

2006 PRIORITY PROJECTS REPORT

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION



This document was produced in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION 2006 PRIORITY PROJECTS REPORT

INTRODUCTION

In September of each year, MPOs in Florida are required to submit priority projects lists to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). The September priority projects submittal date allows FDOT time to incorporate MPO priorities in a new draft tentative Five Year Work Program, transmit the draft tentative work program to MPO's in November, present the work program to MPO's and hold public hearings in December, and submit the work program to the Legislature in January, sixty days prior to the start of the legislative session.

This report contains the Indian River County MPO's 2006 priority projects lists. The MPO priority lists are used by FDOT as the basis for developing its annual five year work program. The projects included in this report will be considered for funding by FDOT primarily in the fifth year (FY 2011/2012) of its FY 2007/08-2011/12 Five Year Work Program.

The component lists of the MPO's 2006 Priority Projects Report are the same as those in the 2005 report. As in 2005, the MPO has opted to divide last year's highway priorities list into three categories, roughly mirroring three major available funding sources: Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects; regional roadway projects; and other projects. Since 2005, the MPO has refined its regional roadway projects methodology to incorporate the findings of both the St. Lucie/Martin and Indian River MPO 2030 Long Range Plans. In addition to the highway priorities list, the MPO has included a second list for priority congestion management process (formerly known as congestion management system) projects, a third list for priority enhancement projects, a fourth list for priority transit projects, and a fifth list for priority aviation projects.

PRIORITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS

This section explains the specific methodology utilized to prepare the MPO's 2006 Priority Highway Projects List. The inputs and data used to develop and rank the projects are explained, and a brief explanation of each project and its rank is also provided.

The MPO's adopted 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was the primary input used in developing the 2006 list of priority highway projects. Besides the 2030 LRTP, routine system monitoring and discussions with staff from other MPOs, local governments, and FDOT were also used as inputs in developing the list.

The 2030 LRTP was used as the primary basis in developing the priority highway projects list. The reasons for this include:

- SAFETEA-LU and state regulations require projects funded through FDOT to be consistent with the MPO's adopted LRTP;

- the LRTP's recommended roadway improvement projects are consistent with adopted local government comprehensive plans, including the Transportation Element of the County's adopted 2020 Comprehensive Plan;
- the improvements listed in the MPO's adopted LRTP were analyzed for need using sound transportation planning and engineering practices; and
- the MPO's LRTP was adopted after considerable involvement of citizens, technical experts, and elected officials.

In addition to using the LRTP, MPO staff reviewed the status of the projects listed in the MPO's 2005 priority highway projects list, and compared those projects to FDOT's current (FY 2006/07 - 2010/11) adopted Five Year Work Program. Finally, meetings and discussions with municipal, County, and FDOT staff provided additional information utilized in preparing the 2006 list. In those meetings, local government staff familiar with localized capacity and safety problems provided additional information regarding needed projects, and FDOT staff provided input regarding potential projects based on the results and recommendations of numerous FDOT corridor studies undertaken within the County.

In order to adopt a priority list that more closely approximates the major classifications of the roadway network, the MPO has, as it did in 2005, divided its highway priority list into three categories: SIS Highways, Regional Highways, and Other Highways.

SIS Highways

The Strategic Intermodal System in Indian River County consists of I-95 and SR 60 West of I-95 to Osceola County. Projects on the SIS generally serve an interstate and intra-regional function and carry high volumes of traffic and goods across long distances.

Regional Highways

Regional roadways serve a function of connecting major population or activity concentrations that are separated by some distance. Prompted by the Growth Management Legislation signed into law in July of 2006, MPOs throughout the state of Florida are in the process of developing and adopting criteria for identifying regional roadways. In Indian River County, the criteria for determining which roadways are regional were developed by the MPO in conjunction with the Martin and St. Lucie County MPOs. Both the criteria and the resulting regional roadway network were adopted in June of 2006 by the Treasure Coast Transportation Council, a board composed of members of all three MPOs. The regional roadway system appears in Figure A-12.

Unlike every other priority list in this document, the Regional priorities list is not adopted solely by the MPO. In actuality, the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC), a board composed of members of all three MPOs, adopts the regional priorities list. The process by which this list gets adopted is as follows. The Martin, St. Lucie, and Indian River MPOs first identify a number of near-term transportation improvement projects on the regional roadway system. The Indian River County projects are shown on page 5. To determine which of the improvement projects rank highest regionwide, the three MPOs retained the consulting firm of

Renaissance Planning to develop a prioritization methodology. A draft of the priority criteria that will be used to evaluate all three county projects, as well as preliminary rankings of those projects, appears in the priority projects report as attachment A-13. It should be noted that, while Indian River County projects rank uniformly at the bottom of the preliminary three-county list, MPO staff has submitted comments on the process to Renaissance Consulting and the other MPO staff directors. Consequently, the list may be re-evaluated in light of the MPO's comments.

Other Highways

Non-SIS and Non-regional roadways for which the MPO is seeking federal and state funding are included on the Other Highways priority list. Last year, the MPO's top priority was SR 60 from 82nd Avenue to I-95. That project remains the MPO's top priority in 2006.

Once a project is deemed to be a priority, the project must remain on the priority list until construction funding for the project is programmed by FDOT in its five-year work program. Otherwise, FDOT will not fund other projects, since FDOT programs only those projects that the MPO designates as priorities. Therefore, it is not unusual for a project to stay on the highway priority list for ten or more years. Even when initial project phases, including PD&E (project development & environmental), design, and right-of-way acquisition, are programmed, a project needs to stay on the priority list until construction funding is reflected in FDOT's work program. Because projects stay on the priority list until construction funds are programmed, few projects are removed from the priority list each year.

When the MPO adopted the new highway priority list format in 2005, the intent was to expedite certain projects. Those projects, which had been on the MPO's priority list for several years, would take many more years under FDOT's current funding formula to produce. This was due to a disproportionate increase in project costs (such as labor, right of way acquisition and raw materials costs) relative to funding allocations at the Federal and State level. The County decided that several of its long-standing priorities would have a better chance of getting built if they were removed from the federal funding process. An in fact, by placing Oslo Road on last year's Regional Highways priority list the county was able to obtain roughly \$4 million in state funding. And by naming the Oslo Interchange as the top SIS priority and providing additional justification, the County was able to obtain state approval and full funding.

In light of the above changes, the MPO's top unfunded highway priorities are as follows: the MPO's top SIS Highway priority is the Oslo Road Interchange, which, despite being fully funded, will remain on the list until the IJR is approved in order to ensure the funding is not reprogrammed. The top Regional Highway priority is CR 510 (which must also be ranked on a three county regional list and adopted by the TCTC); and the top Other Highway priority is SR 60 from I-95 to 82nd Avenue.

The complete list of highway priorities is included as Table A-1 in the Appendix. The list is consistent with the 2030 LRTP interim year project sets as well as local comprehensive plans, MPO plans, and FDOT's work program. A summary description of each project in order of priority ranking and an explanation of its ranking is presented below.

2006 List of Priority Highway Projects – SIS

1. **Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95** – Growth within the Oslo Road corridor is expected to increase significantly over the next several years. An interchange at Oslo Road and Interstate 95 will provide Indian River County with increased access to Interstate 95. This interchange has the potential to increase economic activity and provide enhanced hurricane evacuation for Indian River County. Additionally, the Interchange Justification Report process for this interchange is underway. Right of Way and Construction funding is requested for this project.

2006 List of Candidate TRIP Grant Priority Highway Projects – Regional (MPO Rankings Only)

1. **CR 510 four laning from CR 512 to US 1** - This is a project included in the MPO's 2030 LRTP. This corridor is rapidly approaching capacity and will experience LOS problems in future years. While the project was recently removed from the federal funding process so that the project could advance using local funds, the project remains a priority as a regionally-significant roadway. As such, the MPO is seeking cooperative funding agreements with FDOT to expedite the project. The project serves a regional function as an evacuation route, connector to the barrier island, and a connector from a SIS segment (I-95) to a principal arterial (US1). Right-of way acquisition and construction funding is requested from the state TRIPS program for this project.
2. **Oslo Road from I-95 to 27th Avenue** - This project involves four laning Oslo Road from I-95 to 27th Avenue. As indicated in the adopted 2030 LRTP, an Oslo Road/I-95 interchange is an improvement planned for the later part of the planning period. Even without the interchange, however, volumes along Oslo Road are expected to increase significantly in the near future due to growth within the Oslo Road corridor. The project serves a regional function as a facility that connects a SIS segment (I-95) to a principal arterial (US1). One phase of the project, from Dixie Highway to 27th Avenue, has been funded in the County's capital improvement program and has received TRIP funding. Therefore, the MPO is requesting funding for the remaining segment, from 27th Avenue to I-95.
3. **CR 512 from CR 510 to I-95** – This project involves widening CR 512 to four lanes from CR 510 to I-95. The project, currently under design, is included in the 2030 LRTP. This roadway serves as the primary access to the City of Sebastian from I-95 and is rapidly approaching capacity. This project will alleviate the congestion and capacity issues on this road segment.
4. **CR 512 from Fellsmere to I-95** - This project involves four laning CR 512 from I-95 to Fellsmere. This roadway serves as the primary access to the City of Fellsmere from I-95. Due to future growth in Fellsmere, volumes along CR 512 are expected to increase significantly. This project will alleviate the capacity and congestion issues along this roadway.

5. **66th Avenue from CR 510 to SR 60** - This project involves four laning 66th Avenue from CR 510 to SR 60. This roadway serves as the primary connector between Sebastian and the Indian River Mall area of SR 60, the County's largest employer and major trip generator.
6. **58th Avenue from S of Oslo Road to the St. Lucie County Line (Preliminary Regional Ranking: N/A)** - This project involves extending 58th Avenue from South of Oslo Road to the St. Lucie County Line, where it will join Kobelgard Rd. and connect to Indrio Road.

2006 List of Priority Highway Projects – Other

1. **SR 60 from Interstate 95 to 82nd Avenue** – This project is a continuation of a previous top MPO priority that now appears in the FDOT Work Program, the widening of SR 60 from 66th Avenue to 82nd Avenue. This segment of SR 60, the County's principal east-west roadway, is projected to exhibit extreme traffic congestion in the next few years. Indian River County's concurrency management system, which accounts for current and vested traffic on the County's thoroughfare roadway network, indicates that this segment of SR 60 is approaching capacity. SR 60 was ranked as the number one priority on the MPO's 2005 Priority Highway Projects List and will remain the MPO's top priority until construction can be fully funded.
2. **US 1 six laning from Highlands Drive to south of Oslo Road** – This project is a continuation of a project in the current TIP, the six laning of US 1 from south of Oslo Road to south of Indian River Boulevard. The Highlands Drive to Oslo Road segment has one of the highest volume to capacity ratios of any County roadway. Construction funding is requested for this project.
3. **US 1 six laning from the St. Lucie County Line to Highlands Drive** - This project is a follow-on to the number three priority project of six laning US 1 from south of Oslo Road to Highlands Drive. The St. Lucie County Line to Highlands Drive segment experiences congestion that needs to be addressed in the intermediate (5-15 year) term. This project will alleviate the congestion and capacity issues on this road segment. Construction funding is requested for this project.
4. **26th Street from 66th Avenue to 43rd Avenue** – This project involves widening 26th Street to four lanes and adding access improvements. This roadway segment is a major intermodal corridor in Indian River County. It is the primary access to the Vero Beach Municipal Airport, and the eastern terminus of this road crosses the Florida East Coast railroad. Aviation Boulevard is also served by Indian River Transit Route 8. The two largest single-site employers in the County are located along Aviation Boulevard (Piper Aviation and Dodgertown). During the past year, the County applied for and received a competitive County Incentive Grant Program (CIGP) grant in the amount of \$1.2 Million to provide partial construction funding for the project. Prior to this, the County received \$1.6 Million through FDOT's intermodal grant program. The county is requesting matching funds from other state sources to complete the project.

Conclusion

It is important to note that the MPO's 2006 List of Priority Highway Projects identifies only those projects for which state and/or federal funding is requested. As indicated in the MPO's 2030 LRTP, many of the plan's cost-feasible roadway improvements will be funded with local revenues and constructed by the County or local municipalities. Because locally funded roadway improvement projects can generally be completed in shorter timeframes than state or federally funded projects, it is often preferable not to include those projects for which local funding is available on the MPO's priority highways list. Therefore, the priority highway projects list includes only roadway projects which require state or federal funds and which are not needed for several years. The 2006 highway priority projects are shown on the priority projects map included in this report.

PRIORITY ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

One important component of SAFETEA-LU, the federal highway act, is the federal enhancements program. Funded with ten percent of Surface Transportation Program allocations, the enhancement program focuses on improvements that complement the transportation system. In Florida, enhancement funds are allocated to each FDOT district, which then determines how these funds will be distributed among the MPOs in its jurisdiction. For the 2006 enhancement funding cycle, FDOT District Four will allocate approximately \$350,000 to the Indian River County MPO for enhancement projects. These funds will likely become available in FY 2009/10 of FDOT's FY 2007/08-2011/12 Five Year Work Program.

The 2006 enhancement project prioritization process began in Spring 2006. At that time, the MPO notified eligible enhancement project sponsors and other interested groups of the opportunity to apply for enhancement funds. For the 2006 project cycle, three enhancement project applications were submitted to MPO staff. All of the applications were submitted by Indian River County. Upon review, MPO staff determined that all three projects appeared to be eligible for enhancement funding. MPO staff then transmitted the three enhancement project applications to FDOT for review and final eligibility determination.

The three submitted enhancement project applications are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
Submitted Enhancement Projects

| Proposed Project | Estimated Project Cost | Project Sponsor | Project Type |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Roseland Road Sidewalk Ph. I (Collier Creek Bridge to Capewell Ct.) | \$496,000 | Indian River County | Bike/Ped |
| Roseland Road Sidewalk Ph. II (Capewell Ct. to 126 th St.) | \$433,300 | Indian River County | Bike/Ped |
| Indian River Boulevard Sidewalk (SR 60 to 37th St) | \$861,500 | Indian River County | Bike/Ped |

In addition to the three submitted priorities, the MPO also received requests from two of its member jurisdictions, the City of Fellsmere and the City of Vero Beach, to increase funding in order to complete two of its longstanding priorities. Those priorities, along with the year they were first prioritized by the MPO, are Sidewalks on CR 512 (1997) and landscaping on SR A1A (1999).

There are a number of reasons that those projects require increased funding. Since enhancement funds are federal monies, enhancement projects are subject to many regulations not applicable projects funded with state and local money. These regulations both delay and drive up the cost of federal projects. When coupled with recent cost increases in labor and raw materials, enhancement project construction bids have substantially exceeded project budgets. This is illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

| Project Name | Year Submitted | Grant Application | Funded Amount | Revised Cost Estimate | Remaining Need |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| CR 512 Sidewalks (Fellsmere) | 1997 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 550,000 | 310,000 |
| SR A1A Landscaping (Vero Beach) | 1999 | 102,000 | 83,000 | 450,000 | 366,000 |
| Totals | | | 323,000 | | 676,000 |
| (less) 2009 Allocation | | | | | 350,000 |
| Deficit | | | | | 326,000 |

To ensure that these projects can get constructed, these projects were evaluated against the enhancement priority criteria used by the MPO. This analysis, which is explained on the following pages, indicated that these projects continue to rank as top MPO priorities.

Consequently, the top MPO enhancement priority is the completion of its earlier top priority, Fellsmere sidewalks.

Enhancement Project Descriptions

CR 512 Sidewalks (Cypress Street – Myrtle Street) – Fellsmere

This enhancement project application was first submitted by Indian River County in 1997. The project serves a number of pedestrian-accessible attractions in the City of Fellsmere, including Fellsmere Elementary School and downtown Fellsmere. Indian River County has attempted to implement the project several times since funding became available. In its latest attempt earlier this year, the low bid for the project was \$310,000 over project budget.

Roseland Road Bike Path Enhancement - Phases I & II

This enhancement project application was submitted by Indian River County and has been divided into two phases. The first phase, Collier Creek Bridge to Capewell Court, has a project cost of \$244,000. The second phase, from Capewell Court to 126th Street, has a project cost of \$226,700. As proposed, this project consists of an eight foot sidewalk on the southeast side of Roseland Road and extends from the Collier Creek Bridge to 126th Street. This is phase one of a three-phase project that will ultimately extend from CR 512 to 126th Street. When completed, this three-phase project will result in a continuous sidewalk from CR 512 to US 1.

SR A1A Landscaping

The Landscaping of A1A (Tulip Lane – Painted Bunting Lane) was an enhancement project submitted and approved for \$102,000 (including design and construction) in 1999. The City has reconsidered the project in light of the visioning plan, recent actual costs, and use of materials that will minimize future maintenance needs and has requested an additional \$366,000 for the project.

Indian River Boulevard Sidewalks

This enhancement project application was submitted by Indian River County and has a project cost of \$861,500. This project, when completed, will extend the existing Indian River Boulevard recreation loop that terminates on the east side of the Merrill Barber Bridge approximately one mile to the north.

Methodology

The methodology used to rank the enhancement project applications is described below. It is important to note that, because enhancement projects complement or enhance the transportation system rather than meet a specific transportation need, prioritizing enhancement projects is not as simple as prioritizing highway projects. Whereas highway projects can be compared based upon such objective measures of need as volume to capacity ratios, enhancement project prioritization is less objective. Because enhancement projects encompass a wide variety of eligible activities, it is difficult to objectively compare different types of enhancement projects.

In 2002, the MPO devised a methodology to rank different kinds of projects on a fair and equitable basis. At that time, MPO staff developed six criteria that emphasize background conditions applicable to any project. For 2005, the same six criteria were used to evaluate enhancement applications. These criteria, along with a brief description of each criterion, are as follows:

Adjacent Roadway Volume - This criterion is included to measure the amount of public benefit that a project provides. It measures both the relative need for a bicycle or pedestrian project and the amount of potential visual exposure to a landscaping or streetscaping project.

Bike/Ped and Comprehensive Plan Priority - This criterion measures the importance/need for an enhancement project based on whether the project is listed as a priority in an adopted plan. The MPO’s adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is the MPO’s policy document for funding sidewalk/bikepath projects in the MPO area and includes a listing of each sidewalk/bikepath project planned in the MPO area. In addition, major streetscaping and redevelopment efforts are often included in County or Municipal Comprehensive Plans.

Ability to Leverage Other Funding – This criterion is included to determine whether newly funded projects can attract or complement other funding, thereby leveraging the new money.

Continuous Adjacent Network - This criterion was developed to reward projects that extend the physical limits of previous projects, thereby providing systemwide continuity for the bike/ped network or a continuous corridor-wide effect for a landscaping or streetscaping project.

Cost/Mile - Cost of the project on a per-mile basis is included as a criterion to maximize efficient use of the limited enhancement resources.

Provides “Safe Path to School” - This criterion was developed to prioritize projects that promote school-zone safety consistent with FDOT’s “Safe Paths to School” campaign.

In addition to developing the criteria, the MPO also developed a scoring system based on a 0 to 5 point scale. Under that system, projects may be awarded 0, 1, 3 or 5 points, depending on whether or not the project meets the criterion and, if it does, how well the project meets the criterion. The enhancement scoring criteria are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2
Enhancement Project Scoring Criteria

| Criterion | Scoring |
|---|---|
| Adjacent Roadway Volume (2005 AADT) | <8,000 = 1 8,000 - 10,000 = 3 >10,000 = 5 |
| Bike/Ped and Comprehensive Plan Priority | Included as High Priority on Plan = 5 Included as Low or Medium Priority on Plan = 3 Not included on Plan = 0 |
| Ability to Leverage Other Funding | Project leverages other funding = 5 Project does not leverage other funding = 0 |
| Continuous Adjacent Network | Connects adjacent improvements on Two Sides = 5 Connects adjacent improvements on One Side = 3 Does not connect to adjacent improvements = 0 |
| Cost/Mile (\$) | <\$100,000 = 5 \$100,000 - \$200,000 = 3 >\$200,000 = 1 |
| Provides “Safe Paths to School” | Provides a safe path adjacent to a school = 5 Provides crossing improvement/provides a path w/in a mile of a school = 3 Does not impact schools = 0 |

As in 2002, the methodology used to rank the 2006 enhancement projects consisted of two parts. First, background information was obtained in order to evaluate each project as to how it meets the enhancement criteria. Next, the evaluation criteria were applied to the background information on each project to obtain a total score for each project and a comparative ranking for all projects.

Background information was compiled by the MPO for use in evaluating proposed enhancement projects. The specific background information compiled for each enhancement project is detailed below in Table 3.

Table 3
Enhancement Project Background Information

| Criterion | Roseland Road Ph I | Roseland Road Ph II | IRB Sidewalks/ Landscaping | CR 512 Sidewalks Fellsmere | SR A1A Landscaping |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Adjacent Roadway Volume (2003 AADT) | 6,277 | 7,106 | 19,421 | 8,500 | 19,320 |
| Bike/Ped/Comp Plan Priority | Bike: High Ped: High Comp: High | Bike: High Ped: High Comp: High | Bike: High Ped: High Comp: No | Bike: High Ped: High Comp: Yes | Bike: No Ped: No Comp: Yes |
| Ability to Leverage Other Funding | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Continuous Adjacent Network | One Side | One Side | One Side | Two Sides | None |
| Cost/Mile (\$) | 251,546 | 254,719 | 1.5 M | 1 M | 1 M |
| Provides "Safe Paths to School" | No | No | Improvement | Improvement | No |

After collecting background information on each project, MPO staff applied the criteria to obtain a total score for each project and a comparative ranking for all projects. The results of this analysis are detailed below in Table 4.

Table 4
Enhancement Project Comparative Ranking

| Criterion | Roseland Road Ph I | Roseland Road Ph II | IRB Sidewalks/Landscaping | CR 512 Sidewalks Fellsmere | SR A1A Landscaping |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Adjacent Roadway Volume (2003 AADT) | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Bike/Ped/Comp Plan Priority | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Ability to Leverage Other Funding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Continuous Adjacent Network | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Cost/Mile (\$) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Provides "Safe Paths to School" | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Total | 10 | 10 | 17 | 24 | 14 |

2006 List of Priority Enhancement Projects

1. **CR 512 Sidewalks, Fellsmere**
2. **Indian River Boulevard Multi-Purpose Path**
3. **A1A Landscaping, Vero Beach**

Given the fact that \$350,000 is available for the current enhancement cycle, the MPO's top priority can likely be finished during this cycle with some additional funding available for one additional priority. With respect to the A1A landscaping project, MPO staff will work with County and City staff to obtain other funding for this project. Potential sources include the state Highway Beautification Grant program and FDOT District IV landscaping programs.

It merits discussion that, in the future, the MPO is reconsidering its traditional enhancement prioritization process. In light of long delays and administrative complexity associated with Enhancement projects, the MPO is considering a change to larger, multi-year projects that emphasize connectivity, such as proposed countywide greenways and trails.

PRIORITY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) PROJECTS

Beginning with the 1998 Priority Projects Report, MPO staff has utilized the MPO's Congestion Management System (CMS) plan to identify and prioritize improvement strategies for the

county's most congested corridors. In 2004, the MPO and its consultant completed a CMS plan update and conducted a new 2004 CMS analysis to identify congested corridors in the county and to identify appropriate CMS strategies for those corridors. The results of the 2004 CMS analysis and resulting priorities are contained below. While traffic signal synchronization was cited as the top CMS strategy for the County's most congested corridors, the MPO decided to implement synchronization countywide, and to utilize all available CMP funding until the project was complete.

| Corridor Ranking | Corridor | Project |
|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Indian River Blvd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement a computerized signal system to provide coordination along Indian River Blvd. ○ Convert the 5-leg intersection of Indian River Blvd. at Royal Palm Point into a 4-leg intersection. ○ Restripe the southbound left turn lane from Indian River Boulevard to Merrill Barber Bridge and modify the signal (if necessary) to provide dual left turn operation. Maintain existing northbound right free-flow movement. |
| 2 | Schumann Dr | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement a computerized signal system to provide coordination along Schumann Dr./66th Ave ○ Extend northbound left turn lane on Schumann Dr./66th Ave. at Barber St. (to 400 feet). ○ Construct an eastbound right turn lane on Barber St. at Schumann Dr./66th Ave. ○ Include maintenance of traffic plan that provides adequate capacity at its intersection with Schumann Dr./66th Ave in the plans to widen Barber Street so that it operates at an acceptable level of service. |

The CMS program, which encourages jurisdictions to monitor congestion and seek low-cost alternatives that could forestall major widening projects, was one of the programs retained in the federal highway bill that was signed into law last summer. While most of the original provisions of the CMS program were retained, the program was retitled the "Congestion Management Process" or CMP. Recently, FDOT has informed the MPO staff that the Signal Synchronization project will be completely funded by 2009. Therefore, FDOT will begin new candidate CMP projects for input into the next work program.

In light of the upcoming availability of CMP funding, the MPO has decided to undertake a new CMP analysis. In order to complete the analysis, the MPO recently issued a Work Order to its General Planning Consultant, Kimley-Horn and Associates. A draft of the MPO's new CMP priorities, which can begin to be implemented in 2009, will be incorporated into this document.

PRIORITY TRANSIT PROJECTS

Until the year 2000, transit priorities had not been included in the MPO's priority projects list because of the way that transit projects are funded. Prior to that time, the MPO had not considered it necessary to develop transit priority lists because transit capital and transit operations are funded by FTA, and because a separate grant application is submitted directly to FTA.

Another reason why transit priority lists were not prepared in the past is that most of the federal and state transit money needed by the MPO's transit provider has been available. The limitation to requesting more federal/state transit money is that transit operations must be 25 percent funded with local money, and additional local money has not been available. If additional operations money is not available and operations cannot be expanded, there is generally not a need for significant capital items.

The primary source of projects in the transit priority list for 2006 was the MPO's Transit Development Plan (TDP) - Major Update. Since the adoption of the TDP in 2005, the county has been implementing a number of strategies contained in the TDP, such as new service, new facilities, and adjustments to existing routes. A number of TDP strategies have not been implemented, and these form the basis of the transit priority list. These strategies include extending operating hours to 6:30 PM and implementing Vero Beach area circulator service.

Other priorities from the TDP and coordination process are identified below in Table 11.

Table 11
Priority Transit Projects

| Ranking | Project | Unit Cost | Funding Source |
|----------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Expand weekday hours of service (8 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.) | \$126,846/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 2 | Provide service between South Beach Park, Humiston Park and Sexton Plaza. | \$89,262/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 3 | Provide service from Pocahontas Park to Sexton Plaza on 17 th Street. | \$89,262/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 4 | Implement a bus wrap program. | N/A | 100% Federal |
| 5 | Develop a transit infrastructure guidelines manual | N/A | 100% Federal |
| 6 | Adopt 30-minute headways on Routes 1 and 2. | \$123,016/yr | 75% State/Federal |

PRIORITY AIRPORT PROJECTS

In Indian River County, there are two publicly owned general aviation airports, each of which qualifies for state and federal funding. Separate priority project lists have been established for each airport. This report includes a Vero Beach Airport priority projects list and a Sebastian Airport priority projects list.

To develop the airport priority projects list, MPO staff reviewed the current JACIPs (Joint Automated Capital Improvement Programs) for each of the two public airports in the county, identified which projects in the JACIPs were unfunded, and coordinated with respective airport staffs. The following airport priority projects were identified for 2006-2009. Airport priority projects are summarized in Table 12 and Table 13 on the following page.

Table 12
Vero Beach Airport Priority Projects

| Ranking | Project |
|---------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Clear Part 77 Obstructions |
| 2 | ARFF Vehicle (Part 139) |
| 3 | Terminal Renovations |
| 4 | Construct Operations Facility |
| 5 | Aviation Boulevard Improvements |
| 6 | Re-roof Building 96 |
| 7 | Rehabilitate Utilities CPV MH Park |
| 8 | Replace/Upgrade Security Fences |
| 9 | Rehabilitate Taxiway B |
| 10 | Construct West GA Apron, Phase 3 |
| 11 | Improve Runway Safety Areas, Phase 1 |
| 12 | Airport Maintenance Equipment |
| 13 | Extend/Mark/Light TWY E East of RWY 4 |
| 14 | Improve Runway Safety Areas, Phase II |
| 15 | Upgrade Airport Layout Plan |
| 16 | RPZ Land Purchase |
| 17 | Rehabilitate Runway 4/22 |

Table 13
Sebastian Airport Priority Projects

| Ranking | Project |
|---------|--|
| 1 | Professional Services for Taxiway C |
| 2 | Relocate Perimeter Fencing |
| 3 | Conduct Master Plan Update |
| 4 | Construct Taxiway C (Parallel for Primary Runway 4-22) |
| 5 | Construct Access Road |
| 6 | Construct Perimeter Road |
| 7 | Construct Apron |
| 8 | Construct Air Traffic Control Tower |
| 9 | Construct T-Hangars |
| 10 | Acquire Loader/Excavator |
| 11 | Construct Taxilanes |
| 12 | Construct Corporate Hangars |

Conclusion

The five components of the Indian River County MPO's 2006 Priority Projects Report—the priority highway projects list, the priority enhancement projects list, the priority CMP projects list, the priority transit projects list, and the priority airport projects list—were reviewed by the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and by the MPO Board. Opportunities for public comment were available at the TAC, CAC, and MPO meetings. The MPO and its advisory committees considered public input before making decisions regarding the five priority projects lists.

At its meeting of September 13, 2006, the Indian River County MPO considered the 2006 Priority Projects Report. The MPO also reviewed the accompanying staff report, considered the recommendations of the TAC and CAC, and discussed various issues. The MPO then adopted the priority projects report containing the MPO's 2006 lists of priority highway, enhancement, CMP, transit, and airport projects.

Appendix
Summary Tables, Maps and Reference Material

Table A-1 – Priority Highway Projects SIS Highways

Table A-2 – Priority Highways Projects Regional Highways

Table A-3 – Priority Highways Projects Other Highways

Table A-4 – Priority Enhancement Projects

Table A-5 – CMP Priority Projects

Table A-6 – Priority Transit Projects

Table A-7 – Vero Beach Airport Priority Projects

Table A-8 – Sebastian Airport Priority Projects

Table A-9 – Long Range Transportation Plan Interim Year Improvement Sets

Table A-10 SAFETEA-LU's Seven Planning Factors

Table A-11 Definitions used in the 2006 Priority Projects Reports

Figure A-12 Regional Facilities

Table A-13 Regional Prioritization

Table A-1
Priority Highway Projects
SIS Highways

| Project Rank | | | | Roadway | Location | | Length (miles) | Improvement Type | Jurisdiction | FDOT FY 2005/06 – 2009/10 Five Year Work Program | | Funding Source Requested |
|--------------|------|------|------|--|----------|----|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2006 | 2005 | 2003 | 2002 | | From | To | | | | FI/FM # | Programmed Improvements (\$000s) | |
| 1 | 1 | 9 | 11 | Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95 | | | n/a | Add interchange | Federal | n/a | No Phase Programmed | state/federal |

Table A-2
Priority Highway Projects
Regional Highways

| Project Rank | | | | Roadway | Location | | Length (miles) | Improvement Type | Jurisdiction | FDOT FY 2005/06 – 2009/10 Five Year Work Program | | Funding Source Requested |
|--------------|------|------|------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | | From | To | | | | FI/FM # | Programmed Improvements (\$000s) | |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | CR 510 | CR 512 | US 1 | 5.82 | Widen from two to four lanes | County | 4056061 | FY 07/08 PE \$2,100 | state/federal |
| 2 | 2 | 8 | 10 | Oslo Road | Interstate 95 | 27 th Ave | 7.3 | Widen from two to four lanes | County | n/a | No Phase Programmed | state/federal |
| 3 | 3 | --- | --- | CR 512 | CR 510 | I-95 | 5 | Widen from two to six lanes | County | n/a | No Phase Programmed | State only (TRIPS) |
| 4 | 4 | --- | --- | CR 512 | I-95 | Fellsmere | 1.5 | Widen from two to four lanes | County | n/a | No Phase Programmed | State only (TRIPS) |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- | 66 th Avenue | CR 510 | Sr 60 | 7.5 | Widen from two to four lanes | County | n/a | No Phase Programmed | State only (TRIPS) |
| 6 | --- | --- | --- | 58 th Avenue | S of Oslo Rd | St. Lucie C/L | 2 | New four lanes | County | n/a | No Phase Programmed | State only (TRIPS) |

Table A-3
Priority Highway Projects
Other Highways

| Project Rank | | | | Roadway | Location | | Length (miles) | Improvement Type | Jurisdiction | FDOT FY 2005/06 – 2009/10 Five Year Work Program | | Funding Source Requested |
|--------------|------|------|------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | | From | To | | | | FI/FM # | Programmed Improvements (\$000s) | |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | SR 60 | I-95 | 82 nd Ave | 2 | Widen from four to six lanes | State | 2286281 | No Phase Programmed | State/federal |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | US 1 | Highlands Drive | Oslo Road | 1.5 | Widen from four to six lanes | State | 2285834 | FY 06/07 ROW \$4,700 | state/federal |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | US 1 | St. Lucie County Line | Highlands Drive | 0.5 | Widen from four to six lanes | State | 2285832 | FY 10/11 ROW \$4,600 | state/federal |
| 4 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 26 th Street | 66th Avenue | 43 rd Avenue | 2 | Widen from two to four lanes | County | 4165121 | FY 04/05 CST \$400 FY 05/06 CST \$400 FY 06/07 CST \$400 FY 07/08 CST \$400 | state |

Table A-4
Priority Enhancement Projects

| Proposed Project | Funds Requested | Project Sponsor | Project Type |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| CR 512 Sidewalks (Fellsmere) | \$310,000 | Indian River County | Bike/Ped |
| Indian River Boulevard Multi-purpose Path (SR 60 to 37th St) | \$861,500 | Indian River County | Bike/Ped |
| Landscaping A1A (Vero Beach) | 366,000 | City of Vero Beach | Landscaping |

Table A-5
CMP Priority Projects *

| Corridor Ranking | Corridor | Project |
|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Indian River Blvd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement a computerized signal system to provide coordination along Indian River Blvd. ○ Convert the 5-leg intersection of Indian River Blvd. at Royal Palm Point into a 4-leg intersection. ○ Restripe the southbound left turn lane from Indian River Boulevard to Merrill Barber Bridge and modify the signal (if necessary) to provide dual left turn operation. Maintain existing northbound right free-flow movement. |
| 2 | Schumann Dr | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement a computerized signal system to provide coordination along Schumann Dr./66th Ave ○ Extend northbound left turn lane on Schumann Dr./66th Ave. at Barber St. (to 400 feet). ○ Construct an eastbound right turn lane on Barber St. at Schumann Dr./66th Ave. ○ Include maintenance of traffic plan that provides adequate capacity at its intersection with Schumann Dr./66th Ave in the plans to widen Barber Street so that it operates at an acceptable level of service. |

* Note – at the request of the MPO, the top corridor strategy, Traffic Signal Synchronization, was adopted as the MPO’s overall top priority on a countywide basis from 2004 through project implementation.

Table A-6
Transit Priorities

| Ranking | Project | Unit Cost | Funding Source |
|----------------|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Expand weekday hours of service (8 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.) | \$126,846/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 2 | Provide service between South Beach Park, Humiston Park and Sexton Plaza. | \$89,262/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 3 | Provide service from Pocahontas Park to Sexton Plaza on 17 th Street. | \$89,262/yr | 75% State/Federal |
| 4 | Implement a bus wrap program. | N/A | 100% Federal |
| 5 | Develop a transit infrastructure guidelines manual | N/A | 100% Federal |
| 6 | Adopt 30-minute headways on Routes 1 and 2. | \$123,016/yr | 75% State/Federal |

Table A-7
Vero Beach Airport Priority Projects

| Ranking | Project |
|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Clear Part 77 Obstructions |
| 2 | ARFF Vehicle (Part 139) |
| 3 | Terminal Renovations |
| 4 | Construct Operations Facility |
| 5 | Aviation Boulevard Improvements |
| 6 | Reroof Building 96 |
| 7 | Rehabilitate Utilities CPV MH Park |
| 8 | Replace/Upgrade Security Fences |
| 9 | Rehabilitate Taxiway B |
| 10 | Construct West GA Apron, Phase 2 |
| 11 | Improve Runway Safety Areas, Phase 1 |
| 12 | Upgrade Airport Layout Plan |
| 13 | RPZ Land Purchase |
| 14 | Rehabilitate Runway |

Table A-8
Sebastian Airport Priority Projects

| Ranking | Project |
|---------|--|
| 1 | Professional Services for Taxiway C |
| 2 | Relocate Perimeter Fencing |
| 3 | Conduct Master Plan Update |
| 4 | Construct Taxiway C (Parallel for Primary Runway 4-22) |
| 5 | Construct Access Road |
| 6 | Construct Perimeter Road |
| 7 | Construct Apron |
| 8 | Construct Air Traffic Control Tower |
| 9 | Construct T-Hangars |
| 10 | Acquire Loader/Excavator |
| 11 | Construct Taxilanes |
| 12 | Construct Corporate Hangars |

Table A-9
2030 Long Range Transportation Plan Needs Plan Improvements

Phase 1: 2011 to 2020

| | On Street | From | To | 2011 Road Type | 2020 Road Type | Total Cost |
|-------------------|---|---|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| SIS | I-95 | S. COUNTY LINE | N. COUNTY LINE | 4 Lane Freeway | 6 Lane Freeway | \$109,919,000 |
| State | SR 60 | I-95 | 82ND AVE | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$8,119,445 |
| | US 1 | S. COUNTY LINE | OSLO RD | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$12,064,823 |
| | Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) | | | | | \$5,000,000 |
| County Roads | 12TH ST | 90TH AVE | 82ND AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$3,781,786 |
| | 12TH ST | 43RD AVE | 27TH AVE | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$2,854,618 |
| | 26TH ST | 66TH AVE | 43RD AVE | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$13,006,154 |
| | AVIATION BLVD | 43RD AVE | U.S. 1 | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$8,537,828 |
| | 27TH AVE | S. COUNTY LINE | OSLO RD | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$9,560,909 |
| | 27TH AVE | OSLO RD | S.R. 60 | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$12,330,699 |
| | 43RD AVE | OSLO RD | 8TH ST | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$8,311,058 |
| | 58TH AVE | S COUNTY LINE/K | OSLO RD | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$11,850,325 |
| | 66TH AVE | SR 60 | C.R. 510 | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$36,173,489 |
| | AVIATION BLVD EXT | US 1 | INDIAN RIVER BLVD | N/A | 4 Lane Divided | \$14,387,771 |
| | C.R. 510 | C.R. 512 | U.S. 1 | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$36,369,280 |
| | C.R. 510 | U.S. 1 | ICWW | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$3,718,539 |
| | C.R. 512 | FELLSMERE CITY | I-95 | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$19,192,929 |
| | C.R. 512 | I-95 | C.R. 510 | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$13,317,010 |
| | C.R. 512 | C.R. 510 | ROSELAND RD | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$6,674,370 |
| | 8TH ST | 82ND AVE | 74TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$3,955,196 |
| | OSLO RD | I-95 | 58TH AVE | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$19,484,669 |
| | SCHUMANN DR | C.R. 510 | BARBER ST | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$3,974,335 |
| | Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) | | | | | \$5,000,000 |
| | Totals | State SIS (Strategic Intermodal System) | | | | |
| Other State Roads | | | | | \$25,184,268 | |
| County Roads | | | | | \$232,480,965 | |
| City Roads | | | | | \$0 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | \$367,584,233 | |

Phase 2: 2021 to 2030

| | On Street | From | To | 2021 Road Type | 2030 Road Type | Total Cost |
|--------------|---|---------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| SIS | SR 60 | 98TH AVE | I-95 | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$2,543,842 |
| State | SR 60 | 6TH AVE | INDIAN RIVER BLVD | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$1,864,758 |
| | US 1 | AVIATION BLVD | OLD DIXIE HWY (N) | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$44,372,047 |
| | US 1 | ROSELAND RD | N. COUNTY LINE | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$5,255,518 |
| | Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) | | | | | \$5,000,000 |
| County Roads | 4TH ST | 98TH AVE | 66TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$16,262,035 |
| | 13TH ST SW | 66TH AVE | 58TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$4,041,388 |
| | 13TH ST SW | 43RD AVE | 34TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$1,560,899 |
| | 13TH ST SW | 34TH AVE | 27TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$3,359,684 |
| | 13TH ST SW | 27TH AVE | 20TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$1,922,225 |
| | 17TH ST SW | 66TH AVE | 58TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$4,019,519 |
| | 26TH ST | 82ND AVE | 74TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$3,850,481 |
| | 43RD AVE | S COUNTY LINE | OSLO RD | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$12,974,563 |
| | 53RD ST | 82ND AVE | 66TH AVE | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$9,599,620 |
| | 66TH AVE | S COUNTY LINE | OSLO RD | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$8,562,423 |
| | 66TH AVE | OSLO RD | 4TH ST | 2 Lane Undivided | 4 Lane Divided | \$8,887,466 |
| | 66TH AVE | 4TH ST | SR 60 | 2 Lane Divided | 4 Lane Divided | \$8,853,565 |
| | 82ND AVE | S COUNTY LINE | OSLO RD | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$7,302,941 |
| | 82ND AVE | 26TH ST | C.R. 510 | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$28,174,165 |
| | LACONIA ST | C.R. 510 | CONCHA DR | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$11,076,344 |
| | INDIAN RIVER BLVD | ROYAL PALM | 37TH ST | 4 Lane Divided | 6 Lane Divided | \$8,678,255 |
| | ROSELAND RD | C.R. 512 | U.S. 1 | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$12,847,897 |
| | Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) | | | | | \$5,000,000 |
| City | BARBER ST | SCHUMANN DR | U.S. 1 | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$3,621,587 |
| | BARBER ST | C.R. 512 | SCHUMANN DR | 2 Lane Undivided | 2 Lane Divided | \$7,596,306 |
| | FLEMING ST | EASY ST | SCHUMANN DR | N/A | 2 Lane Undivided | \$4,838,861 |
| Totals | State SIS (Strategic Intermodal System) | | | | | \$2,543,842 |
| | Other State Roads | | | | | \$56,492,323 |
| | County Roads | | | | | \$156,973,470 |
| | City Roads | | | | | \$18,056,754 |
| | TOTAL | | | | | \$232,066,389 |

Table A-10.
SAFETEA LU Planning Factors

Subtitle B, Section 1203(f) of SAFETEA lists eight metropolitan planning areas that must be considered as part of the planning process for all MPOs. The following eight areas have been explicitly considered, analyzed as appropriate, and reflected in the Indian River County MPO's 2006 Priority Projects Report:

- (1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- (2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
- (3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
- (4) Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
- (5) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- (6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- (7) Promote efficient system management and operation; and
- (8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

Table A-11.
Definitions Used in the 2006 Priority Projects Report

Project Phases

| | |
|------|---|
| CST | Construction |
| DES | Design |
| PD&E | Project Development and Environmental Study |
| PE | Preliminary Engineering |
| ROW | Right of Way |

Other Terms

| | |
|------------|--|
| FDOT | Florida Department of Transportation |
| LOS | Level of Service (measure of roadway traffic congestion) |
| L RTP | Long Range Transportation Plan |
| PLEMO | Planning and Environmental Management Office (FDOT planning study) |
| SAFETEA-LU | Safe, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users |

Table A – 13

| Priority Project | Score | Rankings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. DRAFT <u>Indian River County Airport</u> The project will address the need for a new terminal building at the Indian River County Airport. The project will provide increased capacity for passengers, cargo, and aircraft parking. The project will also improve airport security and enhance the overall airport environment. | 95 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. <u>Indian River County Sewer Treatment Plant</u> The project will provide for the construction of a new sewer treatment plant in Indian River County. The project will improve water quality and protect the environment. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 90 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. <u>Indian River County Road Improvement</u> The project will provide for the construction of new roads and the improvement of existing roads in Indian River County. The project will improve traffic flow and reduce travel time. The project will also improve safety and reduce emissions. | 85 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. <u>Indian River County Water Conservation</u> The project will provide for the installation of water-saving devices in homes and businesses in Indian River County. The project will reduce water consumption and lower utility bills. The project will also improve the environment and save money. | 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. <u>Indian River County Public Safety</u> The project will provide for the purchase of new police cars and the hiring of new police officers in Indian River County. The project will improve public safety and reduce crime. The project will also improve the quality of life and create jobs. | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. <u>Indian River County Parks and Recreation</u> The project will provide for the construction of new parks and the improvement of existing parks in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. <u>Indian River County Economic Development</u> The project will provide for the construction of new industrial buildings and the improvement of existing industrial buildings in Indian River County. The project will create jobs and stimulate economic growth. The project will also improve the quality of life and create jobs. | 65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. <u>Indian River County Affordable Housing</u> The project will provide for the construction of new affordable housing units in Indian River County. The project will provide housing for low-income families and improve the quality of life. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. <u>Indian River County Arts and Culture</u> The project will provide for the construction of new arts and cultural facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. <u>Indian River County Senior Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new senior centers and the improvement of existing senior centers in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for seniors. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. <u>Indian River County Libraries</u> The project will provide for the construction of new libraries and the improvement of existing libraries in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. <u>Indian River County Health Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new health care facilities and the improvement of existing health care facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. <u>Indian River County Child Care</u> The project will provide for the construction of new child care centers and the improvement of existing child care centers in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for children. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. <u>Indian River County Elder Care</u> The project will provide for the construction of new elder care facilities and the improvement of existing elder care facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for seniors. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. <u>Indian River County Disability Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new disability services facilities and the improvement of existing disability services facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for people with disabilities. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. <u>Indian River County Community Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new community service facilities and the improvement of existing community service facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for the community. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. <u>Indian River County Animal Care</u> The project will provide for the construction of new animal care facilities and the improvement of existing animal care facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for animals. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. <u>Indian River County Environmental Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new environmental service facilities and the improvement of existing environmental service facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for the environment. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. <u>Indian River County Transportation Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new transportation service facilities and the improvement of existing transportation service facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for transportation. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. <u>Indian River County Energy Services</u> The project will provide for the construction of new energy service facilities and the improvement of existing energy service facilities in Indian River County. The project will improve the quality of life and provide recreation opportunities for energy. The project will also create jobs and stimulate economic growth. | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |