2,500 ROW <i>Legislative Appropriation</i> <i>ROW funding in impact fee BD3 district</i>	2,750 CST <i>Legislative Appropriation</i>			
466A (Picciola Road) from Dogwood Drive C-5913 to South of Twin Palms Road C-5814 <i>SPJ14010-CD5</i>	Construct paved shoulders, FM# 434422	\$ 451,000	451 CST				
473 from Treadway School Road C-5335 to CR-44 <i>SPJ16017-CD3</i>	Construct paved shoulders, FM# 437485	\$ 624,000	66 PE \$65,100		558 CST \$557,348		
Citrus Grove Road C-1946 Phase I from Grassy Lake Rd C-1846 to N. Hancock Rd C-1354 <i>REB14001-CD2</i>	Add lanes and reconstruct, FM# 435541-1	\$ 2,000,000	500 ROW <i>Legislative Appropriation</i> <i>ROW & CST funding in South impact fee district</i>	1,500 CST <i>Legislative Appropriation</i> <i>CST funding in South impact fee district</i>	<i>Estimated cost: Phase I from Grassy Lake Rd to N. Hancock Rd \$5.5M CST Phase II from Founder's Ridge to Grassy Lake Rd (IMF Credits TBD) Phase III from US-27 to Founder's Ridge \$4.1M CST (unfunded)</i>		
Citrus Grove Road C-1946 Phase III from US-27 to Founder's Ridge <i>REB14001-CD2</i>	Add lanes and reconstruct, FM# 435541-2	\$ 1,000,000	1,000 ROW <i>Legislative Appropriation</i> <i>DSN funding in South impact fee district</i>	<i>ROW funding in South impact fee district</i>		<i>CST funding in South impact fee district</i>	

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: **FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS**

Local Agency Program and County Incentive Grant Projects to be reimbursed by the Florida Department of Transportation

* in thousands

Project Name	Scope of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
Hancock Road, North C-1354 Intersection with North Ridge Boulevard <i>INT16018-CD2</i>	Install traffic signal, FM# 437486	\$ 381,000	32 PE		349 CST <i>\$348,626</i>		
Lake-Wekiva Trail from SR-46 to Hojin Street (Segment 2) <i>SPJ15007-CD4</i>	Construct bike path/trail <i>13,358 LF</i> FM# 430975-3	\$ 305,000	305 DSN				
Lake-Wekiva Trail from Tremain Street to SR-46 (Segment 1), Joint Agmt with City of Mt. Dora	Construct bike path/trail <i>29,198 LF</i> FM# 430975-2	\$ 755,000	755 DSN				
		\$ 11,074,000					
	Projected Expenditures		5,609	4,250	1,215	0	0
	Budgeted Amount		5,609	4,250	1,215	0	0
	Balance		0	0	0	0	0

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: **ROAD IMPACT FEES BENEFIT DISTRICT 3**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
466A (Miller Street) from Timbertop Lane to US-27/441 (Phase I and III) <i>SDY03008-CD5</i>	Widen to 4-lane with paved shoulders and improve intersection ~ 10,824 LF	\$ 500,000	500 ROW <i>ROW funding in Federal/State Grants</i>				
Total Cost Estimate		\$ 500,000					
Available Balance			500	0	0	0	0
Projected New Revenue (No new revenue projected)			0	0	0	0	0
Projected Expenditures			500	0	0	0	0
Projected Available Revenue			0	0	0	0	0

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
FUNDING SOURCE: **ROAD IMPACT FEES SOUTH LAKE COUNTY**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
455 from Hartwood Marsh Road C-0854 to Lost Lake Road <i>NRD16008-CD2</i>	Construct new 2-lane road with curb & gutter (future 4-lane)	\$ 5,275,000			625 DSN	1,400 ROW	3,250 CST <i>Additional funding needed</i>
455 from Lost Lake Road to Hartle Road C-1362 <i>NRD16009-CD2</i>	Construct new 2-lane road with curb & gutter (future 4-lane), developer's agreement	\$ 500,000			500 CST		
455 from Wellness Way to Hartwood Marsh Road C-0854 <i>SDY16010-CD2</i>	Project Development & Environmental Study	\$ 600,000	600 PD&E				
455 Intersection with CR-50 <i>INT97033-CD2</i>	Intersection improvements, FM# 436150 for FDOT funding in FY 2019	\$ 75,000	75 ROW		<i>CST funding in Federal/State Grants</i>		
561 Intersection with C-561A <i>SDY16019-CD2</i>	Preliminary engineering for intersection realignment and roundabout	\$ 250,000			250 PE		
561 Intersection with Lakeshore Drive C-1040 <i>INT16004-CD1</i>	Realign intersection and construct turn lanes	\$ 790,000				40 DSN	750 ROW CST

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: **ROAD IMPACT FEES SOUTH LAKE COUNTY**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
Citrus Grove Road C-1946 Phase I from Grassy Lake Rd C-1846 to N. Hancock Rd C-1354 <i>REB14001-CD2</i>	Add lanes and reconstruct, dev agmt, FM#435541	\$ 4,750,000	750 ROW CST <i>ROW funding in Federal/State Grants</i>	4,000 CST <i>CST funding in Federal/State Grants</i>			
Citrus Grove Road C-1946 Phase III from US-27 to Founder's Ridge <i>REB14001-CD2</i>	Add lanes and reconstruct, developer's agreement	\$ 5,600,000	500 DSN <i>ROW funding in Federal/State Grants</i>	1,000 ROW		4,100 CST	
Fosgate Road Extension from US-27 to Grassy Lake Road C-1846 <i>NRD08049-CD2</i>	Construct new 2-lane road with curb & gutter, signal at US-27, developer's agreement	\$ 25,000	25 PE				
Hancock Road C-1254 Intersection with Sunburst Lane <i>INT16011-CD2</i>	Construct southbound left turn lane	\$ 550,000			250 DSN ROW	300 CST	
Sawgrass Bay Boulevard C-0360 from end to Fleming Road (Orange Co) <i>NRD16012-CD1</i>	Construct new 2-lane road with curb & gutter (future 4-lane), developer's agreement	\$ 100,000			100 ROW		
Total Cost Estimate		\$ 18,515,000					

Available Balance	4,224	4,207	1,527	2,585	85
Projected New Revenue	1,933	2,320	2,784	3,340	4,008
Projected Expenditures	1,950	5,000	1,725	5,840	4,000

Projected Available Revenue
 Draft for BCC August 9, 2016

1,527 2,585 85

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: **ROAD IMPACT FEES CENTRAL LAKE COUNTY**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
CR-468 Intersection with Lewis Road C-5105 <i>SPJ15008-CD1</i>	Construct northbound left turn lane	\$ 275,000	275 CST				
Lake Ella Road C-6604 from April Hills Boulevard to US-27/441 <i>NRD02006-CD5</i>	New alignment ~ 2,640 LF	\$ 118,000					118 CST <i>Additional funding needed; total cost estimate \$2M</i>
Lake Ella Road C-6604 from Micro Racetrack Rd C-6202 to Rolling Acres Rd C-6903 <i>W&R16013-CD5</i>	Widen & resurface, construct turn lanes at each end	\$ 200,000				200 DSN	

Total Cost Estimate \$ 593,000

Available Balance	251	22	77	143	23
Projected New Revenue	46	55	66	79	95
Projected Expenditures	275	0	0	200	118
Projected Available Revenue	22	77	143	23	0

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021
 FUNDING SOURCE: **ROAD IMPACT FEES NORTH LAKE COUNTY**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
437 from Harbeck Lane to SR-46/C-437 Intersection <i>NRD16014-CD4</i>	Construct new 2-lane realigned road with curb & gutter	\$ 1,640,000		500 DSN	340 ROW	365 ROW	435 CST <i>Additional funding needed</i>
Round Lake Road/C-439 from Wolf Branch Road C-4583 to SR-44 <i>SDY12012-CD4</i>	Project Development & Environmental Study	\$ 550,000	550 PD&E				

Total Cost Estimate \$ 2,190,000

Available Balance	629	289	41	3	1
Projected New Revenue	210	252	302	363	435
Projected Expenditures	550	500	340	365	435
Projected Available Revenue	289	41	3	1	2

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021

FUNDING SOURCE: **RENEWAL SALES TAX CAPITAL PROJECTS - ROADS**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
561 Realignment with SR-19 <i>INT16015-CD3</i>	Construct new realignment across from Slim Haywood Avenue	\$ 1,000,000	200 DSN	300 ROW	500 CST		
Hartwood Marsh Road C-0854 Intersection with US-27 <i>INT15010-CD2</i>	Construct receiving lane for dual-left on US-27 and resurface to Hancock Road	\$ 600,000	100 DSN ROW				500 CST
Johns Lake Road C-1158 from Lost Lake Elem to Hancock Road C-1254 <i>W&R10028-CD2</i>	Widen to 24', curb & gutter, resurface, construct sidewalk ~ 3,985 LF	\$ 2,200,000	2,200 ROW DSN CST				
Kurt Street from US-441 to SR-19 (Interlocal Agreement with City of Eustis) <i>RSF15003-CD4</i>	Mill and resurface ~ 8,330 LF 3-phase project, split 50/50 with City of Eustis, Ph. 1	\$ 300,000	150 CST	150 CST			
Log House Road C-0835 Intersection with CR-561 and CR-565B <i>S/W09031-CD1</i>	Construct turn lane and sidewalk	\$ 750,000	750 CST				
Ridgewood Avenue C-1864 from Fosgate Road C-1860 to C-455 <i>SPJ14012-CD2</i>	Resurface, remove inverted crown, drainage improvements, roundabout at C-455	\$ 2,150,000	300 DSN	350 ROW	1,500 CST		

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021

FUNDING SOURCE: **RENEWAL SALES TAX CAPITAL PROJECTS - ROADS**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
Rolling Acres Road C-6903 Intersection with US-27/441 <i>INT16016-CD5</i>	Intersection improvements	\$ 390,000				390 CST	
Traffic signal installations	New traffic signal installation throughout County as warranted (2 projects annually)	\$ 1,200,000			400 DSN CST	400 DSN CST	400 DSN CST

Total Cost Estimate \$ 8,590,000

Balance Carried Forward (from previous year)	2,036	1,180	1,691	91	101
Projected New Revenue (adjusts for Equipment expenditure & reserve balance)	2,844	1,311	800	800	800
Projected Expenditures	3,700	800	2,400	790	900
Projected Available Revenue	1,180	1,691	91	101	1

Projected new revenue based on Department's share of the County's total less adjustment for vehicles & equipment, sidewalks, resurfacing, and water quality project allocations.

LAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 5 - YEAR RESURFACING PLAN
 FISCAL YEAR 2017 THRU 2021

FUNDING SOURCE: **RENEWAL SALES TAX CAPITAL PROJECTS - ROADS**

* in thousands

Project Name	Type of Work	Cost Estimate	2017 *	2018 *	2019 *	2020 *	2021 *
Countywide Resurfacing Program	Resurface roads throughout Lake County	\$ 10,350,000	2,850 RSF	2,400 RSF	1,700 RSF	1,700 RSF	1,700 RSF
Countywide Sidewalk Program	Construct new and retrofit sidewalk throughout Lake County for ADA compliance	\$ 712,000	712 CST	1,000 CST	1,000 CST	1,000 CST	1,000 CST
Total Cost Estimate		\$ 11,062,000					

Resurfacing projects to be determined by annual road rating inspection.
Sidewalk projects to be determined by priority need for new sidewalk and inspection ratings for retrofit.
Projected new revenue based on Department's share of the County's total.



POLICY 2016-7

SAFE SCHOOLS EMPHASIS PROGRAM POLICY

1. POLICY OBJECTIVE

The program will be used to assist the counties and municipalities identify and prioritize the most urgent needs within the two-mile radius, “parent responsibility zone,” for each school in the Lake~Sumter MPO planning area. The Safe Schools Emphasis Program Policy will be incorporated into Transportation 2040 after Governing Board adoption. This objective is consistent with the multimodal transportation goals and visions set forth in TRANSPORTATION 2040, the MPOs long range transportation plan.

2. BACKGROUND

Today more than ever, there is a need to provide options that allow all children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school safely. Many communities struggle with traffic congestion around schools and motor vehicle emissions polluting the environment. At the same time, children in general engage in less physical activity, which contributes to the prevalence of childhood obesity. At first glance, these problems may seem to be separate issues, but the Safe Schools Emphasis program can address some of these challenges through coordinated school transportation planning.

Recent studies have found that walking to school is associated with higher overall physical activity throughout the day. There are many potential benefits of physical activity for youth including:

- Weight and blood pressure control
- Bone, muscle, and joint health and maintenance
- Reduction in the risk of diabetes
- Improved psychological welfare
- Better academic performance

3. Safe Schools Emphasis Program: The MPO received funding from FDOT for the Safe School Access Transportation Study (SSATS) to assess the transportation conditions of each school located within both Lake and Sumter counties. The primary goal of the SSATS was to develop transportation master plans for each school in the study area, focusing on a 10-year planning horizon. The plans were based on data

collected and analyzed for each school in the study area, as well as recommendations for improvement for all modes of travel to and from the individual school sites. The study area is a two-mile buffer around each school site encompassing any statutorily defined student walk zones and any locally defined parent responsibility zones for long range transportation planning purposes. Each school starts from a unique situation with different circumstances. Some schools have great places for walking and bicycling, but few students taking advantage of it. Other communities have children walking and bicycling to school in unsafe conditions or along poorly maintained routes. The SSATS addressed each school site and its unique conditions and issues and developed recommendations to provide more safe options and for walking and biking to and from school. To implement the recommendations made in the SSATS, the MPO is establishing a Safe Schools Emphasis Program.

The benefits of walking and biking , such as improving public health, fostering connected communities, decreasing automobile dependence, and reducing air pollution are all highlighted in the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (TRANSPORTATION 2040). There is an increasing need and responsibility to give people the opportunity to walk and bike for transportation. TRANSPORTATION 2040 addresses the importance of walking and biking and what can be done to facilitate and promote it as a viable mode of transportation.

4. DEFINITION

Safe Schools Emphasis Area: For the purposes of this program the Safe School Emphasis area is defined as a 2 mile circular buffer around all school sites. This is a standard school transportation planning boundary established in July 2005, when Congress passed federal legislation that established a national Safe Routes to School program and defined this 2 mile buffer around schools. Specifically, this program addresses the planning, design, and construction of infrastructure related projects that will substantially improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school, on any public road or any bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail within approximately two miles of a school.

5. GOALS

- a. The primary goal of the Safe Schools Emphasis Program is to help municipalities and counties within the Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization planning area to provide a transportation system where students can safely and conveniently walk and bike to school.
- b. The Safe Schools Emphasis Program serves as framework for identifying and selecting school transportation projects for implementation.
- c. To establish a comprehensive vision and strategies for school transportation accommodations that enhance mobility through connectivity & accessibility, improved safety & quality of life.

- d. To maximize the multimodal capacity of existing roadways around our schools.
- e. To reduce the number of injuries and deaths in crashes involving motorists and pedestrians and bicyclists around our schools.
- f. Promote community policies, plans, subdivision regulations, and right-of-way requirements to make sure that school transportation provisions are included in new construction and rehabilitation projects both at a regional and local level.
- g. Safe Schools Emphasis Program aims to create safe, convenient, and fun opportunities for children to bicycle and walk to and from schools.
- h. Reverse the decline in children walking and bicycling to schools, increase kids' safety and reverse the alarming nationwide trend toward childhood obesity and inactivity.

6. POLICY

The MPO will promote the planning and implementation of the Safe Schools Emphasis Program throughout the region and recommends that all member governments adopt Safe Schools Emphasis policies, consistent with this program. The MPO will seek incorporation of the Safe Schools Emphasis Program into the development of transportation projects and plans where applicable. The concepts listed provide a broader perspective for both regional and local decision making concerning Safe School Emphasis Program implementation:

- a. Create Complete Streets around our schools
- b. Close Gaps in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Network
- c. Improve the Pedestrian and Bicycling Environment around our schools

7. CRITERIA

Safe Schools Emphasis projects can have different types of benefits, depending on the type of project. It can increase the number of children walking or bicycling to school, it can improve safety, and it can even reduce busing costs. The Lake~Sumter MPO defines Safe Schools Emphasis Program as one of their priorities: "projects that provide safe and convenient access to school locations within the MPO region; projects that complement education, outreach, and planning efforts at school sites The Lake~Sumter MPO will prioritize Safe Schools Emphasis projects in their Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) application process based on any of the following criteria:

- a. The proposed project been identified as a priority in the SSATS or other Plan or is a missing link in a pedestrian or bicycle system.

- b. The project resolves a documented hazardous walking condition and eliminates the resultant school busing requirement.
- c. The project meets the objectives and/or guidelines described in the Florida Safe Routes to School program and is within the defined Safe School Emphasis Area.

8. REQUIREMENTS

- a. Safe Schools Emphasis project sponsors must complete and submit a MPO Project Information Application and Maintenance Agreement covering the long term operation and maintenance of the Safe Schools Emphasis facility
- b. Each project should use the most appropriate design standards and procedures. For projects using MPO attributable federal funding, it is important to meet or exceed standards and procedures acceptable to the Florida and U.S. Departments of Transportation, i.e., Florida Greenbook, Plans Preparation Manual. All waivers of design criteria as described in the Florida Greenbook and the Plans Preparation Manual are supported in this policy document.
- c. Designs should include accommodation of all users and be sensitive to the context of the roadway and adjacent land use for the corridor.
- d. The project sponsor should provide the local transit agency the opportunity to participate throughout the process and encourage the involvement of the local transit agency in the design process to ensure that sufficient accommodation of transit users and access to transit facilities is provided.

9. APPEALS

When a member government is not in agreement with the MPO's decision regarding Safe Schools Emphasis projects subject to the Transportation Improvement Program Selection Process, the jurisdiction may introduce a formal appeal by means of a resolution adopted by their local governing body. The resolution must be submitted to the MPO and proceed through the established transportation planning process. As such, the resolution will be subject to review and comment by the Technical Advisory Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee. The MPO Governing Board, after considering comments from the other three committees, will make the final decision on the appeal.

10. IMPLEMENTATION

Upon approval and adoption of this Safe Schools Emphasis Program, it will become part of MPOs planning process and project selection for state and federal funding. The principles of this Program will also guide MPO staff in preparation of MPO planning documents and regional transportation planning efforts to which it contributes. TRANSPORTATION 2040 will be amended to incorporate this Program in accordance with

the requirements of the plan at adoption. Also, the List of Priority Projects will be amended as necessary in order to seek funding for projects as the result of the completion and resolution of support of a Safe School Emphasis Project Information Application.

11. EVALUATION

The MPO, through its committee review process, will evaluate this Policy and the documents associated with it on an annual basis. This evaluation may include recommendations for amendments to the Safe Schools Emphasis Program, including the development of prioritization criteria, design guidance, and subsequently be considered for adoption by the MPO Governing Board.

Policy Approved on: _____

Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization

Leslie Campione, Chairman

Approved as to form and legality:

Melanie Marsh, MPO Attorney



LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

2020/21 - 2039/40

Adopted April 27, 2016

Prepared by the
Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization
1616 South 14th Street
Leesburg, FL 34748

This report was financed in part by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Florida Department of Transportation and local participating governments.

**PROJECTS WITH PROGRAMMED CONSTRUCTION FUNDING
TABLE 1**

FM NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR FUNDING TO BE ADVANCED?	COST ESTIMATE
4336731	TAV-LEE TRAIL EXT	WOOTON PARK	N OF SINCLAIR AVE/RUBY ST	TAV	MIXED USE TRAIL	CST	2016/17		\$660 K
429-206	SR 46 REALIGNMENT (SEG 2C)	E OF ROUND LAKE RD	ORANGE COUNTY LINE	CFX	REALIGNMENT	CST	2016/17 2017/18		\$30 M
2382752	SR 46/US 441 WEKIVA PKWY SEG 3B	WEST OF US 441	EAST OF POND RD	FDOT	ADD LANES AND RECONSTRUCT	CST	2016/17		\$50 M
2382757	SR 429/46 WEKIVA PKWY SEG 6	W OF OLD MCDONALD RD	E OF WEKIVA RIVER RD	FDOT	BELTWAY / NEW ROAD CONSTR	CST	2016/17		\$244 M
2382758	CR 46A REALIGNMENT WEKIVA PKWY SEG 5	SR 46	N OF ARUNDEL WAY	FDOT	NEW ROAD CONSTR	CST	2016/17		\$14 M
4309754	WEKIVA TRAIL SEGMENT 3	RED TAIL BLVD	WEKIVA RIVER	LC	MIXED USE TRAIL	CST	2016/17		INCL IN SEGMENT 6
4299441	C-475	C-470	CR 542	SC	M&R, ADD PAVED SHOULDERS, REPLACE BRIDGE	CST	2016/17		\$3.263 M
2383192	SR 19 LITTLE LAKE HARRIS BRIDGE			FDOT	REPLACE BRIDGE	CST	2016/17		\$47 M
4336701	C-673	SR 93 (I-75)	0.8 MILES W OF SR 35 (US 301)	SC/BUSH	WIDEN LANES AND PAVE SHOULDERS	CST	2016/17		\$2.032 M
4344221	PICCIOLA ROAD	DOGWOOD RD	1200 FT SOUTH OF TWIN PALMS	LC	SAFETY PROJECT	CST	2016/17		\$256 K
2382753	SR 46/WEKIVA PKWY SEG 3A	EAST OF POND ROAD	EAST OF ROUND LAKE RD	FDOT	ADD LANES AND RECONSTRUCT	CST	2016/17 2019/20		\$9.5 M
4354961	SR 48 (EAST BELT AVE)	MAIN ST	US 301	BUSH	RESURFACING	CST	2017/18	ADVANCE TO 2016/17	\$127 K
4309755	WEKIVA TRAIL SEGMENT 4 NEIGHBORHOOD LAKES	SR 46	LAKE/ORANGE COUNTY LINE	LC	MIXED USE TRAIL	CST	2017/18		\$2.3 M
4369351	HIGHLAND STREET SIDEWALK SAFETY PROJECT	HIGHLAND STREET		MD	SIDEWALK	CST	2018/19		\$1.1M
4354931	WEST STREET	SR 48	CR 476	BUSH	RESURFACING	CST	2017/18		\$197 K
4354951	BATTLEFIELD PKW	CR 476	SR 48	BUSH	RESURFACING	CST	2017/18		\$197 K
2383955	SR 500/US 441	LAKE ELLA RD	AVENIDA CENTRAL	FDOT	WIDEN TO 6 LANES	CST	2018/19		\$33 M
4374861	HANCOCK RD@NORTH RIDGE BLVD			LC	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	PE CST	2016/17 2018/19		\$32 K \$349 K

**PROJECTS WITH PROGRAMMED CONSTRUCTION FUNDING
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)**

FM NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR FUNDING TO BE ADVANCED?	COST ESTIMATE
4361501	CR 455 @ OLD HWY 50 EAST			LC	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	CST	2018/19		\$305 K
4344031	CR 478	SR 471	CENTER HILL CITY LIMIT	SC	RESURFACING	CST	2018/19		\$2.6 M
4302531	CR 466A (PHASE 3)	CUTOFF ROAD	SUNNY COURT	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	CST	2015/16		\$4 M
-	SR 91 (FL TPK)	ORANGE CO LINE	MINNEOLA INTERCHANGE	FTE	WIDEN TO 8 LANES	CST	2019/20		TBD
4225703	SOUTH LAKE TRAIL PHASE 3B	SR 33 (CRITTENDEN ST)	SILVER EAGLE RD	FDOT	MIXED USE TRAIL	CST	2019/20		\$2 M
4190581	CR 48 WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER BRG	BRIDGE ID #184006		SC	REPAIR/REHABILITATE BRIDGE	CST	2020/21		\$273 K
4374671	C-476 BRIDGE OVER THE WITHLACHOOEE	BRIDGE ID# 184019		SC	REPAIR/REHABILITATE BRIDGE	CST	2020/21		\$601 K
4374661	CR 48 JUMPER CREEK BRG	BRIDGE ID# 184008		SC	REPAIR/REHABILITATE BRIDGE	CST	2020/21		\$280 K
4374651	C-470 LAKE PANASOFFKEE OUTLET BRIDGE	BRIDGE ID# 184054		SC	REPAIR/REHABILITATE BRIDGE	CST	2020/21		\$137 K

**CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
TABLE 2**

RANK	FM NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
1	4098701	SR 44	SR 500 (US 441)	SR 44/E ORANGE AVE	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	ROW	2013/14	CST	\$16 M
2	-	CR 470	TP EAST RAMPS	BAY RD	LEES	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	ROW	2012/13	CST	\$10 M
3	2383943	SR 500/US 441	PERKINS ST	SR 44 (E DIXIE AVE)	FDOT	WIDEN TO 6 LANES	ROW	2015/16	CST	TBD BY FDOT
4	4293561	SR 500 (US 441)	SR 44	SR 46/WEKIVA CONN	FDOT	WIDEN TO 6 LANES	ROW	2017/18	ADVANCE ROW TO 2016/17, CST 2017/18	\$24 M
5	-	CR 466A PHASES 2 & 3	TIMBERTOP RD	CENTURY AVE	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	ROW	2013/14	CST	\$11 M
6	4358931	SOUTH LAKE TRAIL, PHASE 4	VILLA CITY ROAD	VAN FLEET TRAIL	FDOT	MIXED USE TRAIL	ROW	2018/19	CST	\$7 M
7	-	C-470 SIDEWALK	CR 436	OUTLET BRIDGE	SC	SIDEWALK	NA		DSB	\$200 K
8	-	US 27 ATMS	SR 44	SE HWY 42	FDOT	ATMS FOR CORRIDOR	N/A		DSB	\$1.60 M
9	-	LAKE COUNTY ATMS.NOW PROJECT			LC	CENTRAL MGMT PLATFORM SYSTEM	N/A		EQUIPMENT PURCHASE/ INSTALLATION	\$99 K
10	-	DIXIE AVE (SR 44) COMPLETE STREETS	12TH STREET	US 441	LEES	ACCESS MANAGEMENT/MEDIANS/SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	STUDY	2015/16	CST	\$36 K
11	-	HARTWOOD MARSH RD PAVED SHOULDER	HANCOCK RD	ORANGE COUNTY LINE	LC	NEW PAVED SHOULDER	PE	2009/10	CST	\$2 M
12	-	C-575 BRIDGE OVER SPRING RUN	BRIDGE ID# 184052		SC	REPAIR/REHABILITATE BRIDGE	STUDY	2014/15	CST	\$210 K
13	-	SOUTH BUENA VISTA BLVD	N ODELL CIR	SOUTH OF S ODELL CIR	SC	RESURFACING	N/A		DSB	\$2 M

**RIGHT OF WAY PROJECTS
TABLE 3**

RANK	FM NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
1	4309752	WEKIVA TRAIL SEGMENT 1	TREMAIN STREET	CR 437	LC/MD	MIXED USE TRAIL	PE	2015/16	ROW	\$5 M
2	4309753	WEKIVA TRAIL SEGMENT 2	CR 437	RED TAIL BLVD	LC	MIXED USE TRAIL	PE	2015/16	ROW	\$1 M
3	4270561	SR 50 REALIGNMENT/ SOUTH LAKE TRAIL, PHASE 3	CRITTENDEN RD	VILLA CITY	FDOT	REALIGNMENT	PD&E PE	2014/15	ROW	\$25 M
4	4354711	SOUTH SUMTER CONNECTOR TRAIL	VAN FLEET TRAIL	WITHALOOCHOOCEE TRAIL	FDOT	MIXED USE TRAIL	PD&E PE	2018/19 2016/17	ROW	\$9 M
5	4301321	SR 35 (US 301)	C-470 (W)	SR 44	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PD&E PE	2013/14 2016/17	ROW	TBD BY FDOT
6	4355411	CITRUS GROVE ROAD (PHASE 1&2)	US 27	N HANCOCK RD	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PE	2014/15	ROW	\$15 M
7	4374641	EUDORA ROAD/OLD 441/CR 19A			LC	ROUNDBABOUT/INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	PE	2017/18	ROW	\$201 K
8	-	CR 470	BAY RD	CR 33	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PER PE	2009/10	ROW	\$150 K
9	-	CR 48	CR 33	EAST OF PALATLAKAHA BRIDGE	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PER PE	2009/10	ROW	\$800 K
10	4349121	C-470	CR 527	SR 91 (FL TPK)	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PD&E PE	2014/15 2019/20	ROW	TBD BY FDOT
11	2383191	SR 19	CR 561	CR 48	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PD&E PE	2011/12 2013/14	ROW	TBD BY FDOT

**PE (DESIGN) PROJECTS
TABLE 4**

RANK	FM NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
1	-	EAST ORANGE AVE	FRUITWOOD AVE	SUNRISE LN	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$50 K
2	-	CR 473	US 441	SOUTH HAINES CREEK/POE ST	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$151 K
3	-	RADIO RD (TREADWAY ELEMENTARY)	SILVER BLUFF	TREADWAY SCHOOL RD	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$36 K
4	-	CR 561 (MONROE ST) ASTATULA ELEMENTARY	TENNESSEE AVE	CR 48/FLORIDA AVE	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$20 K
5	-	CR 44 BYPASS/DELAND RD (EUSTIS MIDDLE SCHOOL)	EAST ORANGE AVE	CYPRESS GROVE RD	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$20 K
6	-	HANCOCK RD (LOST LAKE ELEMENTARY)	SUNBURST LN	GREATER PINES BLVD	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$36 K
7	-	LOG HOUSE RD (PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)	CR 561	LAKESHORE DR	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$24 K
8	-	LAKESHORE DR (PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)	CHERITH LN	OLEANDER DR	LC	NEW SIDEWALK	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$49 K
9	-	ROLLING ACRES ROAD	US 27/US441	CR 466	LL	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	STUDY		PE 2016/17	\$1.9 M
10	4354761	CR 514 INTERCHANGE*	@ I-75		FDOT	NEW INTERCHANGE	PD&E	2016/17	PE	TBD
11	4363601	BLACK BEAR SCENIC TRAIL	MARION/LAKE COUNTY LINE	VOLUSIA/LAKE COUNTY LINE	FDOT	NEW TRAIL	PD&E	2019/20	PE	
12	-	CR 437 REALIGNMENT	ADAIR AVE	SR 44	LC	REALIGNMENT & MULTI-MODAL DESIGN PHSE	STUDY	2015/16	PE	\$650 K
13	-	ROUND LAKE ROAD EXTENSION/CR 439	LAKE/ORANGE CL	CR 44	LC	NEW ALIGNMENT/ADD LANES	STUDY	2016/17	PE	\$450 K
14	-	US 27	SR 44	US 441	LEES	COMPLETE STREETS	STUDY	2015/16	PE	TBD
15	4349101	SR 91 (FL TPK)	CR 470	SR 25 (US 27) (N)	FTE	WIDEN TO 8 LANES	PD&E	2015/16	PE	TBD BY FTP
16	-	SR 91 (FL TPK)	SR 35 (US 301)	CR 470	FTE	WIDEN TO 8 LANES	PD&E	2015/16	PE	TBD BY FTP

* DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PHASES WILL BE ADDRESSED BY SUMTER COUNTY ONCE THE INTERCHANGE IS APPROVED. AT THIS TIME, IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT ALL RIGHT -OF-WAY NEEDED FOR THE INTERCHANGE WILL BE DONA

**PD&E PROJECTS
TABLE 5**

PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
US 27 & SR 44			FDOT	INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT	PER/ STUDY	2013/14 2014/15	PD&E 2016/17	\$1 M
NORTH LAKE TRAIL	CR 450	SR 40	UM	NEW TRAIL	N/A		PD&E 2016/17	\$2.1 M
SR 44	SR 44 & ORANGE AVENUE	CR 46A	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	N/A		PD&E 2016/17	TBD BY FDOT
W. SR 50/FM#4358591	US 98 (HERNANDO CO.)	CR 33 (LAKE COUNTY)	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	STUDY	2015/16	PD&E 2016/17	\$1 M
SR 19	SR 50	CR 455	FDOT	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	N/A		PD&E 2016/17	TBD BY FDOT
US 27	CR 561 (S)	FL TPK NORTH RAMPS	FDOT	WIDEN TO 6 LANES	N/A		PD&E	TBD BY FDOT

**PLANNING STUDY PROJECTS
TABLE 6**

PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
EAST AVENUE	GRAND HIGHWAY	MINNEHAHA AVE	CLR	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$110 K
US 301	CLEVELAND AVE (C-466A)	HUEY ST (C-44A)	WW	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$200 K
WEBSTER SR 471	CR 478A	NW 10TH AVE/CR 730	WEB	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$100 K
WOLF BRANCH INNOVATION BLVD	CR 437	ROUND LAKE RD	MD	NEW 4 LANE RD	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	TBD
UMATILLA SR 19	CR 450-A	OLD MILL STREAM RV PARK	UMA	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$170 K
SORRENTO BLVD	ORANGE AVE	HOJIN ST	LC	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$850 K
ORANGE ST & BROAD ST (SR 50)	ALABAMA AVE	SR 33	GRV	COMPLETE STREETS	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	TBD
LAKE DENHAM TRAIL	TRAIL HEAD AT W MAIN ST LEESBURG	LC LINE ON CR 33	LEES	NEW TRAIL	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$150 K
EAST MAIN ST IMPROVEMENTS	CANAL ST @ MAIN ST	SR 44 @ MAIN ST	LEES	CURB & GUTTER, ADA UPGRADE, ON STREET PARKING	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$50 K
WEST MAIN ST IMPROVEMENTS	W MAIN ST @ CR 468	W MAIN ST @ US 27	LEES	CURB & GUTTER, ADA UPGRADE, ON STREET PARKING	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$75 K
I-75 EXIT 309 SUMTER SCENIC BYWAY PROJECT			SUMTER SCENIC BYWAY/SC	ENAHNCEMENT OF INTERSTATE EXIT TO NATIONAL CEMETARY	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$50 K
MONTVERDE GREENWAY TRAIL EXTENSION	EXISTING GREENWAY TRAIL TERMINUS	STRETCHER PROPERTY	MON	3,042 FT EXTENSION TO EXISTING TRAIL	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$50 K
RIDGEWOOD ROUNDABOUT	RIDGEWOOD @ CR 455		MON	SAFETY STUDY/ROUNDAABOUT WARRANT STUDY	N/A		STUDY 2016/17	\$50 K

**CANDIDATE PROJECTS
TABLE 7**

PROJECT NAME	FROM	TO	SPONSOR/ LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FUNDED PHASE(S)	FISCAL YEAR	REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING	COST ESTIMATE
WELLNESS WAY/ FM#4357231	US 27	SR 429	LC	NEW ROAD, ALTERNATIVE CORRIDOR EVALUATION	N/A		STUDY	TBD
CAGAN'S CROSSING PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS			LC	NEW US 27 OVERPASS FOR PEDESTRIANS	N/A		STUDY	TBD
CR 561/561A REALIGN	CR 455	SR 91 (FL TURNPIKE)	LC	CORRIDOR STUDY	N/A		PD&E	\$750 K
HARTLE RD	SR 50	HARTWOOD MARSH RD	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PD&E		PE	\$800 K
HOOKS ST	HANCOCK RD	EMIL JAHNA RD	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	N/A		PE	\$800 K
C-501	C-468	C-470	SC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PER	2014/15	PE	\$1.4 M
HARTWOOD MARSH RD	SR 25 (US 27)	HANCOCK RD	LC	WIDEN TO 4 LANES	PE	2013/14	ROW	\$2 M

PD&E = PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
PE = PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING (DESIGN)

CST = CONSTRUCTION
ROW = RIGHT-OF-WAY

* ELIGIBILITY TO BE DETERMINED OR APPLICATION PARTIALLY COMPLETED OR NEED FOR APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED.

REQUESTING AGENCY & LOCATION CODE:

AST = ASTATULA
BUSH = BUSHNELL
CLR = CLERMONT
EUS = EUSTIS
FP = FRUITLAND PARK
GRV = GROVELAND
HOW = HOWEY-IN-THE-HILLS
LC = LAKE COUNTY
LL = LADY LAKE
LEES = LEESBURG

LSMPO = LAKE-SUMTER MPO
MAS = MASCOTTE
MD = MOUNT DORA
MIN = MINNEOLA
MON = MONTVERDE
SC = SUMTER COUNTY
TAV = TAVARES
UMA = UMATILLA
WW = WILDWOOD

LAKE~SUMTER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

RESOLUTION 2014 – 19

A RESOLUTION OF THE LAKE~SUMTER METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION ADOPTING CRITERIA FOR ADDING PROJECTS TO THE LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the duly designated and constituted body responsible for carrying out the urban transportation planning and programming process for Lake~Sumter Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175; 23 U.S.C. 134; and 49 U.S.C. 5303 require that the urbanized area, as a condition for the receipt of federal capital or operating assistance, has a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process that results in plans and programs consistent with the comprehensively planned development of the urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, Florida Statutes 339.175(8)(a) requires that the MPO is responsible for developing, annually, a List of Priority Projects ranking the transportation needs of the MPO area; and

WHEREAS, the List of Priority Projects must be based upon project selection criteria that considers, in part, the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan; the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Strategic Intermodal System Plan; criteria consistent with projects eligible to receive funding from the Transportation Regional Incentive Program outlined in Florida Statutes 339.2819(4); the results of the Transportation Management System data; and the MPO Public Involvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, the List of Priority Projects must be formally reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee, the Citizens' Advisory Committee and the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee for recommendation for action by the MPO Governing Board prior to submittal to FDOT District 5; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Florida Statutes 339.175(8)(b), the List of Priority Projects must be submitted annually by the MPO to FDOT by September 1 and must be utilized by the FDOT in developing the district five-year work program, and must be used by the MPO in developing its five-year Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, three members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), one member of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) and one member of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) began coordinating in March for the purposes of providing a draft FY 2019/20 – 2034/35 List of Priority Projects and establishing process and prioritization criteria to be used for updating the List of Priority Projects; and

WHEREAS, the list of criteria contained herein is the product of these efforts, and the above-referenced informal group has now been formally recognized by the MPO Governing Board as the Project Prioritization Subcommittee pursuant to Section 1.7 of the MPO Bylaws.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lake~Sumter MPO:

1. The MPO adopts the following list of process criteria that must be met for new projects to be added to the List of Priority Projects: (1) a candidate project must be on the cost feasible project list in the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan; (2) a candidate project can only be submitted by a MPO member government in the form of resolution and included as applicable in the sponsoring municipal or county comprehensive plan; (3) new projects shall be submitted for consideration no later than the regular committee meetings held in January; and (4) a Project Information Application Form must be completed and submitted for each new project.
2. The MPO adopts the following List of Priority Projects development schedule, developed by the Project Prioritization Subcommittee to ensure sufficient time is available for discussion and vetting of projects by the MPO Governing Board and committees for public input, and for staff to make changes to the List of Priority Projects as directed by the Governing Board and committees:

November – Committees are requested to prepare for submittal of new projects and to begin work on the project application forms for new projects. Projects already on the List of Priority Projects will require an updated application.

January - Submittal of new projects, including an application for each and updated applications for existing projects, must occur by the committee meetings the second week of the month.

February – The Project Prioritization Subcommittee will meet to discuss the proposed List of Project Priorities and make recommendations to the committees; staff will present the draft List of Priority Projects based on moving projects to the appropriate table if funding was programmed over the last year in the Transportation Improvement Program and adding new projects to the appropriate table if the criteria for adding a new project was met; committees will begin discussing prioritization.

April – Staff will provide a revised draft List of Priority Projects for committee discussion. Based upon this discussion, the Project Prioritization Subcommittee will meet to discuss proposed changes.


May – Staff will provide a revised draft based on April discussions. If necessary, the Project Prioritization Subcommittee will meet to discuss proposed changes.

June – Staff will provide the final draft for committees to base their recommendation to the Governing Board to open the public review period.

August – All comments received during the public review period will be discussed by committees, and if appropriate, changes will be recommended to the List of Priority Projects before recommendation is made to the Governing Board for approval.

DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of August, 2014.

Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization


Sean Parks, Chairman

Approved as to form and legality:

 for
Sanford A. Minkoff, MPO Attorney



Florida SRTS in Action

What is the Goal of SRTS?

The goal of SRTS program is to get more students walking and bicycling where it is safe and to fix the conditions where it is not safe. The opportunity to bike and walk to school offers a solution to an array of concerns about traffic safety, traffic congestion, transportation costs and lack of physical activity. At the same times, walking and bicycling to school provides an opportunity for students to build independence. Our goal is based on making that solution into a reality.

Call for Applications

**September 1, 2016 opens the call for applications
for Safe Routes to School Applications in Florida.**

Florida is seeking applications to plan, develop, implement and evaluate eligible Safe Routes to School (SRTS) infrastructure projects. The application is available at the following link.

<http://www2.dot.state.fl.us/proceduraldocuments/forms/ByNumber.asp?formnumber=500-000-30>

Eligible recipients of these funds to be used for SRTS projects are limited to state, local and regional transportation maintaining agencies, including schools and school districts. Schools and School Districts will need to partner with a maintaining agencies to complete the projects. Applications will be accepted only from these entities. Recipients of SRTS funds will be responsible for all aspects of project implementation.

Eligible SRTS projects shall directly support increased safety and convenience for students in grades K-high school to walk and/or bicycle to/from school. In addition, all projects that use SRTS funds shall comply with applicable federal, state and local provisions.

DATES TO REMEMBER

09/01/16	Call for Applications
12/30/16	Applications due to your local FDOT District
August, 2017	Notifications letters sent to applicants

Projects Awarded in the 2015 Call for Applications

These projects include a number of different things: signing and pavement markings, school zones, signals, sidewalks and even school bus shelters. For more information about any of these projects, please contact your FDOT District SRTS Coordinator. See back page for your local coordinator listing.

ALACHUA COUNTY

Metcalfe Elementary School
Construction 2020

BAY COUNTY

Parker Elementary
Construction 2019

BREVARD COUNTY

Port Malabar Elementary
Christa McAuliffe Elementary
Columbia Elementary
Discovery Elementary
Jupiter Elementary
Construction 2020

CALHOUN COUNTY

Altha Elementary
Construction 2019

CITRUS COUNTY

Pleasant Grove Elementary
Construction 2020

Forest Ridge Elementary

Construction 2018

DUVAL COUNTY

Atlantic Beach
Construction 2018

GADSDEN COUNTY

Crossroads Academy
Construction 2019

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

Cypress Creek Elementary
Kenly Elementary
Gibsonton Elementary
Mort Elementary
Construction 2020

JACKSON COUNTY

Cottondale High
Construction 2021

LAKE COUNTY

Treadway Elementary
Construction 2020

LEE COUNTY

Trafalgar Elementary
Construction 2019

LEON COUNTY

Kate Sullivan Elementary
Sabal Palm Elementary
Ruediger Elementary
Canopy Oaks Elementary
Pineview Elementary
Construction 2019

MARTIN COUNTY

Port Salerno Elementary
Construction 2020

MIAMI-DADE

Carrie P. Meek/Westview K-8
Flagami Elementary
Hubert O Sibley K-8
Shadowlawn Elementary
Bunche Park Elementary
Miami Elementary
Myrtle Grove K-8
Florida City Elementary
Robert Russa Moton Elementary
North Twin Lakes Elementary
Norman S. Edelcup K-8
Construction 2021

OKEECHOBEE COUNTY

Seminole Elementary
Construction 2020



October 5, 2016 marks the 20th Walk to School Day celebration!

Walk to School Day began with strong mayor participation – in 1997, Chicago’s Mayor Daley and Los Angeles’ Mayor Riordan walked with students to school. Since then, mayors nationwide have hit the sidewalks in October. Walk to School Day is a great opportunity for a mayor to talk about their commitment to child and youth pedestrian and bicyclist safety and to discuss what they’re going to do to make their community more walkable.

We’re getting the word out both through information directly to mayors and their teams about why and how they can participate, and to Walk to School Coordinators and supporters like you. We’re going to be adding more resources on to the www.walkbiketoschool.org page in the next few weeks as well.

We hope you’ll encourage your communities, stakeholders, and networks of SRTS programs to invite their mayors to join the 20th celebration. And if you’re not already planning to do so, consider participating in an event and inviting your mayor to attend. Your leadership can help build support for this event and inspire others to join the celebration.

Also new this year, an updated Walk to School Day registration system. In order to make registration more simple, we’ve removed the username/password requirement. Now registration can be completed in just a few steps.

Last year there were 5034 schools nationwide that participated. Florida had 430 of those schools. Let’s aim high and shoot for 450 schools statewide. Don’t forget to register at www.walkbiketoschool.org. Then send me (Sarita.taylor@dot.state.fl.us) your event ideas before and after. I love to share what your schools are doing.

P.S. Make sure you register your school early. You never know when a special somebody might just pick your school to walk with.

PARTNERS COUNT!

Please take the time to visit some of our partners.



[Alert Today Florida](#)



[WALKSAFE](#)



[BIKESAFE](#)



[Florida School Crossing Guard Program](#)



[Bicyclist Safer Journey](#)




[Pedestrian Safer Journey](#)



[Pedestrian & Bicycle Resource Center](#)

For more information regarding the program and guidelines, please visit:

www.srtsfl.org



FDOT District SRTS Coordinators

Dist	Contact	Phone	Email
1	David Wheeler	863-519-2378	David.Wheeler@dot.state.fl.us
2	Jeff Scott	904-360-5644	Jeffrey.Scott@dot.state.fl.us
3	Michael Lewis	850-330-1266	Mike.Lewis@dot.state.fl.us
	Barbara Lee	850-330-1428	Barbara.Lee@dot.state.fl.us
4	Tracey Xie	954-777-4355	Yujing.Xie@dot.state.fl.us
	Tom Miller	954-777-4073	Thomas.Miller@dot.state.fl.us
5	Tony Nosse	386-943-5334	Anthony.Nosse@dot.state.fl.us
	Chad Lingenfelter	386-943-5336	Chad.Lingenfelter@dot.state.fl.us
6	Misleidys Leon	305-470-5345	Misleidys.Leon@dot.state.fl.us
7	Matt Weaver	813-975-6254	Matthew.Weaver@dot.state.fl.us

LAKE~SUMTER MPO TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

DRAFT PRESENTED FEBRUARY 2016

DRAFT FY 2016/17 TMS BUDGET BREAKDOWN

	All-Inclusive	Base Rate	Current Commit
	FY 2015/16	FY 2015/16	FY 2016/17
TMS OPERATING BUDGET	\$199,835	\$199,835	\$194,151
MPO CONTRIBUTION FROM FEDERAL FUNDS	\$20,000	\$39,348	\$20,000
TOTAL LOCAL SHARE OF TMS BUDGET	\$179,835	\$160,487	\$174,151
MPO Member	All-Inclusive	Base Rate*	Current
Sumter County BoCC	\$30,069	\$25,108	\$25,108
Bushnell	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$3,200
Coleman	\$466	\$466	\$466
Wildwood	\$6,522	\$6,522	\$6,522
Lake County BCC	\$86,993	\$80,271	\$86,993
Astatula	\$647	\$647	\$647
Clermont	\$9,550	\$7,974	\$9,550
Eustis	\$7,211	\$6,021	\$7,211
Fruitland Park	\$1,567	\$1,567	\$1,567
Groveland	\$2,816	\$2,352	\$2,816
Howey-in-the-Hills	\$477	\$477	\$477
Lady Lake	\$5,575	\$4,656	\$5,575
Leesburg	\$8,096	\$6,760	\$8,096
Mascotte	\$1,771	\$1,771	\$1,771
Minneola	\$3,566	\$2,978	\$3,566
Montverde	\$466	\$466	\$466
Mount Dora	\$4,383	\$3,660	\$3,660
Tavares	\$5,258	\$4,389	\$5,258
Umatilla	\$1,204	\$1,204	\$1,204
Total	\$179,835	\$160,487	\$174,151

* Base rate includes data services; hourly fees charged for traffic study reviews and other services.

TMS WORK PROGRAM LINE ITEMS	FY 2016/17
Salaries and Benefits	\$131,651
Hardware/Software/Licensing	\$2,500
WebCDMS System	\$0
Consulting Fees* could be in lieu of staff = personnel costs	\$0
Traffic Counts Program	\$60,000
TOTAL TMS OPERATING BUDGET	\$194,151

1.0 FTE	\$ 72,335
Additional staff support (admin./GIS/PM)	\$ 59,316
Personnel Costs	\$ 131,651

DRAFT

1. Introduction

The Lake~Sumter MPO, in coordination with the MPO's member governments, has developed a set of guidelines, presented herein, for the preparation of a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). The intent of this document is to provide a general "best practices" preparation guide for applicants and/or consulting planners/engineers assessing the potential traffic impacts of new projects, updates to previously approved projects, or changes in zoning. These guidelines establish minimum standards for all TIA reports, in order to provide a clear, orderly and consistent basis on which traffic impacts are to be evaluated.

NOTE: This methodology is not appropriate for a comprehensive plan amendment. Comprehensive Plan Amendments should instead follow State of Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) requirements.

2. Purpose

The purpose of the traffic impact analysis (TIA) is to identify the potential traffic impacts of new project on the transportation system and to develop mitigation strategies to offset the impact according to the methodologies and provisions as described herein. A TIA also evaluates the impact of proposed project at full buildout on the multimodal transportation system, including roads, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

The purpose of these TIA Guidelines is to provide a coordinated process for performing a review of traffic impacts created by proposed projects within the Lake~Sumter Metropolitan Planning area (MPO). The MPO provides planning services to its member governments that include Sumter County, Lake County, and 19 municipalities located within the two counties (City of Bushnell, City of Center Hill, City of Coleman, City of Webster, and City of Wildwood, City of Clermont, City of Eustis, Town of Lady Lake, City of Leesburg, City of Minneola, City of Mount Dora, City of Tavares, Town of Astatula, City of Fruitland Park, City of Groveland, Town of Howey-in-the-Hills, City of Mascotte, Town of Montverde, and City of Umatilla).

Figure 1: Lake~Sumter MPO Planning Area Boundary (Available at: <http://www.lakesumtermpo.com/pdfs/resources/MPOPlanningBoundary.pdf>)

A TIA is a study which assesses the effects that a particular project's traffic will

DRAFT

have on the transportation network. Studies vary in their range of detail and complexity depending on the type, size and location of the project and can be used to help evaluate what type of transportation improvements may be necessary. Additionally, traffic impact studies are used to:

- Forecast additional traffic associated with new project, based on accepted practices.
- Determine the improvements that are necessary to accommodate new project.
- Help to ensure safe and reasonable traffic conditions on streets after a project is complete.
- Reduce the negative impacts created by projects by helping to ensure that the transportation network can accommodate project.
- Provide direction to community decision makers and developers of expected impacts.
- Protect the substantial community investment in the street system.

3. When is a TIA required

A TIA is required whenever a project is expected to generate 100 or more peak hour two-way net new trips. Net new trips are defined... (list of definitions)

A TIA must be provided in accordance with approving jurisdictions' adopted policies, plans, LDRs and LDCs regulations, as otherwise required. Typically, a TIA is required at the first submission of an Overall Project Plan, or the Final Site Plan stage of the project. To determine when a TIA is required, the applicant is responsible for coordinating with the respective local governments regarding at what project stage this should occur for their specific project. The requirements listed and applicability of this TIA shall be superseded by any future changes to Florida law.

A TIA may also be required for rezoning prior to the project TIA to analyze the net trip difference between the current and proposed zoning categories rather than the impact of the proposed project. The need for a TIA or any studies for a rezoning should be coordinated with the respective City or County. Projects generating less than 100 peak hour two-way net new trips are generally considered to create non-substantial impacts. In most cases, a Request for Exemption from Full TIA may be submitted; however, there may be

DRAFT

circumstances when a project does not meet this threshold and a TIA is necessary. Any exemptions to performing a TIA or deviating from this Methodology shall be at the discretion of the approving local government. If an exemption is approved, the local government has the responsibility of notifying the Lake~Sumter MPO prior to any methodology discussions with the applicant.

Projects that generate 5,000 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) or more require regional coordination that may include other cities, counties and FDOT. LOS standards and concurrency (if applicable) are determined by the local jurisdiction on state and county roads per s. 163.3180(5)(a), Florida Statutes (FS). Roadway segments evaluated in the TIA can be found in the MPO's TMS database. Under certain circumstances, additional roadway segments may be requested to be analyzed if the proposed project affects local "problem" areas, e.g., high accident locations, currently congested areas or areas of critical local concern.

3.1 Projects Generating Less than 100 Peak Hour Two-way Net New Trips

If the traffic impacts of a proposed project can be clearly determined without the submittal of a TIA, and all the parties involved (local government, MPO, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), applicant, etc.) are in agreement, the submittal of a full TIA may not be necessary. The applicant may submit a Request for Exemption from Full TIA utilizing the form found in [Appendix X](#) and on the Lake~Sumter MPO website (a link will be provided later).

3.2 Projects Generating 100 or More Peak Hour Two-way Net New Trips

For projects generating one-hundred or more peak-hour net new trips, a detailed TIA is required. Prior to the submittal of the study, a Methodology Letter must be submitted and approved by the Lake~Sumter MPO. All components of the TIA are described in detail in Section 9 of this methodology document.

4. Study Components

The study components will be discussed during the methodology review process, but ultimately, it is at the discretion of the local government to reduce or expand the study area; add additional roadway segments and intersections as deemed necessary; and request supplementary information that is not specifically stated

DRAFT

in this methodology.

4.1 Study Area

The study area shall be defined as 1 mile in radius from the main access point of the proposed project.

4.2 Study Roadways

All arterials, and collector roadways that are within the 1-mile radius from the main access point of the proposed project shall be analyzed. All roadways where the project's peak hour trips consume five percent (5%) or more of a roadway's two-way peak hour generalized service volume based on the adopted LOS and committed number of lanes, unless otherwise specified by the City/County.

4.3 Study Intersections

All signalized intersections that are within the 1-mile radius from the main access point of the proposed project shall be analyzed. Unsignalized intersections significantly impacted by project traffic shall also be analyzed. All access points to the sites shall also be analyzed.

4.4 Alternate Modes of Transportation

Impacts to the existing or future funded transit network on road segments within the TIA analysis area must be assessed as part of the TIA. Bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities and multiuse trails within the 1-mile radius from the main access point of the proposed project shall be analyzed to ensure the proposed project will maintain or improve existing conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

5. Request for Exemption from Full TIA

As defined in Section 3.1, projects that generate less than 100 peak hour two-way net new trips are eligible to submit a Request for Exemption from Full TIA. If a project meets the criteria and the applicant decide to submit a Request for Exemption from Full TIA, the following information, at a minimum, must be provided:

- Proposed Land Use and Size (e.g., number of dwelling units, number of KSF)
- Project Description
- Site Location Map

DRAFT

- Site Plan
- Area of Influence/Study Area
- Trip Generation
- Trip Distribution/Assignment

A Request for Exemption from Full TIA form is available for download on the MPO's website (a link will be provided later) or by contacting the MPO. A sample completed Request for Exemption from Full TIA form is included in Appendix 1.

6. Methodology Letter

Prior to conducting the TIA, a written methodology letter shall be prepared by the applicant and submitted for review and approval by the local government. The purpose of the methodology letter is to establish agreed upon methodologies and assumptions prior to the start of the study, corresponding to the issues outlined in the following sections. The Methodology Letter, prior to the submittal of a TIA, must include:

- Location map of the site.
- Summary of the proposed trip generation including any proposed pass-by trips and internal trip capture.
- Proposed trip distribution (to 1 mile from main access point) which should include backup calculations.
- List of roadways from the MPO TMS (acronym) database that fall within a 1 mile radius of influence.
- List of all signalized intersections and major un-signalized intersections that fall within the radius of influence.
- List of all signalized intersections and major un-signalized intersections that fall within the radius of influence recommended to be included in study.
- Site plan of the proposed development that shows the proposed access locations.

Once approved, the methodology letter shall be valid to govern submittal of the TIA for a period of six (6) months.

7. Report Format

To provide consistency and facilitate review of the TIA, the following outline shall be followed to the extent possible:

DRAFT

- Table of Contents
- List of Figures
- List of Tables
- Introduction
- Existing Roadway and Intersection Conditions
- Future Roadway and Intersection Conditions
- Transportation Assessment
- Mitigation Strategies
- Summary/Conclusions
- Appendix

8. Detailed Descriptions of Required TIA Components

8.1 Table of Contents, List of Figures and List of Tables

A Table of Contents, List of Figures and List of Tables shall be provided as part of the TIA report.

8.2 Introduction

This section shall contain pertinent information about the proposed project and should include the following:

Purpose – The reason for the submittal of the TIA shall be stated. For example, it shall be stated if the TIA is being submitted for a development plan approval, zoning change, etc. Another example would be if the TIA is being submitted as an update to a previously approved development/phase.

Project Description – A brief description of the proposed project shall be provided. The following information shall be provided and can be presented as a bulleted list or table:

- Area Type (Rural, Transitional, Urban)
- Type of Development (e.g., Residential, Retail, etc.)
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Land Use Code(s)
- Size of development in standard ITE units (e.g., dwelling units for residential)
- Location/Description of the proposed development site access
- Anticipated opening/buildout year (by phase, if necessary)
- Analysis years (by phase, if necessary)

DRAFT

- Analysis periods (e.g., AM, PM, Mid-day, etc)
- Source of adopted roadway Level of Service (refer to TMS spreadsheet)

8.3 Site Location, Area of Influence and Site Plan

An area figure/map shall be provided to show the location of the project. This figure shall also show the area of influence of the project, as described in section 4.1. In addition, a site plan shall be included in this section to provide an overview of the project site and site access.

- 8.4 Existing Roadway Conditions
 - 8.5 Existing Intersection Conditions
 - 8.6 Trip Generation (Internal Capture, pass-by)
 - 8.7 Distribution and Assignment
 - 8.8 Future Roadway Conditions
 - 8.9 Future Intersection Conditions
 - 8.10 Multimodal Impacts
 - 8.11 Turn Lane Analysis
 - 8.12 Access Analysis
 - 8.13 Mitigation of Impacts
 - 8.14 Recommended Improvements
 - 8.15 Summary and Conclusions
 - 8.16 Appendix
9. Submittal and Review Process (Process Flowchart)
10. Appendix 1 – Request for Exemption from Full TIA Form
11. Appendix 2 – Acceptable Analysis Standards and Software (trip generation, internal capture, pass-by...)
12. Appendix 3 – List of Acronyms

ARTICLE III. - TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES

Sec. 22-36. - Short title, authority.

- (a) This article shall be known and may be cited as the "Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance."
 - (b) F.S. Ch. 336, vests the board of county commissioners with general supervision and control of all county roads and road facilities within Lake County which comprise the county road system as defined in F.S. Ch. 334, including county roads within municipalities.
 - (c) The board of county commissioners hereby adopts the "Lake County Transportation Impact Fee Update Study Final Report," dated, January 2013 prepared by Duncan/Associates.
- (Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13)

Sec. 22-37. - Imposition.

- (a) The imposition of transportation impact fees on new development shall be suspended for a period beginning on March 2, 2010 and extending through January 12, 2014. The suspension shall not apply to pre-payments, concurrency reservation accounts, deferral agreements unless the agreement specifically allows, or the use of impact fee credits. Effective January 13, 2014, transportation impact fees shall be collected as provided herein.
- (b) Transportation impact fees for the north and central benefit districts shall be determined as follows:

Lake County Transportation Impact Fee Schedule North and Central Benefit Districts		
Category	Unit	Fee
Single-Family Less than 1,500 1,500 to 2,499 sf 2,500 sf or greater	Dwelling	\$375.00
	Dwelling	\$500.00
	Dwelling	\$590.00
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$229.00
Mobile Home Park	Space	\$143.00

Active Adult Community	Dwelling	\$182.00
Lodging	Room	\$242.00
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sf	\$569.00
Office	1,000 sf	\$485.00
Industrial/Manufacturing	1,000 sf	\$278.00
Warehousing	1,000 sf	\$259.00
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sf	\$66.00
Public/Institutional	1,000 sf	\$150.00

Source — Duncan/Associates, Updated as of January 2013.

sf = square foot

(c) Transportation impact fees for the south benefit district shall be determined as follows:

Lake County Transportation Impact Fee Schedule South Benefit District		
Category	Unit	Fee
Single-Family Less than 1,500 1,500 to 2,499 sf 2,500 sf or greater	Dwelling	\$2,032.00
	Dwelling	\$2,706.00
	Dwelling	\$3,194.00
Multi-Family	Dwelling	\$1,240.00

Mobile Home Park	Space	\$776.00
Active Adult Community	Dwelling	\$985.00
Lodging	Room	\$1,311.00
Retail/Commercial	1,000 sf	\$3,080.00
Office	1,000 sf	\$2,623.00
Industrial/Manufacturing	1,000 sf	\$1,505.00
Warehousing	1,000 sf	\$1,403.00
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sf	\$359.00
Public/Institutional	1,000 sf	\$812.00

Source — Duncan/Associates, Updated as of January 2013 adopted as seventy percent (70%) of recommended rates.

sf = square foot

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2010-10, § 2, 3-2-10; Ord. No. 2011-5, § 2, 1-18-11; Ord. No. 2011-18, § 3, 4-5-11; Ord. No. 2012-3, § 2, 1-10-12; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13; Ord. No. 2013-42, § 2, 9-10-13; Ord. No. 2013-55, § 4, 10-8-13)

Sec. 22-38. - Alternative transportation impact fee; mixed uses; change of use; fee challenges.

(a) If a building or development permit is requested for mixed uses, then the transportation impact fee shall be determined by using the above fee schedule, and apportioning the space committed according to the building or development permit to uses specified on the fee schedule. However, any secondary use which takes up less than twenty-five (25) percent of the square footage of the primary use will be considered an incidental use, not a mixed use, when such use is necessary to carry out the primary use, i.e., office space needed to operate warehouse.

(b)

In the case of a change of use, redevelopment, or modification of an existing use on-site which requires the issuance of a building permit or development permit, the transportation impact fee shall be determined as set forth in the above fee schedule. If impact fees have been previously paid on the site, then a credit shall be given and the applicant shall pay the difference, if any. If the previous fees paid exceed the fee determined in the above fee schedule, no fees shall be due. No refunds shall be given.

- (c) If the person seeking to develop land challenges the transportation impact fee as determined according to the section 22-37, the person shall prepare and submit a traffic study and independent impact fee calculation for the development activity for which a building permit or development order is sought in accordance with the procedures set forth below. The independent fee calculation shall employ the methodology contained in the "transportation impact fee update study," dated January 2013, prepared by Duncan/Associates and be calculated at the same rate as set forth in the fee schedule. The study reduces all development uses to eleven (11) general categories which will be the basis of the traffic study and independent impact fee calculation. A study of a specific use within these categories will not be allowed.
- (d) The traffic study shall document the basis upon which the independent fee calculation was made and be in accordance with the methodology described above. The county manager or designee shall consider the documentation submitted; however, the county manager or designee is not required to accept such documentation if it is deemed to be inaccurate or not reliable. The county manager or designee may require the submission of additional and distinct documentation for consideration. If an acceptable independent impact fee calculation is not presented, the county manager or designee shall require payment in accordance with the fee schedule located in subsection (a). If an acceptable independent impact fee calculation is presented, the county manager or designee may adjust the impact fee, as appropriate to a specific building permit or development order.
- (f) The following procedures shall be used to prepare the alternative transportation impact fee study:
 - (1) *Pre application conference.* Feepayers are encouraged to schedule a meeting with the public works department before proceeding with a study. At such a meeting, the basic requirements of a study can be discussed.
 - (2) *Application, study methodology, and initial approval.* The following materials shall be submitted and approved prior to the study being conducted. Submitted materials will be reviewed and every effort will be made to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the study methodology within ten (10) working days of the date submitted.
 - a. An application form indicating the name, address and telephone number of the feepayer and the name, address and telephone number of any agent for the feepayer, a legal description of the property involved and a description of the development activity proposed.
 - b. If the feepayer proposes relying on the results of any previous studies, such as studies originally submitted as part of the zoning approval process, copies of those reports should be provided. Such studies must meet the requirements of this procedure in order to be relied upon.

- c. The feepayer shall, in accordance with the following guidelines, provide the study methodology that is proposed to be used for the study.
 1. The proposed methodology shall identify a minimum of three (3) comparable sites to be studied. Such sites shall be located within the county unless sites are not available in the county. The site descriptions should include the specific location, the character of the location (central business district, urban, suburban, or rural), and the land use(s) at the location. An explanation of why the proposed sites are similar to the proposed new development should be included. The explanation should address pertinent characteristics, such as land use, adjacent area, and demographics. A map should be included showing the location of the proposed new development and the proposed study sites.
 2. The proposed methodology shall discuss the proposed data elements of the study. These shall include trip generation rate, trip length and percent new trips, and any other applicable data elements that may be necessary.
 3. The trip generation rate should normally be determined by machine counts. The proposed methodology should provide documentation depicting the proposed machine counter sites and locations within the site as well as the type of equipment, hose/loop detector configurations, and the proposed dates of counting.
 4. The machine counters should normally be placed at project driveways, for a minimum of seven (7) consecutive days of twenty-four (24) hour machine counting, on days representative of typical traffic patterns at that site (not during a holiday, for example).
 5. The data to be collected should include:
 - i. Date and time counts,
 - ii. A summary of counts by fifteen (15) minute increments (entering, exiting and total),
 - iii. Average daily volume, and
 - iv. Volume during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of the adjacent street.
 6. The study methodology should show that the correct operation of the machine counters will be verified by manually observing their proper data recording for at least fifteen (15) minutes on at least four (4) occasions. Two (2) of the four (4) occasions can be verifications performed at the start and finish of the counting period. This manual verification should be documented in the study report.
- d. The trip length and percent new trips will normally be determined by an origin/destination survey, consisting of motorist surveys. The proposed study methodology should provide the proposed location of interviewers, interview forms, and dates and times of day for conducting interviews. The origin/destination survey will collect the following information:
 1. Date of interview,
 2. Location of the interview,

3. Name of the interviewer,
 4. Time of day of the interview,
 5. Origin of the interviewee's trip,
 6. Destination of the interviewee's trip, and
 7. Trip purpose.
- e. The place of origin or destination should be identified as accurately as possible. The origin and destination should be determined with one (1) of the following methods:
1. The specific name of the place (mall, town, bank, supermarket, subdivision, school, etc.),
 2. The address of the place,
 3. The intersection nearest to the place, and
 4. The major intersection nearest to the place.
- The most preferred method to the least preferred method is indicated by the order listed above.
- f. The proposed methodology should include a copy of the interview form to record the interview responses which are proposed to be used. Copies of the completed interview forms should be included in the study report.
- g. It is not acceptable to collect trip length as estimated and reported by the interviewee. The proper method to determine a trip length is to use a scaled map to measure the shortest route between the site and the reported places of origin and destination, or to measure the distance directly using a vehicle odometer.
- h. Acceptable procedures to determine if a trip is classified as primary, secondary, diverted, or captured, and to compute the assessable trip length are described in "measuring travel characteristics for transportation impact fees" W.E. Oliver, (ITE Journal, April 1991). Another acceptable procedure is in the most recent state department of transportation-site impact handbook.
- i. Also included in the study report should be the following:
1. The number of observations (useable interview responses),
 2. The mean trip length, rounded off to one-tenth (0.1) mile, and
 3. The percent new trips.
- j. In determining a reasonable estimate of the trip length and percent new trips the proposed methodology must propose surveys to be performed for a minimum of three (3) sites for three (3) days. These surveys will be conducted for nine (9) hours each day. The specific time period to be covered should be governed by the type of land being surveyed and the typical daily operations of the specific land use. The total survey hours should be approximately eighty-one (81) hours (three (3) x three (3) x nine (9) = eighty-one (81)).
- k. The study report should be submitted in the following format:

1. Table of contents,
2. Letter of transmittal,
3. Findings of the report:
 - Trip generation rate
 - Trip length and percent new trips,
4. Impact fee calculations, and appendices:
 - Trip generation rate summary
 - Trip length worksheet
 - Percent new trips worksheet
 - Trip generation data
 - Interview forms

- I. The proposed study shall include a completed impact fee work sheet in the format provided by the county manager or designee.
 - m. After submittal of the proposed methodology, the county manager or designee will either approve the proposed study methodology or request additional information or changes to the proposed methodology.

- (3) Upon approval of the study methodology, the feepayer may proceed with the study. Upon completion, three (3) copies shall be submitted to the county manager or designee. A review fee specified in the board of county commissioners fee resolution shall be submitted with the study.
- (4) County review will be made within thirty (30) days and a written decision will be rendered approving or disapproving of the study and specifying the applicable fee, if necessary.
- (5) If a property owner desires to obtain a building permit prior to the time the protest is completed he/she shall pay the challenged impact fee at the time of issuance of the building permit. If the county approves the traffic study referenced above and the study establishes a lower fee the owner shall be entitled to a refund representing the difference between that paid and the new established fee. The traffic study described herein shall be completed in a time frame agreed upon in writing by the owner and the county manager at the time of fee payment.

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13)

Sec. 22-39. - Dedication of land and impact fee credits.

- (a) In lieu of all or part of the transportation impact fee, the county manager or a designee, may enter into a developer's agreement with a person seeking to develop land to allow such person to construct part of a road improvement project shown in the Lake County Comprehensive Plan, or to construct off-site

road improvements determined necessary as a result of the development of the property or to donate land or right-of-way for a project shown in the Lake County Comprehensive Plan so long as the project or improvement is within the road benefit district in which the funds were collected. The person seeking to enter into the developer's agreement shall submit a construction cost estimate certified by an engineer registered pursuant to F.S. Ch. 471, to the county manager or designee. If acceptable, the county manager or designee shall agree to credit the cost of construction of the improvements towards the transportation impact fee chargeable to the proposed development. If right-of-way dedicated is to be included in the credit, the person shall provide to the county manager or designee an MAI appraisal indicating the fair market value of the property to be dedicated; provided, however, that if the parcel is valued by the property appraiser at fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000.00) or less, the property appraiser's assessed value may be used to determine the square footage value of the right-of-way. The county manager or designee may additionally determine the value of the right-of-way by using the square footage value as determined from an appraisal of a similarly situated parcel so long as such appraisal was completed upon request of the county and is no older than one (1) year. If the county manager or designee elects to use an appraisal of a similarly situated parcel, the county manager or designee shall make a determination that such the economic conditions at the time of the appraisal have not changed significantly so as to invalidate such appraisal. The developer's agreement shall be approved by the board of county commissioners and shall set forth all other applicable requirements and conditions of performance.

- (b) In the event the impact fee credits for construction shall exceed the impact fees chargeable to a particular development, the county manager or designee may agree to compensate the person seeking to develop land with cash, impact fee credit or a combination thereof, as set forth in the developer's agreement. If the person seeking to develop elects cash reimbursement, the person shall be required to competitively bid the construction project and/or professional services. Professional services shall be bid in accordance with F.S. § 287.055, known as the Consultants' Competitive Negotiation Act, and construction services shall be bid in accordance with the county's standard competitive bidding procedures and any other applicable Florida Statutes. A construction cost estimate and/ or right-of-way appraisal shall be provided in the same manner as subsection (a) above. The developer's agreement shall be approved by the board of county commissioners and shall set forth all other applicable requirements and conditions.

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07)

Sec. 22-40. - Transfer of impact fee credits.

The transfer of impact fee credits shall be permitted on a project-by-project basis subject to the following:

- (a)

A request to permit the transfer of impact fee credits, if any, shall be submitted simultaneously with the property owner's request to construct road improvements in accordance with section 22-39. All requests to permit the transfer of impact fees credits shall be approved by the board of county commissioners. Untimely requests shall not be considered, nor shall the board of county commissioners consider a request to transfer any impact fee credits distributed by the county to any owner of record prior to the effective date of this subsection, unless the project was specifically approved at the time of submittal to allow the future transfer of such credits.

(b) The county manager or designee shall establish an account in the name of the owner of record and credit to the account the amount of impact fee credits due and owing as certified by the county manager or designee. In the event the owner of record desires to transfer any portion of the impact fee credits to another party, and the board of county commissioners has previously approved the transfer of credits for the project, the owner of record shall submit a notarized affidavit to the county manager or designee indicating to whom the credits are to be transferred. Upon receipt of the notarized affidavit, the impact fee credits shall be transferred to a similar account established for the transferee.

(c) The transfer shall become effective upon confirmation by the county manager or designee that the credits have been:

- a. Duly distributed to the transferor;
- b. Approved by the board of county commissioners for transferring; and
- c. Are being transferred within the same transportation benefit district.

The county manager or designee shall notify the transferee when the credits are available to the transferee.

(d) In no event shall any impact fee credit be transferred outside of the transportation benefit district in which the original project was completed. Any transfer of impact fee credit sheet attempting to transfer such credits outside of the transportation benefit district shall be immediately voided by the county manager or designee.

(e) In no event shall the transferee be entitled to further transfer those same credits to a second transferee, except as provided for in subsection (h) below.

(f) All other provisions, policies and procedures that are applicable to the payment of impact fees, or to impact fee credits shall be applicable to the transfer of impact fee credits.

(g) A schedule of fees may be established by resolution of the board of county commissioners in order to cover the costs of the administrative activities required pursuant to this section.

(h) A transfer of impact fee credits by an owner of record, or their personal representative or authorized agent, done for the purposes of liquidating an estate or liquidating a business entity shall not be subject to the prohibition contained in subsection (e) above. The transferee under this subsection shall take the place of the owner of record and shall be entitled to avail themselves of the provisions set forth in subsections (a) through (g) above. Prior to transferring the impact fee

credits, the owner of record, or their personal representative or authorized agent, shall receive written approval from the county manager or designee, and shall provide the county manager or designee documentation necessary to show that the transfer is warranted in order to effectuate the liquidation of the estate or business entity.

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13; Ord. No. 2015-51, § 2, 12-15-15)

Sec. 22-41. - Impact fee trust account and use of monies.

- (a) A separate transportation benefit district account shall be established for each road benefit district and funds shall be deposited accordingly. Such accounts shall be known as the "transportation impact fee trust account." Effective for any transportation impact fee paid on or after January 1, 2014, the transportation benefit districts have been redrawn and reduced in number from six (6) to three (3). Transportation impact fees collected on or before December 31, 2013, shall be expended in the district in which they are collected, utilizing all six (6) districts. Transportation impact fees collected on or after January 1, 2014, shall be expended in the district in which they were collected utilizing all three (3) districts.
- (b) All funds collected from transportation impact fees shall be used solely for the purpose of providing capital improvements to transportation facilities associated with the arterial and collector road network under the jurisdiction of the county, or the state, and shall not be used for maintenance or operations. Such improvements shall be of the type as are made necessary by new development.
- (c) All funds shall be used exclusively for capital improvements within the transportation benefit district in which the funds were collected or for projects in other transportation benefit districts which are of direct benefit to the transportation benefit districts from which the funds were collected. In the event, funds collected in one (1) transportation benefit district are to be utilized for a project in another transportation benefit district that is of direct benefit to the transportation benefit district in which the funds were collected, such use shall be approved by a majority of the municipalities in the transportation benefit district within which the funds were collected. Said recommendation shall be forwarded to the board of county commissioners through the county manager or designee. The board of county commissioners shall approve the use of funds collected in one (1) transportation benefit district for a project in another transportation benefit district after a specific finding that there shall be a direct benefit to the transportation benefit district in which the funds were collected. Funds shall be expended in the order in which they are collected.
- (d) Each fiscal year the county manager shall present to the board of county commissioners, a proposed transportation capital improvement program based upon the recommendations of the municipalities within the transportation benefit district and senior department director of the department of public works which shall assign funds, including any accrued interest, from the transportation impact fee trust account, to specific road improvement projects and related expenses. Monies, including any accrued interest, not assigned in any fiscal year shall be retained in the same transportation benefit district

account until the next fiscal year, except as provided elsewhere in this chapter. The board of county commissioners shall hold a public hearing to adopt the program including any amendments which the board of county commissioners determines are necessary.

- (e) The governmental authority issuing the permit or other approval for the development shall determine whether road improvements constructed by the person seeking to develop land are "site-related" or "nonsite-related" as defined herein. In the event the permitting authority has a question as to whether a particular improvement is site-related or nonsite-related, the county shall be consulted and make the final decision.

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13)

Sec. 22-42. - Transportation benefit districts.

- (a) The following transportation benefit districts are established and shall be used for transportation impact fees collected on or before December 31, 2013:
 - (1) *Transportation Benefit District 1.* Begin at C-42 and the Lake County line in Section 31, Township 17 South, Range 27 East, Lake County, Florida; run easterly along C-42 to C-439; thence run southerly along C-439 to C-44A; thence run easterly along C-44A to SR-44; thence run southwesterly along SR-44 to C-46A; thence run southeasterly along C-46A to SR-46; thence run easterly along SR-46 to the Lake County line in Section 21, Township 19 South, Range 29 East; thence run northeasterly, northerly, northwesterly, and southerly along the Lake County line to the aforementioned C-42 being the end of this description.
 - (2) *Transportation Benefit District 2.* Beginning at C-561 and C-455 in Section 8, Township 21 South, Range 26 East, Lake County, Florida; run west along C-455 to 3-2739 North Buckhill Road; thence run northerly along 3-2739 North Buckhill Road to a point on the north line of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the theoretical northeast corner of said Section 1; thence run north to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 13, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run thence run west to the theoretical southeast corner of Section 14, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run northwest to the theoretical northwest corner of said Section 14; thence run north to a point lying east of the mouth of Dead River and Lake Harris; thence run east to the mouth of said Dead River; thence run northeasterly along Dead River to Lake Eustis; thence run east to the theoretical east line of Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run north to the northeast corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run west to C-44; thence northeasterly along C-44 to 5-6744 Fish Camp Road; thence run north along 5-6744 Fish Camp Road to C-452; thence run northerly along C-452 to the Lake County Line in Section 2, Township 18 South, Range 25 East; thence run east and north along the Lake County line to C-42 in Section 31, Township 17 South, Range 27 East; thence run easterly along C-42 to C-439; thence run southerly along C-439 to C-44A; thence run easterly along C-44A to SR-44; thence run southwesterly along SR-44 to C-46A; thence run southeasterly along C-46A to SR-46; thence run easterly along SR-46 to the Lake County Line in Section 21, Township 19 South, Range 29 East designated as point "A".

Return to point of beginning. From said point of beginning run southeasterly along C-455 to the south line of Section 22, Township 21 South, Range 26 East; thence run east to the Lake County line; thence run north, east and northerly along the Lake County line to SR-46 and the aforementioned point "A" being the end of this description.

- (3) *Transportation Benefit District 3.* Begin at the Oklawaha River and the Lake County line in Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 25 East, Lake County Florida; run southerly along the Oklawaha River to a point on the theoretical west line of Section 17, Township 18 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run west to the theoretical northwest corner of said Section 19; thence run south to the theoretical southwest corner of Section 31, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the theoretical southwest corner of Section 35; thence run north to a point lying west of the mouth of Dead River and Lake Harris; thence run east to the mouth of said Dead River; thence run northeasterly along Dead River to Lake Eustis; thence run east to the theoretical east line of Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run north to the northeast corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run west to C-44; thence run northeasterly along C-44 to 5-6744 Fish Camp Road; thence run north along 5-6744 Fish Camp Road to C-452; thence run northwesterly along C-452 to the Lake County line; thence run west along the Lake County line to the aforementioned Oklawaha River being the end of this description.

Also:

Begin at C-470 and the Lake County line in Section 7, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida run easterly along C-470 to C-33; thence run northeasterly along C-33 to US-27; thence run northerly along US-27 to the north line of Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East; thence run East to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 1, Township 20 South, Range 24 East designated as Point "A." Return to point of beginning. From said point of beginning run north along the Lake County line to the northwest corner of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 24 East; thence run east along the Lake County line to the Oklawaha River being in Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 25 East; thence run southerly along the Oklawaha River to a point on the theoretical west line of Section 17, Township 18 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the northeast corner of Section 1, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the corner of Section 1, Township 20 South, Range 24 East and the aforementioned point 'A' being the end of this description.

- (4) *Transportation Benefit District 4.* Begin at C-561 and US-27 in Section 36, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; run northerly along C-561 to C-455; thence run west along C-455 to 3-2739 North Buckhill Road; thence run northerly along 3-2739 North Buckhill Road to a point on the north line of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the theoretical northeast corner of said Section 1; thence run north to the theoretical southeast corner

of Section 13, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run west to the theoretical southeast corner of Section 14, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run northwest to the theoretical northwest corner of said Section 14; thence run north to the theoretical northwest corner of Section 2; Township 20 South, Range 25 East designated as point "A". Return to point of beginning. From said point of beginning run northwesterly along US-27 to 2-2713 Bridges Road; thence run westerly along 2-2713 Bridges Road, 2-2607 Austin Merritt Road, and 2-2403 Youth Camp Road to the Lake County line; thence run north along the Lake County Line to C-470; thence run easterly along C-470 to C-33; thence run northeasterly along C-33 to US-27; thence run northerly along US-27 to the north line of Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East; thence run east to the theoretical northwest corner of Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, and the aforementioned point "A" being the end of this description.

- (5) *Transportation Benefit District 5.* Begin at SR-33 and the Lake County line in Section 28, Township 24 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; run northerly along SR-33 to C-565B; thence run easterly along C-565B to C-561; thence run northerly along C-561 to C-561A; thence run northwesterly, northeasterly along C-561A to US-27; thence run northerly along US-27 to C-561; thence run northerly along C-561 to C-455; thence run southeasterly along C-455 to the south line of Section 22, Township 21 South, Range 26 East; thence run east to the Lake County line, thence run southerly, west, north, and west along the Lake County line to the aforementioned SR-33 being the end of this description.
 - (6) *Transportation Benefit District 6.* Begin at SR-33 and the Lake County line in Section 28, Township 24 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; run northerly along SR-33 to C-565B; thence run easterly along C-565B to C-561; thence run northerly along C-561 to C-561A; thence run northwesterly, northeasterly along C-561A to US-27; thence run northwesterly along US-27 to 2-2713 Bridges Road; thence run westerly along 2-2713 Bridges Road, 2-2607 Austin Merritt Road, and 2-2403 Youth Camp Road to the Lake County line; thence run south, east, north and east along the Lake County line to the aforementioned SR-33 being the end of this description.
- (b) The following transportation benefits districts are established and shall be used for transportation impact fees collected on or after January 1, 2014:
- (1) *North Transportation Benefit District.* Begin at the Lake County line at the northwest corner of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 26 East; thence run south to the northwest corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run east to the northeast corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run south to the theoretical southeast corner of Section 18, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run west to CR 473; thence run south along CR 473 to US 441; thence run west along US 441 to the eastern boundary of Section 23, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the southeast corner of Section 23, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run west to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 27, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run south to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 15, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run southeasterly in a straight line to the theoretical northeast corner

of Section 23, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 24, Township 20 South, Range 25 East, thence run south to the southeast corner of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the southeast corner of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 26 East; thence north along the Lake County line and continuing along the Lake County line to the aforementioned northwest corner of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 26 East being the end of this description.

- (2) *Central Transportation Benefit District.* Begin at Youth Camp Road and the Lake County line in Section 18, Township 21 South, Range 24 East; run northeasterly along Youth Camp Road/Austin Merritt Road to CR 33; thence run northerly along CR 33 to the northern boundary of Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 24 East; thence run east to the southeast corner of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 25 East; thence run north to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 24, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run west to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 23, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; thence run northwesterly in a straight line to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 15, Township 20 South, Range 25 East; then run north to the theoretical northeast corner of Section 27, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the northeast corner of Section 26, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run north to US 441; thence run easterly along US 441 to CR 473; thence run northerly along CR 473 to the northern boundary of Section 24, Township 19 South, Range 25 East; thence run east to the theoretical southeast corner of Section 18, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run north to the northeast corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run west to the northwest corner of Section 6, Township 19 South, Range 26 East; thence run north to the Lake County line; thence run west along the Lake County line to the northwest corner of Section 6, Township 18 South, Range 24 East; thence run south along the Lake County line to the aforementioned Youth Camp Road being the end of this description.
- (3) *South Transportation Benefit District.* Begin at Youth Camp Road and the Lake County line in Section 18, Township 21 South, Range 24 East; run northeasterly along Youth Camp Road/Austin Merritt Road to CR 33; thence run northerly along CR 33 to the northern boundary of Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 24 East; thence run east to the theoretical southeast corner of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 26 East at the Lake County line; thence run south along the Lake County line to the southeast corner of Section 36, Township 24 South, range 26 East; thence run west along the Lake County line to the southeast corner of Section 34, Township 24 South, Range 25 East; thence run north along the Lake County line to the southeast corner of Section 27, Township 24 South, Range 25 East; thence run west along the Lake County line to the southwest corner of Section 30, Township 24 South, Range 25 East; thence run south along the Lake County line to the southwest corner of Section 31, Township 24 South, Range 25 East; thence run west along the Lake County line to the southwest corner of Section 31, Township 24 South, Range 24 East; thence run north along the Lake County line to the aforementioned Youth Camp Road being the end of this description.

(Ord. No. 2007-60, § 1, 12-11-07; Ord. No. 2013-7, § 3, 2-12-13)

Secs. 22-43—22-45. - Reserved.

PROJECT UPDATES – September 2016

- **US 301 Project Development and Environment Study (Sumter County)**
US 301 is being studied from SR 44 in Wildwood south to C-470 (west) in Sumterville. The study will lead to specific operational improvements and design improvements to the interchange of US 301 and Florida's Turnpike and to the intersection of US 301 and SR 44. The study is also examining the concept of a new alignment east of Coleman. The planning effort is being coordinated with other Sumter County projects including the I-75/CR 514 proposed interchange and the C-470 study.
- **I-75/CR 514 Interchange Planning (Sumter County near Coleman)**
Staff is coordinating with Sumter County, FDOT and the Federal Highway Administration on an Interchange Justification Report and on an upcoming study of a potential new interchange with I-75 west of Coleman at CR 514. This effort is being coordinated with the US 301 study.
- **C-470 Study (Sumter County and Lake County)**
FDOT has commenced a Project Development and Environment Study for C-470 in Sumter County east into Lake County across Florida's Turnpike. The study is examining future needs for the roadway through 2040. The study is also part of an initiative to have 470 in both counties designated as a state road from I-75 in Sumter County east to US 27 in Lake County. A public meeting was held June 16 in Lake Panosoffkee to review the alternatives that have emerged from the study. The preferred alternative emerging from the study would result in a new alignment of C-470 at US 301 that would remove the jog of C-470 in Sumterville.
- **Wekiva Parkway Project (Lake County, Orange County, Seminole County)**
The Central Florida Expressway Authority is constructing and the FDOT is now in the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project. Construction is underway by CFX from US 441 north to the future systems interchange that will include the connection from SR 429 of future SR 453 to SR 46 in Lake County just east of Round Lake Road. Construction of FDOT segments in Lake County will be substantially underway by 2017.
- **Trails: Central Florida C2C Trail and Wekiva Trail (Sumter County and Lake County)**
Because of the Central Florida MPO Alliance prioritization of Regional Trails, almost all phases of the C2C Trail recently received advancements of funding from FDOT for each needed phase in both counties. The FDOT recently announced forthcoming programming of the subsequent phases of each segment of the C2C. Meanwhile, the Wekiva Trail has two segments out of four segments committed for construction to be complete by 2019. The other two segments are moving into the design phase.
- **Minneola Interchange: Florida's Turnpike/North Hancock Road/Citrus Grove Road**
Florida's Turnpike Enterprise is constructing the new interchange, which will be complete by summer 2017. The FDOT TRIP grant for North Hancock Road has allowed Lake County to proactively meet FTE's timeline for construction as the roadway project is complete. North Hancock Road from has now been extended from CR Old 50 to north of Fosgate Road. From that point north, the roadway is included as part of the FTE construction project. The final portion of the roadway, the extension of the roadway north from the interchange to CR 561A, will be constructed by the Hills of Minneola landowner. Meanwhile, an east-west connection to US 27 will be accomplished by building Citrus Grove Road as a four-lane roadway, which is under design.
- **Lake-Orange Parkway (US 27 to SR 429)**
The Orange-Lake Parkway Partners, LLC, is examining options to construct a road between US 27 in Clermont east to SR 429 just south of Winter Garden. A \$28.5 million State Infrastructure Bank loan is currently programmed in the FDOT program for the LLC of landowners to potentially accomplish the potential project. Meanwhile, the concept is in the CFX's 2040 Master Plan to examine concepts for the potential roadway. Therefore, multiple options are being explored to satisfy this regional need that would catalyze the northern corridor of the Wellness Way Area Plan.
- **SR 50 Corridor Study (Sumter County, Lake County, Hernando County)**
SR 50 is being studied from US 301 in Hernando County east to CR 33 in Mascotte. The study is examining safety and capacity needs and will take into account the environmental issues relative to the Green Swamp and the Withlacoochee State Forest.