2010

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Priority Highway Projects	3
Priority Congestion Management Process (CMP) Projects	7
Priority Enhancement Projects	
Priority Transit Projects	
Priority Airport Projects	
Conclusion	
Appendix	
Summary Tables and Reference Material	
Table A-1 – Priority Highway Projects, SIS Highways	12
Table A-2 – Priority Highways Projects, Other Highways	12
Table A-3 – Regional/Intermodal Priority Projects	12
Table A-4 – CMP Priority Projects	13
Table A-5 – Priority Enhancement Projects	13
Table A-6 – 2010 Enhancement Prioritization	14
Table A-7 – Priority Transit Projects	15
Table A-8 – Priority Aviation Projects for Vero Beach Airport	15
Table A-9 – Priority Aviation Projects for Sebastian Airport	15
Table A-10 – Long Range Transportation Plan, 2030 Cost Affordable Plan	16
Table A-11 – Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, 2030 Needs Plan	17
Table A-12 – IRC Greenways Project Prioritization	
Table A-13 – SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors	
Table A-14 – Definitions used in the 2010 Priority Projects Reports	20

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION 2010 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 MPOs in November, present the work program to MPOs in early December, and hold public hearings in mid-December. The Five Year Work Program is then submitted to the Legislature in January, sixty days prior to the start of the legislative session.

This report contains the Indian River County MPO's 2010 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 2015/2016) of its FY 2011/12-2015/16 Five Year Work Program.

The component lists of the MPO's 2010 Priority Projects Report are similar to those in the 2009 report. In 2009, however, the MPO opted to divide the highway priorities list into three categories, roughly mirroring three major available funding sources: Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects; Regional Highway projects; and Other Highways. This year, the MPO has eliminated the Regional Highway list and developed a new list, known as the Regional/Intermodal Priorities list, for TRIP-grant eligible projects. This action was taken because alternative modal projects, as well as roadway projects, are eligible for funding under the TRIP program. Since approximately \$500,000 will be made available in TRIP funding in the three-county Treasure Coast area, it is more likely that an alternative modal project could be constructed, given the limited amount of available funding.

As it did in 2009, the MPO has also developed lists for priority Congestion Management Process projects, Enhancement projects, Transit projects, and Aviation projects.

PRIORITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS

This section explains the specific methodology utilized to prepare the MPO's 2010 Priority Highway Projects List. In this section, the inputs and data used to develop and rank the projects are explained, and a brief explanation of each project and its rank are also provided.

The primary input used in developing the 2010 list of priority highway projects was the MPO's adopted 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). 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 (Table A-10 of the Appendix) 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 2009 priority highway projects list and compared those projects to FDOT's current (FY 2010/11 - 2014/15) adopted Five Year Work Program. Finally, meetings and discussions with municipal, County, and FDOT staff provided additional information utilized in preparing the 2010 list. In those meetings, local government staff familiar with localized capacity and safety problems provided additional information regarding needed projects, while 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 divided its highway priority list into two categories: SIS Highways and Other Highways.

SIS Highways

The Strategic Intermodal System in Indian River County consists of I-95, the Florida Turnpike, and SR 60 West of I-95 to Osceola County. Projects on the SIS generally serve an interstate and inter-regional function and carry high volumes of traffic and goods across long distances. FDOT allocates funding specifically for Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects and has requested local input into the SIS funding prioritization process. This year's top SIS project in Indian River County remains the Oslo Road Interchange. That project is programmed for \$2,300,000 in Project Developmental and Environmental (PD&E) funding in 2014/15 in the current TIP, but still needs Right-of-Way acquisition and Construction funding.

Other Highways

Non-SIS 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 US 1 from Oslo Road to Highlands Drive. That project is programmed for approximately \$11,000,000 in construction funding in FY 2012/13 in the current TIP, and is now considered fully funded for construction.

The second ranked priority from 2009, the widening of US 1 from Highlands Drive to the St. Lucie County Line, has now become the MPO's top unfunded priority.

The complete list of highway priorities is included as Tables A-1 and A-2 in the Appendix. That 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.

2010 List of Priority Highway Projects – SIS

1. Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95 – The project was included in the MPO's 2030 LRTP – Cost Feasible Plan based on anticipated future travel demand in the Oslo Road corridor. Not only will the project help meet demand, but the project will also assist in generating commercial/industrial activity. Finally, this interchange will enhance hurricane evacuation capabilities in the county. Right of Way and construction funding is requested for this project.

2010 List of Priority Highway Projects – Other

- 1. US 1, six laning from the St. Lucie County Line to Highlands Drive This project is a follow-on to last year's top priority, 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 that road segment. Construction funding is requested for this project.
- 2. 82nd Avenue, two laning from 26th Street to CR 510 The MPO's 2030 LRTP includes a project to construct 82nd Avenue as a two lane facility from its current terminus near 26th Street to CR 510. This segment of roadway is identified as a multiuse corridor with Greenways for non-motorized transportation. As currently proposed, the project involves paving 82nd Avenue from 26th Street to CR 510. Design of the project is nearly complete. Right-of-way acquisition and construction funding are requested for this project.

Conclusion

As structured, the MPO's 2010 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 projects on the MPO's priority highways list where local funding is available for those projects. Therefore, the priority highway projects list includes only roadway projects which require state or federal funds and which are not needed for several years.

PRIORITY REGIONAL/INTERMODAL PROJECTS

Regional transportation projects serve a function of connecting major population or activity concentrations that are separated by some distance. With the 2006 Growth Management Legislation, regional projects became more important, because that legislation established a new grant program, known as the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP), for use on transportation projects determined to be regional in nature.

In order to qualify for TRIP funding, the MPO engaged in a number of actions. Tho5se included establishing a new regional entity, the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC), with Martin and St. Lucie Counties; developing a regional roadway network map; and developing a set of interim criteria for prioritizing TRIP project candidates on a regional basis. In 2008, the interim prioritization criteria were applied to the list of regional projects identified in the Long Range Plans of the individual counties.

In 2010, the MPO removed Regional Highways as a category of the Highway Priorities list and developed a new list, known as the Regional/Intermodal Priorities list, for TRIP-grant eligible projects. This action was taken because alternative modal projects, as well as roadway projects, are eligible for funding under the TRIP program. Since only about \$500,000 will be made available in TRIP funding in the three-county Treasure Coast area, the Treasure Coast MPOs have determined that this year's TRIP funding allocation would be best utilized to partially satisfy the local matching fund requirement for passenger rail corridor improvements on the FEC rail corridor.

Indian River County has also identified a number of regional roadway projects to be funded in the event that the FEC rail corridor improvements project is found ineligible. Those projects include segments of 66th Avenue and County Road 510, which were first identified on last year's TRIP priority list. Those projects are the top unfunded or partially-funded Indian River County projects on the 2008 TCTC regional priority list. The announced level of TRIP funding available, however, would be sufficient to fund only a small portion of one of those projects.

Unlike every other priority list in this document, the Regional priorities list is not adopted solely by the MPO. After approval of Indian River County's regional priority candidates by the MPO, the candidate projects from all three counties will be ranked and approved by the TCTC. After approval, the TCTC regional priorities will be submitted to FDOT.

PRIORITY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) PROJECTS

Beginning with the 1998 Priority Projects Report, MPO staff utilized the MPO's Congestion Management System (CMS) plan to identify and prioritize improvement strategies for the county's most congested corridors. In 2003, the MPO prepared a CMS Plan Major Update. With the 2006 passage of SAFETEA-LU, the new federal highway authorization bill, the

Congestion Management System was renamed the "Congestion Management Process," or CMP.

The most recent CMP project in Indian River County, improvement of the intersection of Royal Palm Pointe and Indian River Boulevard, was completed earlier this year. That project, which resulted in significant efficiency improvements, demonstrates the potential successes of the CMP approach to congested corridors.

In 2010, MPO staff completed a new CMP analysis. Using the CMP methodology adopted by the MPO in 2003, staff identified the most congested corridors in the county based on existing and vested trips; eliminated those corridors which are programmed for widening; and eliminated those corridors which have already been evaluated through the CMP process. The remaining corridors were then subject to a screening process to identify appropriate CMP strategies and projects. The resulting CMP priorities are as follows:

CORRIDOR	STRATEGY				
37 th Street (US 1	Add right turn lanes at major intersections and driveways				
to Indian River Boulevard)	Add bus shelters				
,	Provide intersection improvements at 37 th and Indian River Boulevard				
Indian River	Extend right turn lanes at Vero Isles and other driveways				
Boulevard (17 th Street to Merrill	Connect 5 th Avenue to the Miracle Mile Shopping Center				
Barber Bridge)	Increase transit headways on Route 1				

Although there is no specific allocation of FDOT funding reserved exclusively for CMP projects, MPOs have the option to program CMP projects for funding with federal highway money. Since MPO formula highway funding has been significantly curtailed in recent years, the MPO will not request the allocation of funds that would otherwise be used for MPO highway priorities but will instead seek alternative funding sources (such as County Incentive Grant, Intermodal, and ITS funding) for the construction of CMP projects.

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.

In 2007 and 2008, the MPO suspended the enhancement prioritization cycle, since a single year of enhancement funding in Indian River County has proven to be insufficient to construct a project of significant impact. In 2009, the MPO indicated that its top-ranked Enhancement priority was the Trans-Florida Railway Corridor Greenway in Northern Indian River County. That project was the highest ranked priority contained in the MPO's first ever Greenways Plan, which was adopted in 2006. Subsequently, FDOT District Four allocated \$717,060 in year 2012 of the most recent TIP for construction of that priority.

For 2010, FDOT will no longer allow MPOs to suspend Enhancement cycles to accumulate funding. Therefore, the MPO must submit priorities for approximately \$350,000 in Enhancement Funds. Those funds will be available in FY 2013/14. To identify new priorities, the MPO once again identified unfunded projects in the County's Greenways Master Plan. Two projects have been ranked according to the criteria contained in the County's Greenways Master Plan. Those criteria, including connectivity, constructability, quality of life benefits, agency support and cost, are summarized in A-9 of the Appendix. The highest ranked Greenways projects based on the criteria are shown in Table A-5 and Table A-6, and are described in detail below.

2010 List of Priority Enhancement Projects

- 1. South Sebastian Greenway Corridor The South Sebastian Greenway corridor is a north-south connector, traversing between Barber Street and CR 512. It runs within the City of Sebastian, with the right-of-way under City of Sebastian or Indian River County ownership. The corridor provides access to two elementary schools, the Sebastian Stormwater Park, the Sebastian Harbor Preserve Conservation Area, Sebastian City hall, Schumann Drive Park, Easy Street Park, shopping centers, and residential neighborhoods in the City of Sebastian. The corridor is 4 miles long, with an estimated cost of \$1,840,000 for construction of a paved surface trail. For the 2010 Enhancement cycle, the MPO is requesting funds for construction of 1 mile of the corridor, from Thunderbird Drive to Kildare Drive. The estimated cost of the project is \$366,200.
 - **2. Airport Loop Greenway Trail** The Vero Beach Airport Greenway trail runs along 43rd Avenue, 41st Street, Aviation Boulevard/26th Street, and the FEC Railroad corridor parallel to US 1. It is planned as a 10' wide shared-use path, approximately 6.6 miles in length. The MPO is currently requesting funds for the construction of the trail that runs along Aviation Boulevard. This segment is 1.5 miles long and has an estimated cost of \$1,000,000.

PRIORITY TRANSIT PROJECTS

Because of the way that transit projects are funded, transit priorities were not included in the MPO's priority projects list until the year 2000. 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. In the last several years, however, the MPO obtained funds from a variety of sources, including discretionary state grants. In order to apply for many federal and state grant

programs, proposed projects must be included on an adopted MPO priority list. In addition, fixed route transit travel has gained in popularity in recent years, which has made the need to prioritize available resources in order to meet demand even greater. For those reasons, FDOT encouraged the MPO to develop a transit priority list as a mechanism to implement the MPO's transit plans.

For 2010, the primary source of projects in the transit priority list was the MPO's Transit Development Plan (TDP) - Major Update. Since a major update of the TDP in 2008, the county has been implementing a number of TDP strategies, such as new service, new facilities, a bus wrap program, and adjustments to existing routes. In fact, the county recently implemented two of the MPO's top three priorities: providing new service in the West SR 60 corridor, which was made possible by an FDOT grant; and providing service on South Indian River Boulevard, which was also a CMP priority.

Many of the projects in the 2008 TDP, however, have not been implemented. Those projects form the basis of the transit priority list.

Priority Transit Projects

Ranking	Project	Unit Cost	Funding Source
1	Expand Operating hours to 7pm on Routes 1 - 4 & 8	\$101,794/yr	State/Federal
2	Make Vero Beach Intermodal Hub Improvements	\$50,000	State/Federal
3	Construct Shelters and Benches	\$60,000/yr	State/Federal
4	Expand Saturday Service Hours	\$114,113/yr	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 2010/11 - 2015/16.

Vero Beach Airport Priority Projects

1	Clear Part 77 Obstructions, Phase 2
2	Construct Operations Facility
3	Rehabilitate Runway 4/22
4	Airport Drive Improvements

5	Construct/Mark/Light West GA Apron, Phase 3
6	Airport Security Improvements, Phase 3
7	Airport Master Plan
8	Environmental Assessment Runway 4/22 Extension
9	Rehabilitate Taxiway A/E
10	Rehabilitate Taxiway B
11	Reconstruct/Mark/Light GA Apron
12	Construct North Apron Extension, Phase 1
13	Airport Business Park Improvements

Sebastian Airport Priority Projects

1	Airport Master Plan Update
2	Construct Corporate Hangers
3	Construct Main Street /Airport Drive East-West Access
4	Construct Taxiway C,D,E and install lighting

Conclusion

The six components of the Indian River County MPO's 2010 Priority Projects Report—the priority highway projects list, the priority regional/intermodal projects list, the priority CMP projects list, the priority enhancement 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. Before making decisions regarding the five priority projects lists, the MPO and its advisory committees considered public input.

At its meeting of September 8, 2010, the Indian River County MPO considered the 2010 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 2010 lists of priority highway, regional/intermodal, CMP, enhancement, transit, and airport projects.

APPENDIX Summary Tables and Reference Material

Table A-1 Priority Highway Projects, SIS Highways

Project Rank		Project Rank Location Roadway			tion	Length	Improvement	Jurisdiction	FDOT FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 Five Year Work Program		Funding Source	
2010	2009	2008	2007	Koadway	From	То	(miles)	Туре	Jurisdiction	FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	Requested
1	1	1	1	Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95	-	-	n/a	Add interchange	Federal	4130482	FY 12/13 PE \$2,200	State/Federal

Table A-2 Priority Highway Projects, Other Highways

	Project Rank		Roadway Location		ation	Length	Improvement	Jurisdiction		Γ FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 e Year Work Program	Funding Source	
2010	2009	2008	2007	Koadway	From	То	(miles)	Туре	Jurisdiction	FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	Requested
1	2	3	4	US 1	Highlands Drive	S. County Line	0.5	Widen from four to six lanes	State	2285832	FY 09/10 ROW \$3,694	State/Federal
2	3	4	-	82 nd Ave	26 th St	CR 510	7.0	New Road two lane undivided	County	2308791	FY 06/07 PE \$ 1,550	State/Federal

Table A-3
Priority Regional/Intermodal Projects

	Project Rank		Project	Location		Length	Improvement	Jurisdiction	FDOT FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 Five Year Work Program		Funding Source	
2010	2009	2008	2007	Troject	From	То	(miles)	Type	Jurisdiction	FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	Requested
1	-	-	-	FEC RR	Countywide		N/A	Station and Platform Improvements	FEC	n/a	No Phase Programmed	State only (TRIPS)
2	1	2	5	66th Avenue	CR 510	SR 60	7.5	Widen from two to four lanes	County	4258831	FY 11/12 CST \$2,000	State only (TRIPS)
3	2	3	1	CR 510	CR 512	US 1	5.82	Widen from two to four lanes	County	n/a	No Phase Programmed	State/Federal

Table A-4 CMP Priority Projects

37 th Street (US 1	Add right turn lanes at major intersections and driveways					
to Indian River Boulevard)	Add bus shelters					
,	Intersection improvements at 37 th and Indian River Boulevard					
Indian River	Extend right turn lanes at Vero Isles and other driveways					
Boulevard (17 th Street to Merrill	Connect 5 th Avenue to the Miracle Mile Shopping Center					
Barber Bridge)	Increase transit headways on Route 1					

Table A-5
Priority Enhancement Projects

Project Rank	Rank Prioriti-		Loc	ation	Length		Jurisdiction	_	Γ FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 e Year Work Program	Funding Source
2010	Score	Roadway	From	То	(miles)	Туре	Carigateusii	FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	Requested
1	83	South Sebastian	Thunderbird Drive	Kildare Drive		Pave Trails, Add Trail Infrastructure	City	n/a	No Phase Programmed	State/Federal
2	77.29 Airport Loop Trail / Aviation US 1 Blvd		43 rd Ave	1.5	Pave Trails, Add Trail Infrastructure	City	n/a	No Phase Programmed	State/Federal	

Table A-6

2010 Enhancement Prioritization

				Crite	ria			
Projects	Transportation (15)	System Connectivity (20)	Regional Benefits (15)	Multiple Use (10)	Agency Support (20)	Cost (10)	Constructability (10)	Total (100)
South Sebastian Trail	15	20	15	8	10	10	5	83
Airport Loop Trail	11	18.57	10.14	6.86	16.57	7.14	7	77.29

Table A-7
Priority Transit Projects

Ranking	Project	Unit Cost	Funding Source
1	Expand Operating hours to 7pm on Routes 1 - 4 & 8	\$101,794/yr	State/Federal
2	Provide service on South Indian River Boulevard	\$294,512/yr	State/Federal
3	Vero Beach Intermodal Hub Improvements	\$50,000	State/Federal
4	Shelters and Benches Program	\$60,000/yr	State/Federal
5	Expand Saturday Service Hours	\$114,113/yr	State/Federal

Table A-8
Priority Aviation Projects for Vero Beach Airport

1	Clear Part 77 Obstructions, Phase 2
2	Construct Operations Facility
3	Rehabilitate Runway 4/22
4	Airport Drive Improvements
5	Construct/Mark/Light West GA Apron, Phase 3
6	Airport Security Improvements, Phase 3
7	Airport Master Plan
8	Environmental Assessment Runway 4/22 Extension
9	Rehabilitate Taxiway A/E
10	Rehabilitate Taxiway B
11	Reconstruct/Mark/Light GA Apron
12	Construct North Apron Extension, Phase 1
13	Airport Business Park Improvements

Table A-9
Priority Aviation Projects for Sebastian Airport

1	Airport Master Plan Update
2	Construct Corporate Hangers
3	Construct Main Street /Airport Drive East-West Access
4	Construct Taxiway C,D,E and install lighting

Table A-10 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, Cost Affordable Plan Phase 1: 2011 to 2020

	On Street	From	То	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
	SR 60	I-95	82ND AVE	4 Lane Divided	6 Lane Divided	\$8,119,445
State	US 1	S. COUNTY LINE	OSLO RD	4 Lane Divided	6 Lane Divided	\$12,064,823
S	Congestion Manageme	nt System Projects ((\$500 thousand per year	r)		\$5,000,000
	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
श्च	58TH AVE	S COUNTY LINE/K	OSLO RD	2 Lane Undivided	4 Lane Divided	\$11,850,325
County Roads	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 Manageme	nt System Projects ((\$500 thousand per year	r)		\$5,000,000
				State SIS (Strated)	c Intermodal System)	
Totals	Other State Roads					
						\$232,480,965
					City Roads	\$0 \$367 584 233
	l				IOIAL	a307 584 Z.

Phase 2: 2021 to 2030

SR 60 6TH AVE INDIAN RIVER BLVD 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided 51,8	Cost
US 1 AVIATION BLVD OLD DIXIE HWY (N) 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$44,3 US 1 ROSELAND RD N. COUNTY LINE 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$5,4 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,6 TH AVE	43,842
Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,0 4TH ST 98TH AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$16,0 13TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 13TH ST SW 43RD AVE 34TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,0 13TH ST SW 34TH AVE 27TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,0 13TH ST SW 27TH AVE 20TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,0 17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 26TH ST 82ND AVE 74TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 43RD AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 53RD ST 82ND AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE OSLO RD 4TH ST 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSL	64,758
Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,0 4TH ST 98TH AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$16,0 13TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 13TH ST SW 43RD AVE 34TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,0 13TH ST SW 34TH AVE 27TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,0 13TH ST SW 27TH AVE 20TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,0 17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 26TH ST 82ND AVE 74TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 43RD AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 53RD ST 82ND AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,2,0 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE OSLO RD 4TH ST 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSL	72,047
### ATH ST	55,518
13TH ST SW	00,000
13TH ST SW	62,035
13TH ST SW 34TH AVE 27TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,3 13TH ST SW 27TH AVE 20TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,6 17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,6 26TH ST 82ND AVE 74TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,8 43RD AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$12,8 53RD ST 82ND AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$9,8 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 66TH AVE OSLO RD 4TH ST 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$8,8 66TH AVE 4TH ST SR 60 2 Lane Divided 4 Lane Divided \$8,8 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$7,7 82ND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$2,8 11,0 1NDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,6 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 12,6 12,6 13,7 14,6 15,7 16,7 16,7 17,7 17,7 18,7 1	41,388
13TH ST SW 27TH AVE 20TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$1,5	60,899
17TH ST SW 66TH AVE 58TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$4,0 26TH ST 82ND AVE 74TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,0 43RD AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$12,9 53RD ST 82ND AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$9,0 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,0 66TH AVE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,0 66TH AVE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,0 66TH AVE OSLO RD 4TH ST 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$8,0 66TH AVE 4TH ST SR 60 2 Lane Divided 4 Lane Divided \$8,0 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$7,0 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$7,0 82ND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28,0 LACONIA ST C.R. 510 CONCHA DR N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$11,0 INDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,0 ROSELAND RD ROSELAN	59,684
26TH ST 82ND AVE 74TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$3,8 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$12,9 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$9,8 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 AND AVE ATH ST SR 60 2 Lane Divided 4 Lane Divided \$8,8 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8 AND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$7,3 AND AVE 2 COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28,8 AND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28,8 AND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$11,0 AND AVE 2 COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided	22,225
43RD AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$12,9 53RD ST 82ND AVE 66TH AVE N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$9,9 66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,6 66TH AVE OSLO RD 4TH ST 2 Lane Undivided 4 Lane Divided \$8,6 66TH AVE 4TH ST SR 60 2 Lane Divided 4 Lane Divided \$8,8 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$7,3 82ND AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28, 82ND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28, LACONIA ST C.R. 510 CONCHA DR N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$11,0 INDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,6 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,6	19,519
66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8	50,481
66TH AVE S COUNTY LINE OSLO RD N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$8,8	74,563
SR 60	99,620
SR 60	62,423
SR 60 2 Lane Divided 4 Lane Divided 58,8	87,466
82ND AVE 26TH ST C.R. 510 N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$28,1 LACONIA ST C.R. 510 CONCHA DR N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$11,0 INDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,6 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,6	53,565
LACONIA ST C.R. 510 CONCHA DR N/A 2 Lane Undivided \$11,0 INDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,6 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,0	02,941
INDIAN RIVER BLVD ROYAL PALM 37TH ST 4 Lane Divided 6 Lane Divided \$8,6 ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,6	74,165
ROSELAND RD C.R. 512 U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$12,6 Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,0	76,344
Congestion Management System Projects (\$500 thousand per year) \$5,0	78,255
	47,897
	00,000
BARBER ST SCHUMANN DR U.S. 1 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$3,6	21,587
BARBER ST C.R. 512 SCHUMANN DR 2 Lane Undivided 2 Lane Divided \$7,5	96,306
	38,861
	43.842
Other State Roads \$56.4	92.323
9 Other State Roads \$56.4 County Roads \$156.0 City Roads \$156.0 City Roads \$15.0	73 470 56.754
City Roads \$16.0	

Removed from LRTP in 2008

15

Table A-11

Regionally Ranked 2030 Needs Projects

Regional Project Prioritization Indian River, St. Lucie and Martin MPOs Table 3 (Summary Table)

					Cost Feasible	
				Total Lanes	Sit St	Technical
Project	From	То	Improvement	Fotal Lane:	Cost	Score
Tri-Rail Extension	Stuart	Palm Beach County	New Commuter Rall		N O II	36
U.S. 1	Roseland Rd	N. County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	27
Indian Street Bridge Pri	FL Turnpike	Willoughby Rd	Add 2-4 Lanes/New Bridge	6	Ý	26
Stuart-WPB Express	Stuart	Palm Beach County	New Express Route	-	N	25
FixedRoute to IRC	Ft. Pierce	Indian River County	New Fixed Route	-	N	25
Jenkins Rd.	Midway	Edwards Rd	Add 2-4 Lanes/Bridge	4	Y	24
U.S. 1	Aviation Blvd	Old Dixle Hwy (N)	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	24
Indian River Bivd	Royal Palm	37th St	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	24
Crosstown Parkway	Floresta Dr	US 1	New 6 Lane Bridge	6	N	23
FL Turnpike	Okeechobee County Line	Martin County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	23
S.R. 60 US 1	I-95 Edwards Rd	82nd Ave Midway Rd	Add 2 Lanes Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	23 22
Jenkins Rd.	Okeechobee Rd	Edwards Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Ý	21
I-95	FL Turnpike [in Martin Co]	Palm Beach County Line	Add 2 Lanes	8	N	21
Martin Downs Blvd	High Meadows Ave	Kanner Hwy	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	21
US 1	Jensen Beach Blvd	North of Roosevelt Bridge	Add 2 Lanes	8	N	21
Midway Rd	1-95	Selvitz Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	20
Rangeline Rd	Glades Cut Off	Martin County Line	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	20
US 1	Indian River County Line	Juanita Ave.	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	20
FL Turnpike	St. Lucie County Line	Palm Beach County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	20
S.R. 60	98th Ave	I-95	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	20
U.S. 1	S. County Line	Osio Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	20
66th Ave	SR 60	C.R. 510	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	20
25th Street	Virginia Ave	Edwards Rd.	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	19
Kings Hwy (South)	Angle Rd 25th Street	Okeechobee Rd US 1	Add 2 Lanes Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	19 19
Midway Rd C.R. 512	Felismere City Limits	I-95	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	19
C.R. 512	I-95	C.R. 510	Add 2 Lanes	6	Ý	19
Orange Ave	Kings Highway	Jenkins Road	Add 4 Lanes	6	N	18
SR 714	Western Palm City Corridor	Martin Downs Blvd	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	18
1-95	S. County Line	N. County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	18
C.R. 510	C.R. 512	U.S. 1	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	18
C.R. 510	U.S. 1	ICWW	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	18
Okeechobee Rd	FL Turnpike	McNell Rd	Add 4 Lanes	6	N	17
Orange Ave	Jenkins Road	25th Street	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	17
Indrio Rd	Emerson Avenue	Kings Highway	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	16
Kings Hwy (Middle)	Indrio Rd	Angle Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	16
Okeechobee Rd SR 710	McNell Rd Okeechobee County Line	Virginia Ave Aliapattah Rd / CR 609	Add 2 Lanes Add 2 Lanes	6	N N	16 16
25th Street	US 1	Orange Ave	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	15
Jenkins Rd.	Angle Rd	Okeechobee Rd	Add 2-4 Lanes	4	Y	15
Midway Rd	Selvitz Rd	25th Street	Add 2 Lanes	4	Ý	15
Port St Lucie Blvd	Gatlin Rd	Becker Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	15
Walton Rd	Lennard Rd	Green River Pkwy	Add 2 Lanes	4	Ý	15
SR 76	US 441	SR 710	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	15
SR 76	SR 710	CR 711	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	15
58th Ave	S County Line/Koblegard Rd	Oslo Rd	New 4 Lane	4	Y	15
Keen Rd	Angle Road	St. Lucie Blvd	Add 4 Lanes/New Bridge	4	N	14
Bridge Rd	CR 711	CR A1A	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	14
SR 76	CR 711	Monterey Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	14
US 1 27th Ave	Bridge Rd	Palm Beach County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6 4	N Y	14 14
	Osio Rd	S.R. 60	Add 2 Lanes		_	
Edwards Rd Glades Cut-Off Rd	Jenkins Rd Reserve Blvd	25th Street Selvitz Road	Add 2 Lanes/Bridge Add 2 Lanes	4	N N	13 13
Cove Rd	SR 76	US 1	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	13
27th Ave	S. County Line	Osio Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	13
43rd Ave	Osio Rd	8th St	Add 2 Lanes	4		13
25th Street South	Midway Rd	Edwards Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	12
Midway Rd	Okeechobee Rd	I-95	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	12
Okeechobee Rd	Brocksmith Rd	Fiorida's Turnpike	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	12
US 1	Midway Rd	Walton Rd	Add 2 Lanes	8	N	12
High Meadow Ave	Martin Hwy	I-95	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	12
SR 710	Kanner Hwy / CR 726	Palm Beach County Line	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	12
43rd Ave	S County Line	Oslo Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	12
Shinn Rd	Orange Ave	Glades Cut Off	New 2 Lane	2	N N	11
St Lucie Blvd/Immokolee CR 609	Emerson Ave St Lucie Co Line	25th Street SR 714	Add 2 Lanes Add 2 Lanes	4	N N	11
US 1	Osprey St	Bridge Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	11
S.R. 60	6th Ave	Indian River Bivd	Add 2 Lanes	6		11
82nd Ave	S County Line	Oslo Rd	New 2 Lane	2		11

Table A-12

	IRC Greenways:				
Project Prioritization					
Criteria	Points	Maximum Score			
Transportation : Increases the use of non-motorized travel to destinations within 0.5 mile of the proposed corridor.	Access to Schools: 0-3 points max Access to Employment and Retail: 0-3 Access to Parks & Recreation: 0-3 Access to Transit: 0-3 Access to Residential Neighborhoods: 0-3	15			
System Connectivity: Provides an essential link in creating a continuous greenway system within the study area.	Provides an essential link in the proposed network; without this link, the system could not be completed: 15-20 points Important as a 'stand alone project, but not critical to the overall system: 5-15 points A long-term element and potential future link in the system: 0-5 points	20			
Quality of Life Benefits: Project will provide quality of life benefits to the residents, visitors and businesses of Indian River County.	Increases Tourism visits from outside of the County: 0-3 points max Connects people to Conservation Lands: 0-3 Potential to attract / retain businesses: 0-3 Increases Public Health / Fitness: 0-3 Improves Traffic Safety: 0-3	15			
Multiple Use: Allows for a variety of trail users	Bicyclists: 0-3 points max Pedestrians / Runners: 0-3 Water Trail: 0-2 Equestrian: 0-2	10			
Agency Support: Project is supported by the organization(s) responsible for its implementation and management	Project has full agency support (15-20 points) Project has potential to receive agency support (5-15) Project is not likely to receive support (0-5)	20			
Cost: Project can be implemented within the unit costs provided based on identified opportunities and constraints	Project can be implemented within the following range of unit costs: Less than \$200k / mile (8-10 points max) \$200k - \$500k / mile (3-7 points) Greater than \$500k / mile (0-2 points)	10			
Constructability: Project is ready to be advanced to design and construction	Project presents significant constraints to construction (0-2 points) Project requires further study but has the potential to be advanced (3-7 points) Project is feasible and ready for implementation (8-10 points max)	10			

Table A-13 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 2009 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-14

Definitions Used in the 2010 Priority Projects Report

Pro	ject	PI	has	es

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)

LRTP Long Range Transportation Plan

PLEMO Planning and Environmental Management Office (FDOT planning

study)

SAFETEA-LU Safe, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users