

**2016**

**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 Transportation Alternatives Projects .....8  
Priority Transit Projects ..... 11  
Priority Airport Projects.....11  
Conclusion .....12

**Appendix  
Summary Tables and Reference Material**

Table A-1 – Priority Highway Projects, SIS Highways .....14  
Table A-2 – Priority Highways Projects, Other Highways.....14  
Table A-3 – Priority Highways Projects, Regional Highways .....14  
Table A-4 – CMP Priority Projects.....15  
Table A-5 – Priority Transportation Alternatives Projects.....15  
Table A-6 – Priority Transit Projects.....15  
Table A-7 – Priority Aviation Projects for Vero Beach Airport.....16  
Table A-8 – Priority Aviation Projects for Sebastian Airport .....16  
Table A-9 – Long Range Transportation Plan, 2040 Cost Affordable Plan.....17  
Table A-10 – Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, 2040 Needs Plan .....18  
Table A-11 – Definitions used in the 2016 Priority Projects Report.....19

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
2016 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 2016 priority projects lists. Those 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 2021/22) of its FY 2017/18-2021/22 Five Year Work Program.

As it did in 2015, the MPO has developed lists for priority highway, congestion management process, transportation alternatives (formerly enhancement), transit, and aviation projects. With respect to highway projects, the MPO divided the highway priorities list into three categories, roughly mirroring three major available funding sources: Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects; Regional Highway projects; and Other Highway projects.

**PRIORITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS**

This section explains the specific methodology utilized to prepare the MPO's 2016 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 is also provided.

The primary input used in developing the 2016 list of priority highway projects was the MPO's adopted 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Besides the 2040 LRTP, routine system monitoring and discussions with staff from other MPOs, local governments, and FDOT were also used as inputs in developing the list.

As in past years, the LRTP (Table A-9 of the Appendix) was used as the primary basis in developing the 2016 priority highway projects list. The reasons for this include:

- federal 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 2030 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 2015 priority highway projects list and compared those projects to FDOT's current (FY 2016/17 - 2020/21) adopted Five Year Work Program. Finally, meetings and discussions with municipal, County, and FDOT staff provided additional information utilized in preparing the 2016 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 three categories: SIS Highways, Regional Highways and Other Highways.

### **SIS Highways**

In Indian River County, the Strategic Intermodal System consists of I-95, the Florida Turnpike, and SR 60 West of I-95 to Osceola County. Generally, projects on the SIS serve an interstate and inter-regional function and carry high volumes of traffic and goods across long distances. Through its five year work program, FDOT allocates funding specifically for Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects based on various factors, including local input into the SIS funding prioritization process. This year's top SIS project in Indian River County remains the Oslo Road Interchange at I-95.

### **Regional Highways**

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

In order to qualify for TRIP funding, the MPO engaged in a number of actions. Those 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. The results of that prioritization,

which were subsequently adopted by the TCTC and all three MPOs, are contained in Table A-10 of this report.

According to state regulations, a TRIP funded project phase may not begin until the TRIP funds have been allocated by FDOT. In addition, the project must be at least 50% funded with local money. 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 were ranked and approved by the TCTC. According to FDOT, funds will be awarded to eligible priority projects that are construction ready. The MPO is once again requesting funding for last year's top Regional Highway priority, the 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue widening project.

### **Other Highways**

Non-SIS roadways for which the MPO is seeking federal and state funding are included on the Other Highways priority list. This year's top priority is the widening of County Road 510 (66<sup>th</sup> Avenue – CR 512). The project was formerly the MPO's top priority. However, in 2005, the project was removed from the federal funding process so that the project could advance more quickly using local funds. Those local funds, which were largely from growth-related sources such as impact fees, have dwindled in recent years. Nonetheless, the County was able to accelerate a portion of the original project (widening CR 510 from 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue to US 1). Because the project west of 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not have any funding the MPO has identified the four-laning of CR 510 (58<sup>th</sup> Avenue – CR 512) as its top Other Highways priority.

With respect to the two-laning of 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Indian River County installed asphalt millings on the section of 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue between 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 69<sup>th</sup> Street. This surface has been effective given expected volumes of traffic in the near term. North of 69<sup>th</sup> Street, however, there is neither an unpaved road nor available ROW. Therefore, the MPO is requesting that FDOT proceed with the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project between 69<sup>th</sup> Street and CR 510 and has identified this roadway as its second Other Highways priority.

The complete list of highway priorities is included as Tables A-1 through A-3 in the Appendix. That list is consistent with the 2040 LRTP interim year project sets, as well as local comprehensive plans, MPO plans, and FDOT's work program. A summary description and ranking of each project is presented below.

### ***2016 List of Priority Highway Projects – SIS***

**Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95** – The project was included in the MPO's 2040 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.

***2016 List of Candidate TRIP Grant Priority Highway Projects – Regional***

**66th Avenue from 49<sup>th</sup> Street to CR 510** - This project is the second phase of a project that involves four laning 66th Avenue from CR 510 to SR 60. This roadway serves as the primary connector between Sebastian and the SR 60 commercial area near the Indian River Mall, one of the County's largest employment locations. Construction funding is requested for the unbuilt portions of the project.

***2016 List of Priority Highway Projects – Other***

- 1. CR 510, four laning from CR 512 to 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue** - This project is included as one of the highest priority projects in the MPO's 2040 LRTP. The CR 510 corridor is rapidly approaching capacity and will experience LOS problems in the near future. The Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) phase is underway and right-of-way funds are programmed in 2020/21.
- 2. 82nd Avenue, two laning from 69<sup>th</sup> Street to CR 510** - The MPO's 2040 LRTP includes a project to construct 82nd Avenue as a two lane facility from 69<sup>th</sup> Street to CR 510. Asphalt millings have been installed on the section of the project between 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 69<sup>th</sup> Street, which may forestall the need for paving this section. Right-of-way funds are programmed in 2019/20 and construction funding is requested.
- 3. Oslo Road, four laning from 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-95** - This project is a continuation of two recently completed widening projects (the four-laning of Oslo Road from 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and the four-laning of Oslo Road from 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue). The widening of Oslo Road from 58<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-95, in conjunction with a proposed I-95 interchange at Oslo Road, will alleviate anticipated congestion and capacity issues on Oslo Road. Right-of-way funds are programmed in 2020/21.
- 4. US 1, six laning from 53<sup>rd</sup> Street to CR 510** - The widening of US 1 from 53<sup>rd</sup> Street to CR 510 addresses a future capacity deficiency. Design funds have been allocated in 2016/17. Right-of-way and Construction funding is requested for this project.
- 5. 82nd Avenue, two laning from 26<sup>th</sup> Street to 69<sup>th</sup> Street** - The MPO's 2040 LRTP includes a project to construct 82nd Avenue as a two lane facility from 26<sup>th</sup> Street to 69<sup>th</sup> Street. Asphalt millings have been installed on the section of the project between 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 69<sup>th</sup> Street, which may forestall the need for paving that section. Right-of-way and Construction funding is requested to construct the project from 26<sup>th</sup> Street to 69<sup>th</sup> Street.

***Conclusion***

As structured, the MPO's 2016 List of Priority Highway Projects identifies only those projects for which state and/or federal funding is requested. As indicated in the MPO's 2040 LRTP, many of the plan's cost-feasible roadway improvements will be funded with local revenues and constructed by the County or local municipalities. Therefore, the priority highway

projects list includes only those roadway projects which require state or federal funds and which are multi-million dollar, multi-year projects.

**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 2004, 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.

In 2016, staff performed a CMP analysis in order to identify candidate CMP projects. Through that process, staff identified the most congested corridors in the county based on existing and vested trips. Next, staff eliminated those corridors which are programmed in the short term for widening. Finally, staff eliminated those corridors which had already been evaluated through the CMP process.

Once the initial screening process was complete, MPO staff evaluated the most congested corridors and subjected them to a second screening process to identify appropriate CMP strategies. As a result, the top CMP priority corridors for 2016 are:

1. 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue from the South County line to 12<sup>th</sup> Street
2. CR 510 from US Highway 1 to CR 512
3. Highway A1A from the South City of Vero Beach limit to Fred Turk Drive
4. Barber Street from US Highway 1 to CR 512

The 2016 priority CMP corridors and strategies are as follows:

Corridor	Strategy
27th Avenue from the South County line to 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	Add turn lanes / signal improvements at 17 <sup>th</sup> Street SW and 21 <sup>st</sup> Street SW
CR 510 from US Highway 1 to CR 512	Add turn lane on CR 510 at 58th Avenue
Highway A1A from the S. City of Vero Beach Limit to Fred Turk Drive	Lengthen right-hand turn lanes on south bound Highway A1A at SR 60 (Barber Bridge) and 17 <sup>th</sup> Street
Barber Street from US Highway 1 to CR 512	Add traffic signals at Concha and Joy Haven Drive

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 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES**

Funded with ten percent of Surface Transportation Program allocations, the Transportation Alternatives program focuses on improvements that complement the transportation system. In Florida, TA funds are allocated to each FDOT district, which then determines how these funds will be distributed among the MPOs in its jurisdiction. For the 2016 TA funding cycle, FDOT District Four will allocate approximately \$461,618.78 to the Indian River County MPO. These funds will likely become available in FY 19/20.

The 2016 Transportation Alternatives project prioritization process began in January 2016. At that time, the MPO notified eligible TA project sponsors and other interested groups of the opportunity to apply for TA funds. For the 2016 project cycle, two TA project applications were submitted to MPO staff.

These projects were then evaluated using the MPO’s adopted TA priority criteria. The results of the ranking process are reflected on Table 3.

Table 1  
Submitted Transportation Projects

Rank	Proposed Project	Project Sponsor	Project Type
1	Construction of a sidewalk on 43rd Avenue from Airport West Drive to 41st Street	IRC Public Works	Bike/Ped.
2	Construction of a sidewalk on S. Broadway Street from Massachusetts Avenue to CR 512	City Of Fellsmere	Bike/Ped.

**Methodology**

The methodology used to rank the TA project applications is described below. It is important to note that, because TA projects complement or enhance the transportation system rather than meet a specific transportation need, prioritizing TA 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, TA project prioritization is less objective. Because TA projects encompass a wide variety of eligible activities, it is difficult to objectively compare different types of TA projects. Therefore, the MPO has devised a methodology to rank different kinds of projects on a fair and equitable basis. 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.

**Bike/Ped and Comprehensive Plan Priority** - This criterion measures the importance/need for a 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 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 new money.

**Ability to Expand / Extend Adjacent Network** - This criterion was developed to reward projects that extend the physical limits of previous projects, thereby providing system-wide continuity for the bike/ped network.

**Cost Per Mile Efficiency** - Cost of the project on a per-mile basis is included as a criterion to maximize the use of resources.

**School Zone Safety** - This criterion was developed to prioritize projects that promote school-zone safety.

**Production Readiness** – This criterion rewards projects that are production ready.

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  
Transportation Alternatives Project Scoring Criteria

Criterion	Scoring
Adjacent Roadway Volume (2014 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 (\$)	<p>&lt;\$200,000 = 5                  \$200,000 - \$400,000 = 3                  &gt;\$400,000 = 1</p>
School Zone Safety	<p>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</p>
Production Readiness	<p>Construction begins within 0-6 months of funding = 5                  Construction begins within 6-12 months of funding = 3                  Construction begins after 12 months of funding = 1</p>

The methodology used to rank the 2016 TA projects consisted of two parts. First, background information was obtained in order to evaluate each project as to how it meets the TA 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. The resulting scores are contained in Table 3, along with a final tally of points awarded to each candidate project.

Table 3  
 Transportation Alternatives Project Background Information

Criterion	S. Broadway Street Sidewalk Project	43 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue Sidewalk Project
Adjacent Roadway Volume (2014 AADT)	1	3
Bike/Ped/Comp Plan Priority	3	5
Ability to Leverage Other Funding	5	5
Continuous Adjacent Network	5	5
Cost/Mile (\$)	1	1
School Zone Safety	5	3
Production Readiness	3	3
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>

The following is a ranking by score of the 2016 Transportation Alternatives candidate projects:

1. 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Sidewalk Project
2. S. Broadway Street Sidewalk Project

**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 has 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 it necessary to prioritize available resources in order to meet demand. For those reasons, FDOT encouraged the MPO to develop a transit priority list as a mechanism to implement the MPO's transit plans.

For 2016, 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 2013, the county has been implementing a number of TDP strategies, including new service, new facilities, and adjustments to existing routes. In fact, the county has implemented several of the MPO's top priorities in recent years. Those priorities include expanding service hours on weekdays, providing hourly service to the IRSC Main Campus in Ft. Pierce, and establishing an employee shuttle on the barrier island. Below are the MPO's 2016 Priority Transit Projects:

**PRIORITY TRANSIT PROJECTS**

Ranking	Project	Funding Source
1	Construct Main Bus Hub	State/Federal
2	Expand M-F Operating Hours (6am - 8pm)	State/Federal
3	Expand Saturday Operating Hours (9am - 5pm)	State/Federal
4	Construct Shelters and Benches	Federal

The expansion of operating hours will require additional state and/or federal funding including a local match, while the construction of shelters and benches is an ongoing effort requiring no new funding source.

**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 2016.

**Vero Beach Airport Priority Projects**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Cost</b>
1. Rehabilitate Taxiway C construction (2017)	\$4,510,000
2. Extend/M/L TWY E East of RWY 4 (2017)	\$2,000,000
3. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2017)	\$27,000.00
4. Airfield Security Improvements – Airline Service (2017)	\$625,000.00
5. Reconstruct North Apron (2018)	\$1,875,000
6. Terminal Building Renovations – Airline Service (2018)	\$5,000,000
7. Construct Aviation Hangers and Ramp – TWY E (2018)	\$3,000,000
8. Rehabilitate T-Hanger Buildings (2018)	\$1,875,000
9. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2018)	\$32,000
10. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2019)	\$32,000
11. Rehabilitate Utilities Citrus Park Village MHP (2019)	\$300,000
12. Reconstruct Center Apron – Phase 1 (2019)	\$2,000,000
13. Rehabilitate RWY 12R-30L (Design)(2020)	\$500,000
14. Rehabilitate Taxiway B(2020)	\$1,200,000
15. Rehabilitate Runway 12R-30L (Construction)(2021)	\$4,500,000
16. Rehabilitate Southwest Apron(2021)	\$1,500,000

**Sebastian Airport Priority Projects**

1. Construct Hanger ‘C’ (2017)
2. Taxiway expansion (2018/2019)

**Conclusion**

The five components of the Indian River County MPO’s 2016 Priority Projects Report—the priority highway projects list, the priority CMP projects list, the priority Transportation Alternatives project list, the priority transit projects list, and the priority airport projects list—will be reviewed by the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and by the MPO Board. Opportunities for public comment are

available at the TAC, CAC, and MPO meetings. Before making decisions regarding the five priority projects lists, the MPO and its advisory committees will consider public input.

**APPENDIX  
Summary Tables and Reference Material**

**Table A-1  
Priority Highway Projects, SIS Highways**

Project Rank				Roadway	Location		Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Jurisdiction	FDOT FY 2016/17 – 2020/21 Five Year Work Program		Funding Source Requested
2016	2015	2014	2013		From	To				FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	
1	1	1	1	Oslo Road Interchange at Interstate 95	-	-	n/a	Add interchange	Federal	4130482	ROW \$10,000 2021/25	State/Federal

**Table A-2  
Priority Highway Projects, Other Highways**

Project Rank				Roadway	Location		Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Jurisdiction	FDOT FY 2016/17 – 2020/21 Five Year Work Program		Funding Source Requested
2016	2015	2014	2013		From	To				FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	
1	1	1	1	CR 510	58 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	CR 512	4.2	Widen to 4 lanes	County	N/A	ROW \$4,200 (2020/21)	State/Federal
2	2	2	1	82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	69 <sup>th</sup> Street	CR 510	2.0	New 2 lanes	County	N/A	ROW \$2,300 (2019/20)	State/Federal
3	3	3	2	Oslo Road	I-95	58 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	3.0	Widening to four lane divided	County	N/A	ROW \$1,000 (2020/21)	State/Federal
4	4	4	3	US1	53 <sup>rd</sup> Street	CR 510	4.0	Widen to 6 lane divided Hwy	State	N/A	PE \$1,900 (2016/17)	State/Federal
5	5	5	1	82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	26 <sup>th</sup> Street	69 <sup>th</sup> Street	3.0	New 2 lanes	County	N/A	N/A	State/Federal

**Table A-3  
Priority Regional Highways**

Project Rank				Project	Location		Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Jurisdiction	FDOT FY 2016/17 – 2020/21 Five Year Work Program		Funding Source Requested
2016	2015	2014	2013		From	To				FI/FM #	Programmed Improvements (\$000s)	
1	1	1	1	66th Avenue	CR 510	49 <sup>th</sup> Street	4.5	Widen from two to four lanes	County	4258831	N/A	State only (TRIPS)

**Table A-4  
CMP Priority Projects**

<b>Corridor</b>	<b>Strategy</b>
27th Avenue from the South County line to 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	Add turn lanes / signal improvements at 17 <sup>th</sup> Street SW and 21 <sup>st</sup> Street SW
CR 510 from US Highway 1 to CR 512	Add turn lane on CR 510 at 58th Avenue
Highway A1A from the S. City of Vero Beach Limit to Fred Turk Drive	Lengthen right-hand turn lanes on south bound Highway A1A at SR 60 (Barber Bridge) and 17 <sup>th</sup> Street
Barber Street from US Highway 1 to CR 512	Add traffic signals at Concha and Joy Haven Drive

**Table A-5  
Priority Transportation Alternatives Projects**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Type</b>
1	Construction of a sidewalk on 43rd Avenue from Airport West Drive to 41st Street	IRC Public Works	Bike/Ped.
2	Construction of a sidewalk on S. Broadway Street from Massachusetts Avenue to CR 512	City Of Fellsmere	Bike/Ped.

**Table A-6  
Priority Transit Projects**

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>
1	Construct Main Bus Hub	State/Federal
2	Expand M–F Operating Hours (6am - 8pm)	State/Federal
3	Expand Saturday Operating Hours (9am – 5pm)	State/Federal
4	Construct Shelters and Benches	Federal

**Table A-7  
Priority Aviation Projects for Vero Beach Airport**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Cost</b>
1. Rehabilitate Taxiway C construction (2017)	\$4,510,000
2. Extend/M/L TWY E East of RWY 4 (2017)	\$2,000,000
3. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2017)	\$27,000.00
4. Airfield Security Improvements – Airline Service (2017)	\$625,000.00
5. Reconstruct North Apron (2018)	\$1,875,000
6. Terminal Building Renovations – Airline Service (2018)	\$5,000,000
7. Construct Aviation Hangers and Ramp – TWY E (2018)	\$3,000,000
8. Rehabilitate T-Hanger Buildings (2018)	\$1,875,000
9. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2018)	\$32,000
10. Fleet Vehicle Purchase (2019)	\$32,000
11. Rehabilitate Utilities Citrus Park Village MHP (2019)	\$300,000
12. Reconstruct Center Apron – Phase 1 (2019)	\$2,000,000
13. Rehabilitate RWY 12R-30L (Design)(2020)	\$500,000
14. Rehabilitate Taxiway B(2020)	\$1,200,000
15. Rehabilitate Runway 12R-30L (Construction)(2021)	\$4,500,000
16. Rehabilitate Southwest Apron(2021)	\$1,500,000

**Table A-8  
Priority Aviation Projects for Sebastian Airport**

1. Construct Hanger 'C' (2017)
2. Taxiway expansion (2018/2019)



**Table A-9  
2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, Cost Affordable Plan**

PROJECT	LIMITS FROM	LIMITS TO	DESCRIPTION	PHASE 1 2015 - 2020			PHASE 2 2021 - 2025			PHASE 3 2026 - 2030			PHASE 4 2031 - 2040			COST (YOE) (in millions)
				Pre-Eng	ROW	CST	Pre-Eng	ROW	CST	Pre-Eng	ROW	CST	Pre-Eng	ROW	CST	
I-95 at Oslo Road			New Interchange	✓			✓	✓							\$37.8	
US 1 <sup>1</sup>	53rd Street	CR 510	Widen from 4L to 6L	✓			✓	✓					✓		\$145.3	
CR 510	CR 512	66th Avenue	Widen from 2L to 4L	✓			✓	✓							\$38.0	
CR 510	66th Avenue	55th Avenue	Widen from 2L to 4L				✓	✓	✓						\$22.1	
CR 510	55th Avenue	Intracoastal Waterway	Widen from 2L to 4L		✓		✓	✓	✓						\$22.6	
CR 512	Willow Street	I-95	Widen from 2L to 4L										✓	✓	\$39.5	
CR 512	I-95	CR 510	Widen from 4L to 6L										✓	✓	\$42.9	
12th Street <sup>1</sup>	58th Avenue	74th Avenue	New 2L Facility										✓		\$30.8	
26th Street/Aviation Blvd <sup>2</sup>	66th Avenue	US 1	Widen from 2L to 4L							✓	✓				\$39.1	
43rd Avenue	26th Street	16th Street	Widen from 2L to 4L							✓	✓	✓			\$18.9	
43rd Avenue	16th Street	Oslo Road	Widen from 2L to 4L										✓	✓	\$48.2	
53rd Street	58th Avenue	66th Avenue	New 2L Facility							✓	✓	✓			\$11.1	
53rd Street	66th Avenue	82nd Avenue	New 2L Facility										✓	✓	\$27.0	
66th Avenue	49th Street	81st Street	Widen from 2L to 4L		✓		✓	✓	✓						\$42.9	
66th Avenue	81st Street	Barber Street	Widen from 2L to 4L							✓	✓	✓			\$17.3	
74th Avenue	12th Street	Oslo Road	New 2L Facility										✓	✓	\$35.2	
82nd Avenue <sup>2</sup>	26th Street	69th Street	New 2L Facility										✓	✓	\$61.8	
82nd Avenue <sup>2</sup>	69th Street	Laconia Street	New 2L Facility		✓										\$24.6	
Oslo Road	58th Avenue	I-95	Widen from 2L to 4L	✓									✓	✓	\$48.9	

1. Partially funded  
 • US 1 – Funded \$23.3 M, Unfunded \$122 M  
 • 12th Street – Funded \$1.5 M, Unfunded \$29.3 M

2. Design phase is complete

Pre-Eng = Preliminary Engineering (Design and Project Development and Environment)  
 ROW = Right-of-Way  
 CST = Construction

Table A-10

## Regionally Ranked 2030 Needs Projects

## Regional Project Prioritization

Indian River, St. Lucie and Martin MPOs

Table 3 (Summary Table)

Project	From	To	Improvement	Total Lanes	Cost Feasible	Technical Score
Tri-Rail Extension	Stuart	Palm Beach County	New Commuter Rail	-	N	36
U.S. 1	Roseland Rd	N. County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	27
Indian Street Bridge Prj	FL Turnpike	Willoughby Rd	Add 2-4 Lanes/New Bridge	6	Y	26
Stuart-WPB Express	Stuart	Palm Beach County	New Express Route	-	N	25
FixedRoute to IRC	Fl. 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 Dixie Hwy (N)	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	24
Indian River Blvd	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	I-95	82nd Ave	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	23
US 1	Edwards Rd	Midway Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	22
Jenkins Rd.	Okeechobee Rd	Edwards Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	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	I-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	Oslo 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	Okeechobee Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	19
Midway Rd	25th Street	US 1	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	19
C.R. 512	Fellsmere City Limits	I-95	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	19
C.R. 512	I-95	C.R. 510	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	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
I-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	McNeil 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	McNeil Rd	Virginia Ave	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	16
SR 710	Okeechobee County Line	Allapattah Rd / CR 609	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	16
25th Street	US 1	Orange Ave	Add 2 Lanes	6	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	Y	15
Port St Lucie Blvd	Gallin Rd	Becker Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	15
Walton Rd	Lennard Rd	Green River Pkwy	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	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	Bridge Rd	Palm Beach County Line	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	14
27th Ave	Oslo Rd	S.R. 60	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	14
Edwards Rd	Jenkins Rd	25th Street	Add 2 Lanes/Bridge	4	N	13
Glades Cut-Off Rd	Reserve Blvd	Selvitz Road	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	13
Cove Rd	SR 76	US 1	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	13
27th Ave	S. County Line	Oslo Rd	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	13
43rd Ave	Oslo Rd	8th St	Add 2 Lanes	4	Y	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	Brooksmith Rd	Florida'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	11
St Lucie Blvd/Immokolee	Emerson Ave	25th Street	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	11
CR 609	St Lucie Co Line	SR 714	Add 2 Lanes	4	N	11
US 1	Osprey St	Bridge Rd	Add 2 Lanes	6	N	11
S.R. 60	6th Ave	Indian River Blvd	Add 2 Lanes	6	Y	11
82nd Ave	S County Line	Oslo Rd	New 2 Lane	2	Y	11

**Table A-11**

**Definitions Used in the 2016 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)
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
PLEMO	Planning and Environmental Management Office (FDOT planning study)