AGENDA

THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) WILL MEET AT 10:00 AM ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2009 IN CONFERENCE ROOM B1-501, COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING B, 1800 27TH STREET, VERO BEACH.

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes
   June 10, 2009

   No Action Required

4. Consideration of 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan – Land Use Vision Plan and Preferred Land Use Scenario
   Action Required

5. Request For Authorization To Submit An Application For 49 USC CH. 53, Section 5303 Transit Planning Funds For FY 2009/10
   Action Required
6. Consideration of Resolution Supporting the Inclusion of the Intercity Rail Component of the Florida East Coast (FEC) Corridor Project as part of Florida’s Economic Stimulus Plan

Action Required

7. Other Business

8. Comments from the Public

9. Adjournment

Next Meeting
MPO: August 12, 2009; 10:00 AM; Conference Room B1-501.

To view the MPO Agenda packet on-line please go to the following link:


If you have questions concerning the items on this agenda, please contact MPO staff at (772) 226-1455.

Anyone who may wish to appeal any decision which may be made at this meeting will need to ensure that a verbatim record on the proceedings is made which includes the evidence and testimony upon which the appeal will be based.

Anyone who needs a special accommodation for this meeting will need to contact the County’s Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator at 678-8000, Ext. 213 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.
A meeting of the Indian River County (IRC) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) was held at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 10, 2009, in the County Administration Building, 1800 27th Street, Building B, Room B1-501, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were: Chairman Peter O'Bryan; Vice Chairman Debbie MacKay, IRC School Board; Wesley Davis, Joe Flescher, Bob Solari and Gary Wheeler, Commissioners, IRC; Gerard Weick, Councilmember, Town of Indian River Shores; Sabin Abell, Councilmember, City of Vero Beach; Susan Adams, Mayor, City of Fellsmere; Dale Simchick, Jim Hill, Council Members, and Richard Gillmor, Mayor, City of Sebastian; Richard Dunlop, Councilman, Non-voting member, Town of Orchid; and Andrew Riddle, Non-voting member, FDOT, District 4.

Absent was Frannie Atchison, Councilmember, Town of Indian River Shores (excused).

Also present were IRC staff: Bob Keating, Community Development Director; Phil Matson, MPO Staff Director; Brian Freeman MPO Senior Planner; Sutapa Chatterjee, MPO Planner; Sharon Schalm, MPO Staff Assistant; and Darcy Vasilas, Commissioner Assistant, District 3.

Others present were: Chuck Mechling, Interested Citizen; Julianne Price, IRC Health Department; Karen Wood, Senior Resource Association; and Carin Saldon, APAC Southeast, Inc.

Call to Order

Chairman O'Bryan called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m., at which time it was determined a quorum was present. The members all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes of May 5, 2009 Joint MPO, MPOTAC & MPOCAC meeting

ON MOTION by Commissioner Solari, SECONDED by Commissioner Davis, the members voted unanimously (11-0) to approve the minutes of May 5, 2009 as presented.
Status Report of MPO Advisory Committees - No Action Required

Mr. Phil Matson, IRC MPO Staff Director, reported the status of MPO Advisory Committees as indicated in his memorandum dated June 2, 2009, a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office.

Review of Progress Report and Reimbursement Invoice #3 for the 2008/09 Planning Grant – Action Required

Mr. Matson announced as part of the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Planning Grant contract between the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as the Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA) and the State of Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) periodic progress reports and reimbursement invoices must be submitted. To comply with the CTD's requirements, staff prepared a progress report and invoice for the period from January 1, 2009 to March 31, 2009 in the amount of $2,461.13.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Solari, SECONDED by Councilman Weick, the members voted unanimously (11-0) to approve the invoice in the amount of $2,461.13 for the period of January 1, 2009 to March 31, 2009.

Approval of the Transportation Disadvantaged Program FY 2009/2010 Planning Grant Application – Action Required

Mr. Matson summarized on January 1, 2000, the IRC MPO officially became the county's Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA). In its capacity as the DOPA, the MPO is responsible for executing grant agreements for administering the transportation disadvantaged program. The proposed FY 2009/2010 grant agreement in the amount of $19,883, a copy of which was included in the agenda packet and on file in the Commission Office, was before the MPO with the request from staff to authorize the chairman to sign and execute the application.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Flescher, SECONDED by Commissioner Davis, the members voted unanimously (11-0) to approve and authorize the Chairman to sign and execute the application in the amount of $19,883.
Consideration of Fiscal Year 2009/10 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Action Required

Mr. Matson related the proposed Transportation Improvement Program for FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 lists all state and federally funded transportation improvement projects programmed for IRC over the TIP’s five-year period. The TIP was based on FDOT’s FY 2009/10 – 2013/14 Tentative Work Program which was developed using the MPO’s priorities for highway, enhancement, congestion management system, aviation, transit, and turnpike projects.

Mr. Matson proceeded to give a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Commission Office. Highlights of this presentation were:

• The TIP is a staged multi-year intermodal program of transportation improvement projects, including both state and federally funded, and comes out of the LRTP

• The most significant thing about the five-year budget was a project must first appear in the LRTP before it can end up as a funded project (TIP)

• MPO then takes what FDOT gives them in the Five-year Work Program, put the county information in it to make it a state TIP and then receive the funding

• MPO has a July 1, 2009 statutory deadline to deliver the TIP to FDOT

• The only thing being approved between one TIP and another when wanting to add a new project, is the next phase for those respective projects being programmed

• TIP Funding went from $227 Million in FY 08/09 to $161 Million in FY 09/10

Continued TIP Projects:

• SR 60 widening, 66th Ave – 82nd Ave

• SR 60 widening, 82nd Ave – I-95

• SR 60 & Royal Palm Pointe

• U.S. 1 widening, Indian River Blvd – Oslo Rd
- U.S. 1 widening, Oslo Rd – Highlands Dr
- U.S. 1 widening, Highlands Dr – St. Lucie County
- U.S. 1 resurfacing, 20th Pl – 33rd St
- U.S. 1 resurfacing, SLC – MP 1.83
- I-95 widening, SR 60 – N County Line
- SR A1A resurfacing, SLC – Coquina
- CR 512 @ Barber St and CR 512 @ 108th Ave

Additions:
- Schumann Dr @ Barber St
- SR 60 resurfacing, 58th Ave – 66th Ave
- U.S. 1 sidewalk, 37th Pl – 45th St
- I-95 resurfacing, BC – SLC

Deferrals:
- I-95 widening, SR 60 – SLC
- I-95 & Oslo Rd Interchange

ON MOTION by Council Member Simchick, SECONDED by Councilman Weick, the members voted unanimously (11-0) to approve the Fiscal Year 2009/10 Transportation Improvement Program as presented.

Consideration of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – No Action Required

Mr. Matson explained to expand the limits of the 12th Street Sidewalk Project in Indian River County, MPO staff recently administratively approved an amendment to the adopted TIP. The purpose of this amendment was to extend
the limits of the 12th Street Sidewalk Project approximately one-half mile west of its original project limit. Approval of minor amendments to MPO plans was allowed pursuant to MPO resolution No. 99-02, adopted on July 14, 1999. That resolution allows such administrative amendments with the requirement that the MPO Staff Director provide a status report of any such amendment to the MPO, TAC, and CAC at the next regularly scheduled meetings. This was the required staff report.

Other Business

Commissioner Davis announced he holds a monthly meeting in Sebastian with Mayor Gillmor and on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Sebastian City Council Chambers, they will be discussing the North Indian River Drive Sidewalk Program. He continued the project would go from the north city limits all the way up to Roseland Road on the east side of Indian River Drive. Anyone who is interested was welcome to attend.

Comments from the Public

There were none.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP
Community Development Director

FROM: Phillip J. Matson
MPO Staff Director

DATE: June 25, 2009

SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT OF MPO ADVISORY COMMITTEES

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of July 8, 2009.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING

There have been no meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee since the June 10, 2009 MPO meeting.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING

There have been no meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee since the June 10, 2009 MPO meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The MPO and its advisory committees will next meet as follows:

MPO Meeting: August 12, 2009 – 10:00 am
TAC Meeting: July 24, 2009 – 10:00 am
CAC Meeting: August 4, 2009 – 2:00 pm
BAC Meeting: TBA
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP
Community Development Director

FROM: Phillip J. Matson
MPO Staff Director

DATE: June 25, 2009

SUBJECT: Consideration of 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan – Land Use Vision Plan and Preferred Land Use Scenario

It is requested that the data herein presented be given formal consideration by the Indian River County MPO at its regular meeting of July 8, 2009.

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

Consistent with federal requirements, the Indian River County MPO must approve and adopt a new Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) every five years. As a federally required document that includes formal processes for public input, future transportation demand estimation, and roadway analysis, the LRTP must identify all federal and state-funded transportation projects in Indian River County and is perhaps the most important activity undertaken by the MPO. According to Federal Guidelines, Indian River County must adopt its new LRTP by December, 2010.

In February 2009, the MPO authorized staff to negotiate a contract for the update with the MPO’s General Planning Consultants, Kimley-Horn Associates/Stanley Consultants. To perform a required alternative regional land use visioning analysis, the MPO contracted with the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

On Saturday, March 14, 2009, the MPO formally kicked off the future land use analysis process by holding a Public Workshop at the Vero Beach Community Center. At that workshop, TCRPC staff outlined several transportation and land use planning principles such as connectivity and intermodal corridor development that will be considered throughout the LRTP process. Through small group discussions and face-to-face interviews, the consultants also identified a number of community preferences to be considered in the development of a preferred land use scenario.
In order to proceed with LRTP development, the MPO must select a preferred future land use scenario. This preferred scenario will form the basis for all subsequent LRTP analysis, such as forecasting future travel demand, identifying needed improvements, and adopting a cost-affordable set of highway and transit projects.

**ANALYSIS**

The March 14, 2009 land use visioning workshop, which featured both a presentation by TCRPC staff and facilitated small group discussions, enabled residents to collaborate on alternative land use concepts. During the workshop, each group illustrated its preferred concepts on a map overlay of the region.

The attached report contains the small group map overlays and a summary of the small group discussions. While there were a great variety of opinions expressed by the participants, a number of consensus issues emerged from the discussion. Some of the more significant consensus issues included: maintaining a high quality of life in Indian River County; focusing on infill development/redevelopment over western expansion; creating jobs close to the existing workforce base and diversifying the local economy; keeping and maintaining agriculture in the county where it is feasible; and enhancing connectivity. The complete list of consensus points appears on Page 13 of the report.

In order to proceed with the development of the LRTP, the MPO must select a preferred future land use scenario from among the two scenarios presented in the report. The two scenarios, which appear on Page 14 of the report, consist of an existing trends scenario based on the adopted land use plans of local governments in the county and an alternative scenario based on concepts presented by the TCRPC and feedback obtained at the visioning workshop.

The MPO may select one of the scenarios as presented, or the MPO may select elements from each of the two scenarios and incorporate these into a “hybrid” future land use alternative scenario. The two scenarios are described in more detail in the attached report and are summarized below.

1. **Existing Trends (Adopted Land Use Plan) scenario**

The Existing Trends future land use plan is described on page 14. This plan incorporates the adopted future land use plans of the county and municipalities. It reflects a continuation of the current land-use pattern, consisting primarily of low-density residential development, commercial uses in a few major corridors, relatively little mixed use or downtown development, and dispersed employment centers. With this plan, new residential areas can be expected to expand to the western edge of the urban service area on several corridors.

The Existing Trends future land use plan also includes some provisions for mixed-use development and higher densities. The best opportunities for that kind of development exist in downtown areas, at major commercial nodes, and at the traditional neighborhood design (TND) communities of Pointe West and Liberty Park. With the Existing Trends Plan, it can be expected that future growth will be similar to recent growth and development in the county.
While the county grew rapidly in the early part of this decade, a substantial amount of undeveloped land still exists within the urban service area, and a large number of unbuilt residential and commercial projects still have development approval.

2. Alternative Future Land Use scenario

The alternative scenario developed by the TCRPC appears on page 15 of the report and is referred to as the "Infill Alternative Land Use Plan." That plan reflects a number of new neighborhood, corridor, and district land use designations that focus on infill redevelopment with an emphasis on creating new commercial and industrial opportunities. In conjunction with targeted land use and zoning incentives, the plan is aimed at achieving the goals of greater connectivity and more balanced land uses. With respect to newly developing areas of the county such as Fellsmere, the plan reflects growth occurring in compact areas with a mix of uses and a connected street network.

- 2035 Projections

Once approved, the preferred land use scenario will be the basis for establishing the location of future populations, businesses, and major attractors. These are the principal input variables for the MPO’s travel demand forecasting model.

For the Long Range Transportation Plan’s horizon year of 2035, the county’s total population will be based on the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) midrange population projections. These projections are made using a number of statistical projection methodologies (such as linear regressions, exponential models, and shift-share analysis) where the results of each method are compared to avoid relying on a single (and possibly erroneous) method.

Although BEBR provides its future population projections across a high-to-low range, the BEBR midrange estimate is the most widely accepted as the planning standard in the State of Florida. For comprehensive planning purposes, it is the expectation that jurisdictions will use the BEBR midrange estimate unless there is compelling reason to do otherwise. For Indian River County in 2035, the BEBR midrange population estimate is 209,900. This figure is modestly higher than the estimate used in the 2030 Long Range Plan adopted by the MPO in 2005 and is consistent with historic rates of growth in the county.

Advisory Committee Recommendations

On June 2, 2009, staff from the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council presented the draft alternative land use scenarios to the MPO’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). At that time, the TAC and CAC discussed the merits of each scenario at length and provided the Regional Planning Council with a number of questions and comments.

While both committees expressed a strong preference for the Infill Alternative land use scenario, there were a number of concerns regarding some of the details contained in the scenario. One example involves the City of Vero Beach. Although City of Vero Beach staff agreed with the plan’s concept of infill opportunities in downtown Vero Beach, there were some discrepancies
between the City’s plan for downtown and the Infill Alternative plan with respect to planning area and densities. Subsequently, the TAC and CAC recommended that the MPO approve the Infill Alternative land use scenario, subject to incorporating the comments of the advisory committees. Those comments have been addressed in the attached draft.

**RECOMMENDATION**

MPO staff recommends that the MPO consider the Land Use Vision Plan and presentation by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC); provide the MPO staff and the TCRPC with any comments; and adopt one of the alternative future land use scenarios.

**ATTACHMENT**

1. Public Process and Land Use Vision Plan
Indian River County
Long-Range Transportation Plan
Community Vision ~ 2035

Public Process and Land Use Vision Plan

June 2009

TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
Indian River - St. Lucie - Martin - Palm Beach
Attachment 1
PUBLIC PROCESS AND VISION PLAN

Introduction

In January 2009, Indian River County (County) and the Indian River Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) requested the assistance of the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (Council) for the update of the Indian River County 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Council’s role in this process was to establish a forum for meaningful public input into the land use considerations of the 2035 LRTP as well as develop an alternative land use plan that would reflect the community’s desires for future growth.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and state guidelines require that MPOs update their LRTPs every five years to review priorities and expenditures for roadways and evaluate land use patterns that could influence these priorities. The LRTP process presents an opportunity for communities to continue current trends or to redirect efforts based upon updated data and on-the-ground experience. Accordingly, community input is vital as local residents, business owners, and visitors experience daily the results of previous LRTP decisions.

This chapter of the Indian River LRTP will describe the land use visioning public input process, explain the development of an Existing Trends Plan and a 2035 Infill Alternative Plan, and document selection of the preferred alternative.

The update to the 2030 LRTP is a multi-agency process that included Indian River County, the Indian River MPO, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, and the public.
Purpose

The development of a Preferred Land Use Plan for 2035 is an important first step towards updating the LRTP. As part of the land use visioning process, the Existing Trends Plan and the Infill Alternative Plan were developed after a series of stakeholder interviews and a public design workshop in March 2009. The Existing Trends Plan, the Infill Alternative Plan, or a combination of the two, will form the Preferred Land Use Plan. The Preferred Land Use Plan will be the basis for projecting the general location, timing and pace of growth within Indian River County. These growth/demographic projections are assigned to traffic analysis zones (TAZs) which are geographically linked to the County’s transportation network. Once the demographic data are assigned to the TAZs, the transportation models can be run. The results of these models will help identify transportation needs for long-range roadway network and transit improvements.

The Preferred Land Use Plan sets policy direction for the MPO to manage how and where future growth and development will be accommodated in Indian River County. The pattern of future development is directly related to: 1) the resources a county or city will have to allocate towards transportation infrastructure; 2) the time commuters will spend in their vehicles; 3) the amount of energy expended; 4) the quantity of additional land and water needed; 5) the rate of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere; and 6) the ability for transit to function efficiently and economically. Preparation of the 2035 LRTP provides an opportunity for the MPO to assist the county and local municipalities in both understanding these land use/transportation relationships and planning to most successfully meet the needs for future roadway and multimodal improvements.
PUBLIC PROCESS AND VISION PLAN

Current Conditions

Indian River County comprises approximately 503 square miles with a 2000 census population of 112,947 and a projected 2010 population of 142,300. The County is bounded by Brevard County to the north, St. Lucie County to the south, the Atlantic Ocean to the east, and both Osceola and Okeechobee counties to the west. There are five municipal jurisdictions within the County, including Fellsmere, Sebastian, Vero Beach, Indian River Shores, and Orchid. The eastern third of the County lies between the Atlantic Ocean to the east and Interstate I-95 to the west. The western two-thirds of the County are primarily agricultural land.

Historically, the coastal cities of Sebastian and Vero Beach were established along Henry Flagler's East Coast (FEC) Railway, and they remain two of the oldest settlements in Indian River County. Citrus has been the primary industry within the County since its inception, and many citrus groves remain today. For a variety of reasons, however, the citrus industry in Indian River County has contracted in recent years, which has led to a general reassessment of land uses, particularly land uses within the County’s established Urban Service Area (USA). The USA is generally east of I-95 with the exception of the city of Fellsmere, which is mostly west of I-95.

In Indian River County, the historic pace of development has been moderate, slightly above Florida’s growth rate but slightly below the average growth rate in the Treasure Coast Region. Like many areas of Sunbelt states, the County experienced a development boom between 2002 and 2007.

Many residential projects had been built, approved, or partially completed when the res-
There are many striking signs of the recent decline in the home building industry in Indian River County. The image above is the entry gate to a subdivision with no homes.

The pattern of recent development has been in the form of larger gated communities. This pattern eliminates the option for an interconnected local street network. The result is a limited network of larger collector and arterial roadways that must accommodate all regional and local trips.

One emerging industry that has replaced some of the citrus lands is mining. In addition to having potential environmental impacts, this industry impacts the road network differently than other uses.

The residential market began to decline in 2007/08. The residential market further stalled in the last two years, creating a significant inventory of approved but unbuilt residential units, as well as partially constructed subdivisions, throughout the County.

The state of the agricultural industry, particularly east of I-95, has changed considerably in the past decade as well. These agricultural areas east of I-95 were formerly part of a multicounty citrus corridor. Since 2000, agricultural uses in these areas have declined significantly.

Countywide, the number of packing houses has been reduced by more than half, from 43 in 1999 to 21 today. According to the Florida Agriculture Statistical Service, the number of commercial citrus acres in Indian River County has dropped by 39% since 1998. During that time, declining citrus revenues and increasing demand for residential development (through 2007) exacerbated pressures for the conversion of agricultural lands to low-density residential development, particularly east of I-95. In addition, new residents limit the productivity and management of larger agricultural lands east of I-95, causing a shift west for agricultural uses requiring aerial spraying.

Many residential developments in Indian River County were not fully realized during the development "boom," with demand and absorption simply unable to keep up with supply of new and pending residential units. As a result, there is a significant inventory of land, lots, and vacant residential units that must be considered in the evaluation of future development directions. This condition is also one to be measured carefully against additional agricultural-to-residential land use conversions.
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The Public Input Process

A three-step approach was employed to obtain public input for the land use visioning component of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan. The three steps consisted of:

1. Stakeholder Interviews
2. Public Design Workshop
3. Continued Public Presentations and Outreach

On March 5-6, 2009, 30-minute interviews were conducted with twenty-five elected officials; public agency representatives (including Indian River County, MPO, and local governments), business leaders, residents, and others. The interviews provided critical background for the March 14, 2009 workshop. While the primary focus of these discussions was land use and mobility considerations, there was much discussion about quality of life concerns and how they relate to a more balanced approach to land use/transportation planning.

On Saturday March 14, 2009, a public workshop was conducted. The workshop was attended by nearly 60 residents, business and property owners, staff, and elected officials. The workshop began with an Opening Presentation that described the LRTP process, illuminated current conditions around the County, and discussed the design and lifestyle implications of roadway/land use planning. Using regional and national examples, the Opening Presentation sought to provide the workshop participants with a broader perspective of how the county had grown historically versus how it might grow in the future.

After the Opening Presentation, workshop participants were broken into five groups, each seated at a table with a base map of the County. At each table, an urban designer helped the group graphically represent its ideas onto tracing paper over a base aerial. For nearly two hours, the groups...
developed their ideas for how the County should grow in the future. During that time, participants were asked what they thought was missing from, or needed, in their communities. Issues of density, building heights, transportation features, whether or not to expand the Urban Service Boundary, and even transit considerations were all discussed and documented onto the Citizen’s Plans.

After a brief break for lunch, the plan from each table was hung on the wall, and a presenter from each group (not a staff member) was selected. For the next hour, each group presented its ideas, and many common themes were expressed. The images on pages 8 through 12 reflect the Citizens' Plans as drawn by workshop participants, with a transcription of each table presentation provided below the respective image.
During the workshop, the participants at each table were asked to select one of their teammates to present the table's ideas to the rest of the participants. This format is similar to the project presentation and critique process utilized in schools of architecture and design.

On Saturday March 14, 2009, nearly 60 participants developed, reviewed, and discussed 5 different table presentations. While there is seldom complete consensus on every issue facing a community, many voiced similar ideas about future patterns of development and land use challenges in Indian River County. These commonalities illustrate community consensus on certain issues. As part of this component of the 2035 LRTP, each of the table's presentations and follow-up discussions were videotaped and transcribed.

A synopsis of each presentation, along with the corresponding plan, is provided on the following pages.
The image above is of the "Table 1 'citizens' plan developed during the March 14, 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan public workshop.

Table # 1 issues:

- Infill concepts: Indian River State College and new library could be a pivotal spot along the SR60 corridor.
- Downtown Vero Beach: Create 4 to 5 story buildings allowing for ground floor retail, 2nd floor office and 3rd-4th floor residential space.
- Create a mixed-used town center.
- Airport area: create a job-based information site.
- Create a campus like setting in the CVS area near I95 for business expansion.
- Create an industrial/job center on the west side of the Oslo road interchange.
- The county and the municipalities need to give incentives for connectivity for commerce accessibility.
- Keep and maintain the agricultural areas.
- Going North on US1, keep its continuity and create interconnectivity; not a 'hodgepodge concept.'
- Move the sewage treatment plant.
- Create more waterfront activity.
- The MPO currently has greenway plans for connectivity to Blue Cypress Lake for biking, walking and boat access.
- Create interchange at I95 and Oslo Road.
Table #2 issues:

- Presenter said they shared similar concepts as Tables 1 and 5.
- Take water from the canals, prevent discharge to the lagoon, clean it and make it usable for residents. “Save the Lagoon”.
- Transfer development rights and put in a traditional neighborhood near the reservoir.
- Create a biotech industry near the hospital area, SR 60 near I95 and Oslo (with new interchange at Oslo Road).
- In Wabasso, create another traditional neighborhood, adding more density.
- In Fellsmere: create N/S and E/W roadway connectivity, coming out to CR 510, and Willow Street to SR 60 to establish a grid.
- FEC needs train stations in Fellsmere, and Gifford, near SR 60 and Oslo roads.
- Transfer development rights into new traditional neighborhoods.
- Extend Laconia to CR 510.
The Citizens' Plans

**TABLE # 3**

The image above is of the “Table 3” citizens’ plan developed during the March 14, 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan public workshop.

Table #3 issues:
- Create two North South corridors from Willow St. to SR60 and from the Ansin property to SR 60.
- Create interchange or flyover near 69 Street (Winter Beach Road extension).
- Maintain 2 lanes on CR 512, not to exceed 3 lanes through the city to maintain character and encourage commerce.
- City of Palm Bay in Brevard County has been working diligently for a number of years to create a parkway from 192, west of I95 to the Indian River County line.
- Keep US1 a four lane highway through Sebastian.
- Reduce the speed limit on SR 60 (from 6th Ave to 20th Ave) to 35 mph to improve commerce and pedestrian safety.
- Create “No right turn signals” when the light is red in the downtown area for pedestrian safety in the crosswalks.
- Create a new connection from Barber Bridge to US1.
- Create uninterrupted access to the hospital west of the railroad tracks to gain faster accessibility. Currently, long trains delay access to the hospital.
- Extend hospital facilities west of the railroad.
- Improve gateway at 43 Avenue and SR 60 when entering the City to improve economics.
- Create an I95 interchange at Oslo Road.
The image above is of the “Table 4” citizens' plan developed during the March 14, 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan public workshop.

Table # 4 issues:
• Fill up the urban services area before developing outside the area.
• Connect existing towns and cities; 66th Avenue and 82nd Avenue should not be wide lane highways that psychologically divide communities.
• Make 66 Avenue a 3 lane highway with turning lanes and with bicycle and pedestrian paths.
• Ranch Road, which is currently planned for a two lane highway, should stay that way and be designated as a scenic byway. Continue connectivity between “one part of the county to the other part of the county”.
• Preserve the green space as opposed to more development.
• Increase commercial development in Sebastian South, keeping commercial accessibility close to densely populated areas.
• New development should be infill into the existing urban areas.
• Thinking into the future: Create high speed railroad/stations in Sebastian and Vero Beach in order to arrive in Jacksonville in 90 minutes, Miami in 60 minutes and Orlando in 50 minutes, allowing easy access to jobs and opportunity in developing areas of the State.
• Create hybrid bus/trolley transportation along A1A to beaches, recreation and commercial areas.
• Change ordinances about preserving the grid which is an important need for connectivity.
• Create commercial centers in corners for accessibility to the communities that surround them.
• Encourage CR 512 Corridor and 195 connectivity.
The Citizens' Plans

TABLE # 5

The image above is of the "Table 5" citizens' plan developed during the March 14, 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan public workshop.

Table # 5 issues:

• Create more manufacturing in north county, Fellsmere and I95.
• Although part of IRC covers Piper Aircraft and a mall which sustains part of the community, many people work outside the county. More industrial manufacturing, without inhibiting the residential community, would create jobs within the county.
• On the east side of I95, create more roadways into the nearby communities so there is not just one way in and one way out.
• There is an abandoned grove area near the I95 corridor. Recommendation is to create organic groves that do not require the use of pesticides and aerial pesticide spraying.
• On SR 60 and around the landfill, increase industrial manufacturing.
• The area of 82nd avenue is primarily one residence for every 5 to 10 acres. Recommendation is to keep it, as it is an intrinsic value of Indian River County.
• Branch out the east west corridors from US1.
• Vero Beach: Pave dirt roads & revitalize housing areas.
• Beautify the CR 512 and SR 60 corridors.
• Enhance and beautify the streets.
• Create sidewalks in the schools zones.
• Create more roadways into Vero Lakes Estates community.
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The Citizens' Plans

While there is seldom complete public consensus in a community on all issues, many common themes and ideas were discussed during the Saturday public workshop, and several key points of consensus were raised repeatedly during each table’s presentation. Below is a list of the most common suggestions for land use and quality of life enhancements as presented by the public at the March 14, 2009 public design workshop.

CONSENSUS POINTS

1. Maintain a high quality of life in Indian River County.
2. Focus on infill development/redevelopment over western expansion.
3. Create more mixed-use opportunities in downtown Vero Beach.
4. Provide more workplace opportunities in Indian River County. Create jobs close to the existing workforce base.
5. Diversify the local economy beyond citrus and homebuilding.
6. Focus on creating a corporate campus at SR 60 and I-95 near CVS.
7. Provide industry/workplace land uses near Oslo Road and I-95.
8. Keep and maintain agriculture in the county where it is feasible (especially west of I-95).
10. Explore bio-tech uses in the employment areas along I-95.
11. Look into the feasibility of new train stations along the FEC in Sebastian and Vero Beach.
12. New roads should be smaller and more connected.
13. Increase regional connectivity.
14. New development should be in the form of well-connected neighborhoods with some non-residential uses.
15. Provide for shopping opportunities in neighborhoods (such as corner stores) to balance the land uses and capture more vehicle trips.
16. Fill up the Urban Service Area before expanding outside the Urban Service Area.
17. Pay close attention to the expansion of Fellsmere to ensure it grows responsibly.
18. Enhance sidewalk continuity.
19. Create more jobs through incentives and focused business recruitment.
Existing Trends Plan

As part of the public input and land use vision component of the Indian River County 2035 LRTP, two different plans were developed for consideration. The plan below is the Existing Trends Plan. This option essentially maintains the land uses, intensities, and densities in current local comprehensive plans.

The Indian River 2035 LRTP Existing Trends Plan, shown above, would maintain the status quo in the county regarding land uses and roadway priorities. This map also illustrates future growth areas for the City of Fellsmere.

The county's current land-use pattern consists primarily of low-density residential development, commercial uses in a few major corridors, relatively little mixed use or downtown development, and dispersed employment centers. New residential areas have now expanded to the western edge of the urban service area on several corridors.

The existing land use plan includes some provision for mixed-use development and higher densities. The best opportunities for this kind of development exist in the downtown areas, at major commercial nodes, and at the traditional neighborhood design (TND) communities of Pointe West and Liberty Park. The most recent development projects in Indian River County are probably the best measure for what future growth will look like following the Existing Trends Plan.

As structured, the Existing Trends Plan reflects the future land use plans of the County and 4 of the County's 5 municipalities. The municipality whose plan is not reflected in the trends plan is Fellsmere. That is because Fellsmere recently annexed 21,000 acres and has not yet changed the land use designation on the newly annexed acreage. Therefore, assumptions had to be made regarding future land use in Fellsmere. The Existing Trends Plan anticipates that future growth in Fellsmere will be in the form of compact, well-connected neighborhoods that preserve significant portions of the existing countryside.
The "Infill Alternative" Plan

Based upon the public input received through the process, an Infill Alternative Plan was developed for consideration. This plan was based on citizen input received during the public workshop process and developed with two primary objectives:

1. Incorporate as much community input as feasible;
2. Base the plan on the time-tested principles of traditional town planning and urban design.

The Indian River County 2035 LRTP Infill Alternate Plan is shown above. The plan focuses on specific areas for redevelopment and business recruitment.

The Infill Alternative Plan proposes new neighborhood, corridor, and district areas that will become the focus of infill redevelopment and business recruitment. Notable elements of the Infill Alternate Plan include:

1. The creation of Neighborhood, District, and Corridor areas for targeted land use and zoning incentives to achieve the goals of greater connectivity and more balanced land uses (especially workplace uses around the airports, along the US 1 corridor, in the downtown districts, and around the existing I-95 interchanges).
2. A strategy to accommodate significant growth in Fellsmere using the traditional neighborhood as the increment of development.
3. A provision that all new development/redevelopment activity will occur within the Urban Service Area (with the exception being the "New Town" provision). To achieve the quality of life goals expressed by the public, the impacts of future growth must concentrated and controlled in location and form.
The Infill Alternative Plan is comprised of seven new areas of focused growth. The illustrations and images shown below are conceptual. The intent is to provide scale examples and the general geographic areas from the plan where these focused growth concepts would apply according to the plan. Each of these neighborhood, district, and corridor growth areas is described below. The geographic coverage of these areas is qualitative and for illustration purposes only. Focused growth area boundaries, actual development yields and population growth projections from these areas will be refined and truthed during the future transportation modeling phase of the project.

**Downtown Districts**
These areas are identified within the historic downtowns of Vero Beach and Sebastian. These districts will provide incentives for greater in-town residential development, mixed-use development, and increased densities to make the downtown areas more transit supportive. Open space and pervious area requirements need to be reviewed for the creation of urban spaces. Incentives may be necessary as structured parking becomes more likely in these areas.

**Neighborhood Commercial Districts**
These are typically existing suburban strip centers that serve basic community needs. Intensifying these areas with residential and non-residential uses will provide some workplace opportunities as well as create the necessary critical mass for “town center” experiences.

**Neighborhood Infill Development Districts**
These areas are primarily east of US 1 and the FEC and should grow as medium-density compact neighborhoods. Non-residential uses in the form of neighborhood services should be encouraged. Increases in density and intensity should be considered as incentives for the provision of walkable, well-connected streets and a variety of housing types (single-family, multi-family, townhouse, etc).

**U.S. 1 Development Corridor**
U.S. 1 should be re-envisioned as one of the great public spaces in Indian River County. This will occur if provisions and regulations are established that require the corridor to be spatially defined with 2- to 4-story buildings incorporating a variety of uses. Residential will be a key component in this area and will significantly increase the potential for transit ridership. The area requires high flexibility in building uses along with rigid discipline in building form and placement.
Regional Workplace Districts
Primarily focused at the two existing I-95 interchanges at SR 512 and SR 60, these districts should be the focus of intense business recruitment and incentive packages. To maximize critical mass and intensity, issues such as storm water requirements and provisions should be reviewed. Additionally, workplace uses should be balanced with other uses that are integrated in a manner that encourages interaction and access.

Airport Workplace Districts
The airport areas already have industrial land uses surrounding them. The Airport Workplace District regulations, particularly those related to lot coverage and building height, should be reviewed to allow the greatest flexibility in these areas. It is important, however, that the edges of these districts respond appropriately to neighboring districts and uses.

Fellsmere Annex
The Alternative Infill Plan illustrates how the Fellsmere Annex areas should grow in the form of traditional neighborhoods: neighborhoods with a fine-grained street network; a diversity of housing opportunities; open spaces that are usable and well defined, a mix of neighborhood-supportive non-residential use; and the provision for well-sited civic and school uses.

The Alternative Infill Plan emphasizes the importance of the LRTP to be implemented specifically at every level: the regional road network; the local road network; land use distribution; and the detailed instructions within the Land Development Regulations. For successful implementation to occur, any desired change must be embodied consistently in all regulations.

To achieve the desired development patterns, local governments will need to apply incentive-based zoning techniques to the defined neighborhoods, districts, and corridors. It is important, however, that the local governments and the MPO maintain control of any incentive programs and not "give away" zoning or development rights. "Limited-duration" zoning programs, whereby additional development capacity or use rights would be offered as incentives to achieve specific goals for a pre-determined amount of time, are useful tools in focusing development type, location, and form.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the Downtown Districts on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The Downtown Districts include downtown Vero Beach (including Miracle Mile and Royal Palm Pointe), and Sebastian. The Downtown Districts of Vero Beach and Sebastian are distinct in their character and scale. Future urban redevelopment in these areas should respect those distinctions.

This is one of the historic buildings in the Sebastian Downtown District.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the Neighborhood Commercial Districts on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The Neighborhood Commercial Districts include Fellsmere, Liberty Park, Wabasso, Gifford, and Pointe West. Redevelopment of these areas over time should strive to create more urban, mixed-use districts that provide for public open space in the form of greens and squares.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the Neighborhood Infill Development Districts on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The Neighborhood Infill Development Districts extend along US 1 from the FEC rail corridor east to the Intracoastal Waterway; from Sebastian south to Wabasso; and from Wabasso south to 57th Street. The image to the right illustrates how neighborhoods can accommodate non-residential uses that are appropriately scaled and are not reliant upon the vertically integrated, multi-story, mixed-use building.

This is a neighborhood corner store in the Garden District of New Orleans.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the US 1 Development Corridors on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The US 1 Development Corridors extend approximately three miles north of downtown Vero along US 1 and and three miles south of downtown to along US 1 to Oslo Road. The US 1 Development Corridors should be reinvented as community “Main Streets” with an emphasis on multiple uses including housing.

This image is of US 1 in West Palm Beach. The new mixed-use buildings form the public space of the corridor and provide a transition to the adjacent neighborhoods.
Districts and Corridors
The image below illustrates the locations of the Regional Workplace Districts on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The Regional Workplace Districts are located at the I-95 and CR 512 interchange; at the southwest quadrant of the CR 512 and CR 510 intersection; at the I-95 and SR 60 interchange; and east of I-95 on Oslo Road. These districts are well-situated for regional access; they have ample room to grow, and can provide jobs for local residents. As illustrated in the image to the right, future workplace growth should occur in the form of streets and blocks; accommodating all scales of workplace uses.

This aerial view of an urban workplace district shows clearly-defined streets and block which accommodate large and small-scale users.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the Airport Workplace Districts on the Infill Alternative Development Plan.

The Airport Workplace Districts are located at the Sebastian Municipal Airport and the Vero Beach Municipal Airport. These districts should be promoted for in-town industrial and aeronautic related activities that might not be appropriate in other areas of the county.
Districts and Corridors

The image below illustrates the locations of the Fellsmere annexation growth areas.

The Fellsmere annexation growth areas are located at the bend in CR 512 where it turns southward; at the southwest quadrant of I-95 and CR 512 interchange; and south of Vero Lake Estates east of I-95. The image to the right is of the New Haven neighborhood in Abacoa, Palm Beach County, Florida. There is a dense street network, multiple building types, a series of inter-connected neighborhood greens, and direct connections to businesses along Military Trail to the west.
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2030 LRTP and 2035 LRTP Plan Comparisons
Extensive changes to the 2030 LRTP preferred land use plan or the County's comprehensive plan are not proposed as part of the 2035 LRTP effort. There are, however, important differences or changes between the 2030 and 2035 plans that could positively affect transportation modeling results through improved mobility and patterns of development in the County. These changes are intended to minimize future transportation needs and costs countywide and improve multimodal opportunities by: 1) increasing workplace, residential and retail infill opportunities; 2) improving street network interconnectivity; 3) discouraging sprawling patterns of development; and 4) encouraging the development and redevelopment of compact, complete and connected mixed-use neighborhoods within the County's urban service area. Following is a summary of the differences between the 2030 and 2035 future land use plans.

Downtown Districts
Both plans identify similar areas for downtown development and redevelopment. For transportation modeling purposes, timing, pace and scale of growth anticipated for these downtown areas are similar between the two plans.

Neighborhood Commercial Districts
Infill areas in these districts are expanded slightly under the 2035 plan. For transportation modeling purposes, the timing and pace of development should be increased under the 2035 scenario in anticipation of additional residential and non-residential infill development and the redevelopment of existing strip shopping centers to create small town center experiences.

Neighborhood Infill Development Districts
These infill areas are expanded under the 2035 scenario to include the growth of medium-density compact neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are expected to include non-residential uses in the form of neighborhood services, a walkable, well-connected street network, and a variety of housing types. For transportation modeling purposes, the timing and pace of development should be increased in anticipation of the County encouraging infill growth in this district through density and intensity incentives.

US 1 Development Corridor
Both the 2030 and 2035 plans predict redevelopment of the US 1 corridor in the future. An important difference is the 2035 plan suggests that US 1 be rebuilt as a much improved address capable of supporting a good mix of commercial and residential uses. For transportation modeling purposes, the timing and pace of development should increase under the 2035 scenario. This increase accounts for additional residential development opportunities and the redevelopment of existing obsolete buildings and strip shopping areas to create a more walkable, central business district/main street environment within the US 1 Corridor.
2030 LRTP and 2035 LRTP Plan Comparisons

Regional Workplace District

Both plans identify similar areas for workplace development. The 2035 plan, however, significantly expands the area for workplace development in the County by suggesting the addition of two new workplace districts: 1) the northeast quadrant of the I-95/CR 512 interchange; and 2) the southwest quadrant of the CR 512/510 intersection. For transportation modeling purposes, the timing and pace of development should be increased in recognition of these additions and the County's focus on strategically positioning itself to capture some bioscience/biomedical industry growth.

Airport Workplace District

Both plans identify similar areas for airport workplace development. For transportation modeling purposes, the timing, pace, and scale of growth anticipated for these workplace areas are similar between the two plans.

Fellsmere Annex

There are two important differences between the 2030 and 2035 plans. The 2035 plan: 1) significantly expands the area for future growth around Fellsmere to reflect its recent annexation of approximately 21,000 acres; and 2) acknowledges future growth within the Fellsmere annexation areas will occur in the form of compact, complete and connected mixed-use neighborhoods and districts. For transportation modeling purposes the location, timing and pace of development should occur slowly, beginning in the mid-to later-years of the 2035 time frame, with most growth assigned to the eastern annexation area TAZs.
Conclusion

Results of the public input process and community visioning workshop for the 2035 LRTP documented a general consensus that far-reaching changes to the County’s comprehensive plan are not desired or necessary. At the same time, there was consensus that adjustments to the current County comprehensive plan and land development regulations should be considered to: 1) increase workplace, residential and retail infill opportunities; 2) improve the mix and proximity of complementary land uses; 3) improve street network interconnectivity; 4) discourage sprawling patterns of development; and 5) encourage the development and redevelopment of compact, complete and connected mixed-use neighborhoods within the County’s urban service area, especially within the Fellsmere annexation areas and the US 1 corridor.

The purpose of the County and the local municipalities considering any changes to their comprehensive plans and development regulations would be to:

- Minimize transportation needs and costs countywide.
- Reduce vehicle miles travelled, energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, and time spent driving.
- Improve the chances that public transit and other modes of personal transportation become more viable and economical.
- Conserve land for future water storage, water supply, and food and energy production needs.

The conceptual future land use plan designed to achieve these potential benefits is the 2035 LRTP Infill Alternative Plan. This plan serves as the preferred future land use scenario which is to be used for modeling 2035 transportation needs and costs. There are several differences between the 2030 and 2035 plan. These differences are articulated in this report and could positively affect the outcome of the transportation modeling results.

The 2035 LRTP Infill Alternative Plan does not automatically change the County’s current local comprehensive plan. It should be noted, however, that realizing any benefits derived from this plan will require some local comprehensive plan and development regulation changes.

Preparation of the 2035 LRTP is a good chance for the MPO to assist the County in understanding how changes in the arrangement and location of development can affect the need and costs for transportation infrastructure and whether or not transit will function efficiently and economically. The 2035 LRTP Infill Alternative Plan suggests there are still several opportunities to focus future growth in a manner that is efficient, achieves the benefits described above, and helps preserve the desired quality of life in Indian River County.
TO: Members of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP
Community Development Director

Phillip J. Matson
MPO Staff Director

FROM: Brian Freeman, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner

DATE: June 23, 2009

SUBJECT: Request For Authorization To Submit An Application For 49 USC CH. 53, Section 5303 Transit Planning Funds For FY 2009/10

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at the meeting of July 8, 2009.

SUMMARY

The MPO’s FY 2009/10 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) identifies several transit related activities to be completed this year under Task 3.2, Transit Planning. As indicated in the UPWP, these tasks will be completed using federal Section 5303 transit planning funds. Staff recommends that the MPO adopt the required resolution that authorizes staff to submit a grant application for section 5303 funds and also authorize the Chairman to execute a grant agreement with the Florida Department of Transportation.

DESCRIPTION & CONDITIONS

One of the tasks included in the MPO’s Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is Task 3.2, Transit Planning. Transit planning activities included under this task consist of administration and coordination of all transit activities. Specific tasks to be completed in FY 2009/10 include an update to the MPO’s Transit Development Plan (TDP); a transit quality and level of service analysis; quarterly boarding and alighting analyses; and maintenance of the transit infrastructure database. While the MPO’s highway planning funds are restricted to planning activities only, transit planning funds can be used for design phases of transit and intermodal projects.
As indicated in the UPWP, these activities will be funded primarily through a Section 5303 grant from the Federal Transit Administration. In FY 2009/10, the MPO will receive $56,573 in Federal funds, which will be matched with $7,071.50 in FDOT funds and $7,071.50 in local funds.

**ANALYSIS**

MPO staff proposes that the MPO authorize submittal of an application for federal Section 5303 transit planning funds. A copy of the grant application is included as Attachment #1 to this staff report. The completed grant application includes the following:

1. Authorizing Resolution.
2. Standard Form 424 (needed to apply for any federal grant).
3. 2009 FTA Certification and Assurances.
4. Project budget forms, including federal, state, and local share.
5. Project Summary.
6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

To apply for Section 5303 funds, the MPO must adopt the attached resolution authorizing MPO staff to submit the application and authorizing the chairman to execute the necessary self-certification and standard assurances required by the Section 5303 federal grant program. The resolution also authorizes the MPO chairman to enter into the required joint participation agreement (JPA) with FDOT. The resolution and certifications have been reviewed and approved by the County Attorney’s Office.

Upon the MPO’s adoption of the resolution, MPO staff will transmit the completed grant application to FDOT. Once approved by FDOT, FDOT will forward a public transportation joint participation agreement to be executed by the MPO chairman.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the MPO review the attached grant application for Section 5303 transit planning funds and adopt the attached resolution that authorizes staff to submit the grant application. Staff also recommends that the MPO authorize the chairman to execute the necessary grant agreement, self-certifications, and standard assurances required by the Section 5303 grant program.

**Attachments:**

1. Indian River County MPO FY 2009/10 Application for a 49 USC Ch. 53, Section 5303 Grant.
INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

FTA

SECTION 5303 GRANT APPLICATION – FY 2009/10 FUNDS

Transit Planning

10/01/09 – 09/30/10

Prepared by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization
APPLICATION CONTENTS

1. Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization Authorizing Resolution
2. Standard Form 424 - Application for Federal Assistance
3. FY 2009 Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance
4. Proposed Budget and supporting documentation
5. Project Summary
6. FY 2009-2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Task 3.2 – Transit Planning
7. FY 2009-2010 Florida State Clearinghouse Approval Letter of UPWP
MPO RESOLUTION NO. 2009-004

A RESOLUTION OF THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF AN APPLICATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FOR A GRANT UNDER 49 USC CHAPTER 53, SECTION 5303.

WHEREAS, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make grants for a mass transportation program of projects and budgets;

WHEREAS, the awarding of federal financial assistance will impose certain obligations upon the applicant, including the provision by it of the local share of project costs in the program;

WHEREAS, an applicant for assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Act of 1964, as amended, must give an assurance that it will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the U.S. Department of Transportation requirements thereunder; and

WHEREAS, it is the goal of the applicant that minority business enterprises be utilized to the fullest extent possible in connection with this project, and that procedures shall be established and administered to ensure that equipment purchases, consultant contracts, or other services meet these goals.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION:

1. That the Chairman of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization is authorized to execute, and the MPO Staff Director is authorized to file, applications on behalf of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization with the U.S. Department of Transportation to aid in the short and long term transit planning efforts of the MPO.

2. That the Chairman of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization is authorized to execute, and the MPO Staff Director is authorized to file, with such application an assurance or any other document required by the U.S. Department of Transportation effectuating the purpose of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

3. That the Indian River County MPO Staff Director is authorized to furnish such additional information as the U.S. Department of Transportation may require in connection with the application for the program of projects and budget.

4. That the Chairman of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization is authorized to set forth and execute affirmative minority business policies in connection with the program of projects and budget procurement needs.
5. That the Chairman of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization is authorized to execute a grant agreement on behalf of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization with the Florida Department of Transportation to aid in the financing of the FY 2008/09 – 2009/10 Unified Planning Work Program.

**THIS RESOLUTION** was moved for adoption by ____________________________, and the motion was seconded by ____________________________, and, upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Chairman Peter D. O'Bryan
Vice Chairman Debbie MacKay (School Board)
Commissioner Bob Solari
Commissioner Joseph Flescher
Commissioner Gary Wheeler
Commissioner Wesley Davis
Mayor of Vero Beach, Sabin Abell
Councilmember of Vero Beach, Bill Fish
Councilmember of Sebastian, Dale Simchick
Vice Mayor of Sebastian, Jim Hill
Mayor of Fellsmere, Susan Adams
Councilmember of Indian River Shores, Frannie Atchison

The Chairman thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this ___8th___ day of July ____, 2009.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

________________________________________
Peter D. O'Bryan, Chairman

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

________________________________________
COUNTY ATTORNEY
APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION:
   - [ ] Construction
   - [ ] Non-Construction

2. DATE SUBMITTED: 7/8/2009

3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE
   - [ ] Federal Identifier
   - [ ] State Application Identifier

4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY
   - [ ] Federal Identifier

5. APPLICANT INFORMATION
   - Legal Name: Indian River County MPO
   - Organizational Unit: Indian River County MPO
   - Department: Indian River County MPO
   - Division: Indian River County MPO
   - DUNS: 079208909
   - Address: 1801 27th Street
   - City: Vero Beach
   - County: Indian River
   - State: FL
   - Zip Code: 32960
   - Phone number (give area code): (772)226-1455
   - FAX number (give area code): (772)978-1806

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER EIN:
   - 59-6000674

7. TYPE OF APPLICANT (See back of form for Application Types)
   - [ ] New
   - [ ] Continuation
   - [ ] Revision
   - [ ] Other (specify)

8. TYPE OF APPLICATION:
   - [ ] Construction
   - [ ] Non-Construction

9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY
   - Federal Transit Administration

10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER
    - 20-505

11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT:
    - Transit Development Plan - Minor Update
    - Transit Infrastructure Database Maintenance
    - Transit Infrastructure Planning and Design
    - Greenways Planning and Design

12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (cities, counties, states, etc.):
    - Indian River County, Florida

13. PROPOSED PROJECT
    - Start Date: 10/01/2008
    - Ending Date: 9/30/2009

14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF
    - a. Applicant
    - US Congressional Dist 15
    - US Cong Dist 15

15. ESTIMATED FUNDING
    - a. Federal
      - $56,573
    - b. Applicant
      - $7,072
    - c. State
      - $7,072
    - d. Local
      - $0
    - e. Other
      - $0
    - f. Program Income
      - $0
    - g. Total
      - $70,716

16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT?
    - a. Yes
    - b. No

18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DUTY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.
    - a. Authorized Representative
    - Prefix Mr.
    - Last Name O'Bryan
    - First Name Peter
    - Middle Name D.
    - Suffix
    - b. Title MPO Chairman
    - c. Telephone number (give area code)
      - (772)226-1455
    - d. Date Signed
      - 7/8/2009
APPENDIX A

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009 CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES FOR FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
(Signature page alternative to providing Certifications and Assurances in TEAM-Web)

Name of Applicant: Indian River County

The Applicant agrees to comply with applicable provisions of Categories 01 – 24. OR

The Applicant agrees to comply with applicable provisions of the Categories it has selected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Assurances Required For Each Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Procurement Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Protections for Private Providers of Public Transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Acquisition of Rolling Stock for Use in Revenue Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Acquisition of Capital Assets by Lease</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Bus Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Charter Service Agreement</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School Transportation Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Demand Responsive Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alcohol Misuse and Prohibited Drug Use</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interest and Other Financing Costs</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Clean Fuels Grant Program</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Formula Program and Pilot Program</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nonurbanized Area Formula Program for States</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Job Access and Reverse Commute Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Freedom Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tribal Transit Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Infrastructure Finance Projects</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Deposits of Federal Financial Assistance to a State Infrastructure Banks.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2009 FTA CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES SIGNATURE PAGE
(Required of all Applicants for FTA assistance and all FTA Grantees with an active capital or formula project)

AFFIRMATION OF APPLICANT

Name of Applicant: Indian River County MPO

Name and Relationship of Authorized Representative: ____________________________

BY SIGNING BELOW, on behalf of the Applicant, I declare that the Applicant has duly authorized me to make these certifications and assurances and bind the Applicant's compliance. Thus, the Applicant agrees to comply with all Federal statutes and regulations, and follow applicable Federal directives, and comply with the certifications and assurances as indicated on the foregoing page applicable to each application it makes to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in Federal Fiscal Year 2009.

FTA intends that the certifications and assurances the Applicant selects on the other side of this document, as representative of the certifications and assurances in this document, should apply, as provided, to each project for which the Applicant seeks now, or may later, seek FTA assistance during Federal Fiscal Year 2009.

The Applicant affirms the truthfulness and accuracy of the certifications and assurances it has made in the statements submitted herein with this document and any other submission made to FTA, and acknowledges that the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, 31 U.S.C. 3801 et seq., and implementing U.S. DOT regulations, "Program Fraud Civil Remedies," 49 CFR part 31 apply to any certification, assurance or submission made to FTA. The criminal provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1001 apply to any certification, assurance, or submission made in connection with a Federal public transportation program authorized in 49 U.S.C. chapter 53 or any other statute.

In signing this document, I declare under penalties of perjury that the foregoing certifications and assurances, and any other statements made by me on behalf of the Applicant are true and correct.

Signature ____________________________

Name ________________________________

 Authorized Representative of Applicant

AFFIRMATION OF APPLICANT'S ATTORNEY

For (Name of Applicant): ____________________________

As the undersigned Attorney for the above named Applicant, I hereby affirm to the Applicant that it has authority under State, local, or tribal government law, as applicable, to make and comply with the certifications and assurances as indicated on the foregoing pages. I further affirm that, in my opinion, the certifications and assurances have been legally made and constitute legal and binding obligations on the Applicant.

I further affirm to the Applicant that, to the best of my knowledge, there is no legislation or litigation pending or imminent that might adversely affect the validity of these certifications and assurances, or of the performance of the project.

Signature ____________________________

Name ________________________________

 Attorney for Applicant

Date: ____________________________

Each Applicant for FTA financial assistance and each FTA Grantee with an active capital or formula project must provide an Affirmation of Applicant's Attorney pertaining to the Applicant's legal capacity. The Applicant may enter its signature in lieu of the Attorney's signature, provided the Applicant has on file this Affirmation, signed by the attorney and dated this Federal fiscal year.
# Section 5303
## Approved Project Budget for FY 2009-2010
### (total dollars)

#### Technical Classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.21.00</td>
<td>Program Support and Administration</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.22.00</td>
<td>General Development and Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.23.01</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Planning: System Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.23.02</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Planning: Project Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.24.00</td>
<td>Short Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.25.00</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.00</td>
<td>Planning Emphasis Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.12</td>
<td>Coordination of Non-Emergency Human Service Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.13</td>
<td>Participation of Transit Operators in Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.14</td>
<td>Planning for Transit Systems Management/Operations to Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.15</td>
<td>Support Transit Capital Investment Decisions through Effective Systems Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.16</td>
<td>Incorporating Safety &amp; Security in Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.27.00</td>
<td>Other Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**: $70,716

#### Accounting Classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.30.01</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$70,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.02</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.03</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.04</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.05</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.06</td>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.07</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.08</td>
<td>Indirect Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**: $70,716

#### Fund Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.40.01</td>
<td>MPO Activities</td>
<td>$70,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.40.02</td>
<td>Transit Operator Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.40.03</td>
<td>State and/or Local Agency Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**: $70,716

**Federal Share (80%)**: $56,573

**Local Share (20%)**: $14,143

### Accounting Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>FPC</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91.37.08.8P-2</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Technical Studies - Planning</td>
<td>$70,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Technical Classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.21.00</td>
<td>Program Support and Administration</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.22.00</td>
<td>General Development and Comprehensive Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.23.01</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Planning: System Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.23.02</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Planning: Project Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.24.00</td>
<td>Short Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td>56,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.25.00</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.00</td>
<td>Planning Emphasis Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.12</td>
<td>Coordination of Non-Emergency Human Service Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.13</td>
<td>Participation of Transit Operators in Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.14</td>
<td>Planning for Transit Systems Management/Operations to Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.15</td>
<td>Support Transit Capital Investment Decisions through Effective Systems Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.26.16</td>
<td>Incorporating Safety &amp; Security in Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.27.00</td>
<td>Other Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**

$56,573

### Accounting Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.30.01</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>56,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.02</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.03</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.04</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.05</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.06</td>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.07</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.30.08</td>
<td>Indirect Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**

$56,573

### Fund Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.40.01</td>
<td>MPO Activities</td>
<td>56,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.40.02</td>
<td>Transit Operator Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.40.03</td>
<td>State and/or Local Agency Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Net Project Cost**

$56,573
1. **Program Support and Administration (41.11.00).** Include basic overhead, program support, and general administrative costs directly chargeable to the FTA project, i.e., direct program support, administration, interagency coordination, citizen participation, public information, local assistance, UPWP development, etc. (If direct program administrative and support costs are included in each work or activity, do not enter them a second time in this category.)

2. **General Development and Comprehensive Planning (41.12.00).** Include only the costs of activities *specifically emphasizing* regional policy and system planning for non-transportation functional areas, including the development and maintenance of related data collection and analysis systems, demographic analysis and non-transportation modeling and forecasting activity, i.e., land use, housing, human services, environmental and natural resources, recreation and open space, public facilities and utilities, etc.

3. **Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP) - Metropolitan & Statewide.**
   a. **Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP) - System Level (41.13.01).** Include only the costs of activities *specifically emphasizing* long range transportation system planning and analysis, i.e. long range travel forecasting and modeling including appropriate date base development and maintenance for transportation in the entire metropolitan area or state, system analysis, sketch planning, system plan development, reappraisal or revision, and all long range, Transportation System Management (TSM) activities.
   b. **Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP) - Project Level (41.13.02).** Include only the costs of activities *specifically emphasizing* long range project level planning and analysis, i.e., Major Investment Studies (corridor and subarea studies), cost effectiveness studies, feasibility and location studies, and the preparation of related draft environmental impact studies.

4. **Short Range Transportation Planning (SRTP) (41.14.00).** Include only the cost of activities *specifically emphasizing* short range transportation system or project planning and analysis proposed in the next three to five years, i.e., management analyses of internal operations such as, management/administration, maintenance, personnel, and labor relations; service planning including appropriate data base development and maintenance; TDP preparation; financial management planning, including alternative fare box policies; all short range Transportation System Management (TSM) activities including vanpool/ridesharing, high occupancy vehicles, parking management, etc.

5. **Transportation Improvement Program (41.15.00).** Include only the costs of activities *specifically emphasizing* TIP development and monitoring.

6. **Special Projects.**
   a. **Americans with Disability Act (41.16.01).** Include only the cost of planning and analysis activities *specifically emphasizing* the planning, development and improvement of transportation services to the elderly and persons with disabilities, particularly the wheelchair bound and semi-ambulatory, i.e., 504 planning, special service planning and evaluation, paratransit policy, etc.
b. Clean Air Planning (41.16.02). Include only the cost of FTA assisted activities specifically emphasizing air quality planning and analysis, for example, development analysis, and evaluation of transportation control strategies and measures, air quality-related modeling and analysis of transportation plans and programs, SIP development and revision activities, air quality monitoring, etc. (Do not include EPA Section 175 funds.)

c. Financial Planning (41.16.06). Include only the cost of activities specifically emphasizing the development of the financial plan required by 49 U.S.C. Sections 5303(f) and 5304(b) to support implementation of the TIP and the Metropolitan Long-Range Transportation Plan.

d. Management Systems (41.16.07). Include only the costs of activities specifically emphasizing the development, establishment and implementation of the management systems required by the joint FHWA/FTA Management and Monitoring Systems regulation, 23 C.F.R. Parts 500 and 626 and 49 C.F.R. Part 614. In metropolitan areas, these systems are developed and implemented in cooperation with MPOs. Three of the management systems -- Traffic Congestion, Intermodal Facilities and Systems, Public Transportation Facilities and Equipment -- must be part of the metropolitan planning process. The costs for Management Systems for highways -- Pavement, Bridge, and Safety -- should use BLI 41.18.00, "Highway Planning."

e. Public Participation (41.16.08). Include only the cost of activities specifically emphasizing development, establishment and implementation of the public involvement process as an integral part of the statewide and metropolitan planning process.

f. Livable Communities (41.16.10). Include only the cost of activities specifically emphasizing the planning for livable communities, e.g., consideration of those required factors that are specifically related to preserving or enhancing the quality of life. These factors include: congestion relief and prevention, effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development, and the overall social, economic, energy, and environmental effects of transportation decisions. Other planning activities emphasizing quality of life would include: identification of the relevant issues that relate transportation goals to those of the community; and analysis of methods to assure consideration of quality of life factors in planning and programming.

7. Highway Planning (41.18.00). Specify and include only the cost of activities related exclusively to highway and highway-related planning, e.g., the development, establishment and implementation of the three highway management systems -- Pavement, Bridge, and Highway Safety. Costs under this line item must be separable from nonhighway costs to prevent double counting of proposed expenditures.

8. Other Activities (41.17.00). Include only the cost of those activities whose primary emphasis is unrelated to the specific types of activities described above.
FEDERAL FY 2009-10 CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of her or his knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal Contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress, in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by Section 1352, Title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000.00 and not more that $100,000.00 for each such failure.

________________________________________  ______________________________
Date                                      Chairperson for the MPO
FEDERAL FY 2009-10 DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION CERTIFICATION

As required by U.S. Regulations on Government wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement) at 49 CFR 29.510

(1) The Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principles:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, state or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or state antitrust statutes; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, state or local) with commission of any of the offenses listed in paragraph (b) of this certification; and,

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this certification had one or more public transactions (Federal, state or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) The Metropolitan Planning Organization also hereby certifies that if, later, it becomes aware of any information contradicting the statements of paragraphs (a) through (d) above, it will promptly provide that information to the U.S. DOT.

______________________________
Chairperson for the MPO

______________________________
Date
The Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will use the Section 5303 grant funds to perform a Minor Update of the MPO’s Transit Development Plan (TDP); a Transit Quality and Level of Service Analysis; Transit Infrastructure Design; and other activities. Each of these is described in detail below.

**TDP Minor Update**

As required by state regulations, the MPO must do a major update of its TDP every five years. In interim years, only a minor update or status report is required. During FY 2009/10, the MPO will undertake a TDP minor update. This activity involves collecting data, assessing transit system performance, obtaining public input, coordinating with other transit service providers in the region, and making revisions to service improvements and the transit financing plan, as necessary.

**TDP Status Reports**

In 2009/10, the MPO will complete a TDP status report, in accordance with guidance from FDOT. This activity, which has replaced the annual TDP Minor Update requirement, will involve collecting data, updating numerous transit system service and performance measures, obtaining public input, and determining compliance with the TDP major update’s goals and objectives. This task will also involve updating the transit service quality assessment performed as part of the TDP major update, thus directly addressing FDOT’s Planning Emphasis Area on Transit Quality Level of Service. This activity may utilize consultant services.

**Boarding and Alighting Analysis**

On a quarterly basis, the MPO will collect boarding and alighting data for all routes on the Indian River Transit system. This information will be used to analyze the productivity of various segments on the IRT system, as well as prioritize locations for future transit infrastructure. This activity will be performed with consultant services.

**Transit Infrastructure Database Maintenance/Transit Infrastructure Planning**

On an ongoing basis, the MPO will survey transit routes, review boardings and alightings at strategic locations, identify locations suitable for bus shelters or other transit infrastructure, and maintain and update the database of transit infrastructure developed by FDOT. Transit infrastructure to be monitored includes bus stop signage, benches, shelters, and transit passenger amenities. The MPO will also coordinate with FDOT, Indian River County, and Municipalities to identify new priority locations for future transit infrastructure. In addition, the MPO will assist Indian River County and the Indian River County Senior Resource Association (SRA) in planning for the implementation of transit infrastructure. This may include reviewing available right-of-way and pedestrian connectivity to proposed infrastructure locations; developing design guidelines for transit infrastructure; reviewing local ordinances on signage, benches, and shelters; and assisting implementing agencies in meeting permit requirements.
New Route Development

One of the major enhancements to the transit system contained in the last TDP major update was the implementation of new routes and extended hours on existing routes. MPO staff will assist the transit provider in monitoring recently implemented new routes to Fellsmere and Barefoot Bay. In addition, MPO staff will work with SRA staff to identify and implement new routes and new service in accordance with the Transit Development Plan. Specific activities may include advertising the new routes and system changes, conducting public meetings, and assisting with operational planning for the new routes.

Intermodal Planning

Throughout the year, the MPO will assess the relationship of transit to other modes of transportation. Specifically, the MPO will examine the linkages between the transit and bike/ped networks and identify and improve locations where these modes intersect; will identify ways to coordinate fixed route and specialized transit service; and will examine “park and ride” opportunities on the existing transit routes.

Greenways Planning and Design

The MPO may undertake Greenways studies and/or design projects as identified in Task 4.6. These may include the design of trails at publicly owned land in the City of Sebastian, City of Fellsmere, and in northern portions of unincorporated Indian River County. Greenways planning and design will utilize consultant services.

Other Transit Planning Activity

Other transit planning activities will be undertaken by MPO staff during FY 2009/10. One such activity will be to provide technical assistance to the County in order to maintain the County’s eligibility for the continued receipt of Federal and State Mass Transit grant assistance. Other activities will include conducting quarterly meetings between the County and the Transit provider; conducting Transit Advisory Group meetings; monitoring the performance of the transit system on an ongoing basis; maintaining certifications for grant eligibility; developing an annual goal for Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) participation; and ensuring compliance with FTA and FDOT directives, as appropriate. In addition, the county will undertake other transit planning activities, such as coordinating transit planning activities with the St. Lucie, Martin, and Brevard County MPOs.
UPWP TASK NO: 3.2 - TRANSIT PLANNING

OBJECTIVE:

To complete a major update of the MPO's Transit Development Plan (TDP).

To complete a TDP Status report.

To provide technical assistance and guidance to the County in support of Public Transportation planning and transit grant administration activities.

PREVIOUS WORK:

In the past, the MPO has utilized Section 5303 funds to prepare major and minor updates of its Transit Development Plan (TDP). Major Updates were prepared in FY 2001/02 and FY 2004/05, while minor updates were prepared in interim years. In 2007/08, the MPO initiated another TDP Major Update.

With respect to preparing either a major or minor TDP update, a number of activities must be undertaken. These include collecting data, updating numerous transit system service and performance measures, measuring compliance with the TDP's goals and objectives, coordinating with other transit service providers in the region, and revising the transit financing plan. Since a Major Update was again initiated in 2007/08, staff undertook a number of additional activities, including conducting public workshops, developing the Indian River County T-BEST transit system model, and developing transit route alternatives.

In FY 2007/08, the MPO also engaged in a number of other transit planning activities. Among these were planning for new transit infrastructure in Gifford and on Aviation Boulevard; assisting the Senior Resource Association (formerly Council on Aging) with new route development through Fellsmere, Sebastian, and Barefoot Bay; and providing administrative support for federal and state transit grant funding.

In addition, MPO staff completed the design of the Central Indian River County Greenway in 2007/08. Included as an optional task in the Greenways scope of services, the project began in the fourth quarter of FY 2006/07 and focused on the Vero Beach Airport Loop trail, the first phase of the overall project.

METHODOLOGY:

TDP Major Update

As required by state regulations, the MPO must do a major update of its TDP every five years. In interim years, only a minor update or status report is required. During FY 2008/09, the MPO will complete the ten-year TDP major update that was begun in January of 2008. This activity involves collecting data, updating numerous transit system service and performance measures, assessing transit system performance, obtaining public input, revising the TDP’s goals and objectives, coordinating with other transit service providers in the region, developing a program
of transit service improvements, and revising the ten year transit financing plan. The TDP major update must be completed by September, 2008.

The MPO will look to engage in joint coordination activities with St. Lucie County and Martin Counties in development of the St. Lucie-Martin regional TDP. These activities could include conducting joint meetings and public hearings and developing regional maps and work products. In addition, the MPO will coordinate with the Martin and Brevard County MPOs on future route planning and development.

Another requirement contained in State Regulations is preparation of a Transit Quality and Level of Service Assessment (TQLOS). TQLOS is the only FDOT Planning Emphasis Area for 2008/09. The purpose of a TQLOS analysis is to evaluate fixed-route transit service across six service and performance categories based on defined criteria. With the assistance of a consultant, the MPO will collect the data necessary to perform the evaluation, evaluate quality and level of service, and compile the results of the evaluation into the TDP major update final report.

**TDP Status Reports**

In 2009/10, the MPO will complete a TDP status report, in accordance with guidance from FDOT. This activity, which has replaced the annual TDP Minor Update requirement, will involve collecting data, updating numerous transit system service and performance measures, obtaining public input, and determining compliance with the TDP major update’s goals and objectives. This task will also involve updating the transit service quality assessment performed as part of the TDP major update, thus directly addressing FDOT’s Planning Emphasis Area on Transit Quality Level of Service. This activity may utilize consultant services.

**Boarding and Alighting Analysis**

On a quarterly basis, the MPO will collect boarding and alighting data for all routes on the Indian River Transit system. This information will be used to analyze the productivity of various segments on the IRT system, as well as prioritize locations for future transit infrastructure. This activity will be performed with consultant services.

**Transit Infrastructure Database Maintenance/Transit Infrastructure Planning**

On an ongoing basis, the MPO will survey transit routes, review boardings and alightings at strategic locations, identify locations suitable for bus shelters or other transit infrastructure, and maintain and update the database of transit infrastructure developed by FDOT. Transit infrastructure to be monitored includes bus stop signage, benches, shelters, and transit passenger amenities. The MPO will also coordinate with FDOT, Indian River County, and Municipalities to identify new priority locations for future transit infrastructure. In addition, the MPO will assist Indian River County and the Indian River County – Senior Resource Association (SRA) in planning for the implementation of transit infrastructure. This may include reviewing available right-of-way and pedestrian connectivity to proposed infrastructure locations; developing design guidelines for transit infrastructure; reviewing local ordinances on signage, benches, and shelters; and assisting implementing agencies in meeting permit requirements.

**New Route Development**
One of the major enhancements to the transit system contained in the last TDP major update was the implementation of new routes and extended hours on existing routes. MPO staff will assist the transit provider in monitoring recently implemented new routes to Fellsmere and Barefoot Bay. In addition, MPO staff will work with SRA staff to identify and implement new routes and new service in accordance with the Transit Development Plan. Specific activities may include advertising the new routes and system changes, conducting public meetings, and assisting with operational planning for the new routes.

**Intermodal Planning**

Throughout the year, the MPO will assess the relationship of transit to other modes of transportation. Specifically, the MPO will examine the linkages between the transit and bike/ped networks and identify and improve locations where these modes intersect; will identify ways to coordinate fixed route and specialized transit service; and will examine “park and ride” opportunities on the existing transit routes.

**Greenways Planning and Design**

In 2008/09, the MPO will complete the design of the Airport Trails project that was contained in the Central Indian River County Greenways Plan. In addition, the MPO may undertake additional Greenways studies and/or design projects as identified in Task 4.6. These may include the design of trails at publicly owned land in the City of Sebastian, City of Fellsmere, and in northern portions of unincorporated Indian River County. Greenways planning and design will utilize consultant services.

**Other Transit Planning Activity**

Other transit planning activities will be undertaken by MPO staff during FY 2008/09 and 2009/10. One such activity will be to provide technical assistance to the County in order to maintain the County’s eligibility for the continued receipt of Federal and State Mass Transit grant assistance. Other activities will include conducting quarterly meetings between the County and the Transit provider; conducting Transit Advisory Group meetings; monitoring the performance of the transit system on an ongoing basis; maintaining certifications for grant eligibility; developing an annual goal for Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE) participation; and ensuring compliance with FTA and FDOT directives, as appropriate. In addition, the county will undertake other transit planning activities, such as coordinating transit planning activities with the St. Lucie, Martin, and Brevard County MPOs.

**END PRODUCTS:**

TDP Major Update, to be completed September 2008.

TDP Status Report, to be completed September 2009.

Transit coordination meetings, to be held quarterly.

Airport Trails Greenways Design, to be completed September 2008.
Boarding and Alighting Analysis, to be performed quarterly.

TQLOS analysis, to be completed September 2008.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Agency</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>FY 2008/09</th>
<th>FY 2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County MPO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$7,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River County MPO</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$56,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May utilize $20,000 consultant services in FY 2008/09 and 2009/10

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES:

Indian River County
Indian River County Municipalities
Indian River County – Senior Resource Association
Brevard County MPO
St. Lucie MPO
Martin MPO
FDOT
June 18, 2008

In Reply Refer To: HPR-FL

Mr. James Wolfe
District Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
3400 West Commercial Boulevard
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33309-3421

Attention: Ms. Nancy Ziegler

Dear Mr. Wolfe:

The following is in response to your staff’s recent transmittal of the Final Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/09–2009/10 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that was developed and adopted by the Indian River County Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MPO), in coordination with the Department, the local transit service provider, and other area planning process participants.

Upon our review of the Final UPWP, we have determined that the document satisfies the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, 23 CFR Part 420, 49 CFR Part 18, and other pertinent legislation, regulations, and policies. Moreover, we have determined that our comments on the Draft UPWP have been adequately addressed.

As delegated in the October 2005 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA’s) Florida Division and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Region IV for Administration of Transportation Planning and Programming, the FHWA approves the above stated MPO’s FY 2008/09–2009/10 UPWP submitted by the District.

It is understood that content and consistency issues involving shared regional planning and coordination activities in the UPWPs for the Indian River County MPO and the two other Treasure Coast MPOs, particularly with regard to the 2035 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan, are to be addressed as a post-approval activity.
The FY 2008/09 -- 2009/10 UPWP reflects $555,145 of PL funds for FY 2008/09 and $436,621 of PL Funds for 2009/10. The funds for FY 2008/09 are available upon an approved authorization. Expenditure invoicing and progress reports should be submitted quarterly, with copies to the FHWA. Expenditures incurred without prior authorization will not be reimbursed. The funds for FY 2009/10 will not be available for use until July 1, 2009. Close-out of the PL funds shall occur 90 days after the end of FY 2009/10 state fiscal year (by September 30, 2010). Any exception to this timeframe must be prior approved by the FHWA.

We appreciate your staff's efforts in the development and review of this MPO's UPWP. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Ms. Tamara Christion, AICP (850) 942-9650, extension 3032.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lee Ann Jacobs, AICP
For:    David C. Gibbs
        Acting Division Administrator

cc:    Mr. James Garland, FTA (Region IV)
       Ms. Lois Bush, FDOT (District 4)
       Mr. Phil Matson, Indian River MPO
       Ms. Yvonne Arens, FDOT (MS-28)
       Mr. Marion Hart, Jr., FDOT (MS-57)
       Ms. Iman Ameen, FDOT (MS-21)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

THROUGH: Robert M. Keating, AICP
Community Development Director

FROM: Sutapa Chatterjee
MPO Planner

DATE: June 29, 2009

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution Supporting the Inclusion of the Intercity Rail Component of the Florida East Coast (FEC) Corridor Project as part of Florida's Economic Stimulus Plan

It is requested that the information herein presented be given formal consideration by the Indian River County MPO at its regular meeting of July 8, 2009.

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

In early 2000, Amtrak, the Florida East Coast Railways (FEC), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and regional authorities agreed to a service concept to reintroduce passenger rail along Florida's east coast on the FEC Corridor. At that time, thirteen preliminary station locations were identified between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach. These locations were primarily in downtowns and included Stuart, Fort Pierce, and Vero Beach. The concept then was that the new Amtrak long-distance service would utilize existing FEC tracks, with limited additional track sidings as needed.

For Amtrak service to continue south to Miami, an interconnection in West Palm Beach between the FEC and Chessie & Seaboard (CSX) tracks would be required. That general alignment is included in the 2006 Florida Rail Plan, and is illustrated in the map graphic titled "Figure 5.6 Florida Intercity Passenger Rail Service Vision Plan - Coastal Route" (identified as the north-south line on the map next page).

In 2002, negotiations were nearly completed between Amtrak, FDOT, and the FEC, when the Federal government directed Amtrak to suspend negotiations pending revisions to Amtrak's budget and debt structure. Recently, the Federal loan provisions were satisfied, and Amtrak has begun investigating new service alignments. Over the next five years (2009 through 2014), Amtrak's budget will nearly double to $13 billion, allowing the carrier to better expand its operations. Also, the January 2009 economic stimulus legislation directs an additional $8 billion to states, specifically to develop new corridor and long distance services.
ANALYSIS

According to the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC), the Amtrak/FEC Corridor Project (Jacksonville to Miami) could be an appropriate project for Florida to request as part of the Federal economic stimulus package termed the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan." If implemented, Amtrak intercity corridor service would complement on-going efforts in southeastern Florida, such as the current Tri-Rail service or potential new service to be recommended by the South Florida East Coast Corridor (SFECC) Study. Presently, the cost to carry out the Amtrak/FEC Corridor Project is estimated to be approximately $100 million.

It should be noted that an Amtrak project would compete for a different source of Federal funding than either Tri-Rail or the SFECC project (Federal Railroad Administration funding versus Federal Transit Administration funding). Further, a Jacksonville/Miami Amtrak project would likely include an interconnection between the FEC and CSX tracks in Palm Beach County, a condition which could shift this capital expense away from a future SFECC-recommended service, thereby improving the cost/benefit ratio for a Palm Beach/Miami FEC service.

Overall, the reintroduction of passenger service on the FEC Corridor throughout the region could provide enhanced inter- and intra-regional mobility as well as economic development opportunities in coastal cities. Currently, there is a high potential for this project to be advanced if it is included as part of Florida's request for Federal economic stimulus money. Moving this project forward, however, will require the State of Florida to include the Intercity FEC Corridor Project (Jacksonville/Miami) as part of its Federal economic stimulus request. For that to occur, there needs to be support from the Region's Legislative and Congressional delegation, the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) and affected local governments along the FEC Corridor.

On March 20, 2009, the TCRPC passed a Resolution supporting the inclusion of the Intercity FEC Corridor Project as part of Florida's economic stimulus package. The TCRPC is now requesting that the Indian River County MPO adopt a similar resolution. Draft Resolution 2009-05, which indicates that the MPO supports prioritizing the Amtrak project as a component of the State's stimulus package, is included as Attachment 1.

RECOMMENDATION

MPO staff recommends that the MPO adopt Resolution 2009-05 supporting the inclusion of the Intercity FEC Corridor Project (Jacksonville/Miami) as part of Florida's request for Federal economic stimulus money, and transmit the resolution to the Governor, the Secretary of the Florida Department of Transportation, and the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council.

ATTACHMENT

1. Resolution 2009-05 supporting the Inclusion of the Intercity Rail Component of FEC Corridor Project as part of Florida's Economic Stimulus Plan
RESOLUTION 2009-05

A RESOLUTION OF THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION REQUESTING THE ASSISTANCE OF GOVERNOR CRIST AND FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SECRETARY KOPELOUSOS TO PRIORITIZE THE INTERCITY RAIL COMPONENT OF THE FEC CORRIDOR PROJECT (FROM JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI) AS PART OF THE FEDERAL ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA

WHEREAS, the FEC corridor historically functioned as a passenger rail line along Florida’s east coast, traversing or providing rail connections to urban areas such as Vero Beach and Sebastian in Indian River County; and

WHEREAS, Florida’s east coast historically developed around train stations along the FEC railroad; and

WHEREAS, local governments and the private sector along Florida’s east coast are currently implementing programs to redevelop historic downtowns built around train stations; and

WHEREAS, improved mobility is highly desired in Indian River County and throughout the State of Florida; and

WHEREAS, transit, including rail transit, is a key component of improved mobility, especially between cities and throughout the Florida’s east coast; and

WHEREAS, the 2006 Florida Rail Plan identifies passenger transit along the FEC corridor as a potential “Coastal Route” for new passenger rail service in the State of Florida; and

WHEREAS, Amtrak is well-suited to provide passenger rail service along Florida’s east coast; and

WHEREAS, the reintroduction of Amtrak service along Florida’s east coast would provide near-term jobs and economic stimulus for Florida’s residents and businesses; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government is seeking appropriate projects for inclusion in the Federal economic stimulus package to provide immediate and near-term job opportunities for projects; and

WHEREAS, the Intercity FEC Corridor Project (Jacksonville/Miami) is an appropriate project for inclusion by the State of Florida in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan; and

WHEREAS, former work by Amtrak and FDOT includes plans for the improvements necessary to initiate Amtrak service on the FEC corridor;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION strongly supports inclusion of the Amtrak/FEC Corridor Project (from Jacksonville to Miami) as part of the Federal economic stimulus package for the State of Florida.
THIS RESOLUTION was moved for adoption by ____________________________, and the
tmotion was seconded by ____________________________, and, upon being put to a vote, the vote
was as follows:

Chairman Peter D. O'Bryan
Vice Chairman Debbie MacKay (School Board)
Commissioner Bob Solari
Commissioner Joseph Flescher
Commissioner Gary Wheeler
Commissioner Wesley Davis
Mayor of Vero Beach, Sabin Abell
Councilmember of Vero Beach, Bill Fish
Councilmember of Sebastian, Dale Simchick
Vice Mayor of Sebastian, Jim Hill
Mayor of Fellsmere, Susan Adams
Councilmember of Indian River Shores, Frannie Atchison

The Chairman thereupon declared the resolution duly passed and adopted this ___th___ day
of ___July_____, 2009.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

_____________________________________
Peter D. O'Bryan, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____________________________________
APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

_____________________________________
COUNTY ATTORNEY