

# Prioritized Project List 2030 – 2040

Draft for Adoption | July 2024



# Executive Summary

Each year, MetroPlan Orlando updates the Prioritized Project List (PPL), a document that includes all the upcoming highway, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, aviation, and other transportation-related projects in our three-county region (Orange, Osceola, and Seminole Counties) that have been deemed cost feasible in the near term but may still have unfunded phases. The Prioritized Project List shows which projects are next in line for federal and state funding.

The PPL is created in conjunction with the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which contains all transportation projects that are programmed for funding over the next five years. As written in 23 U.S. Code § 134, all projects that receive federal funding “shall be selected for implementation from the approved TIP by the metropolitan planning organization designated for the area in consultation with the State and any affected public transportation operator.” In addition, the TIP and PPL must be consistent with the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The current proposed TIP is planned from Fiscal Year (FY) 2024/25 to 2028/29 and the currently adopted MTP is planned through 2045. The PPL covers all projects that are awaiting funding and implementation in the first 10 years of the MTP’s Cost Feasible Plan that are not yet included in the TIP, thus this PPL covers FY 2029/30 to FY 2039/40.

## The PPL is organized into two core categories:

### National Highway System and State Roads

This category contains projects on the National Highway System, State Roads, and Off-System Construction Assistance. The State Roads designation also contains other federal functionally classified roadways, but they are identified separately due to the MetroPlan Orlando Board Policy on the allocation of Transportation Management Area (TMA) funds apportioned to MetroPlan Orlando for being a Large Urbanized Area (population over 200,000).

### MetroPlan Orlando Multimodal System

This category contains federally funded projects exclusively off the state highway system. Projects included in the MetroPlan Orlando Multimodal System are Roadway and Complete Streets, Safety Emphasis, Transportation System Management and Operations (TSM&O), TSM&O Area-Wide, Automated/ Connected/ Electric/Share (ACES) Demonstrations, Pedestrian & Bicycle Infrastructure, Safe Routes to School, Critical Sidewalk Gaps, and Regional Transit projects.

To determine which project will be eligible for funding next, each of the projects on the PPL were ranked through a process known as performance-based planning. For projects of the National Highway System and State Roads, the MetroPlan Orlando Board and its subsidiary committees prioritize these projects for funding based on their potential to help achieve targets set for Safety, Travel Time Reliability, Bridge, and Pavement Condition performance measures. Projects in the MetroPlan Orlando Multimodal System are also ranked through performance-based planning and include additional, regionally focused objectives and targets.

After this document is approved by the MetroPlan Orlando Board, it is submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). FDOT uses both the National Highway and State Road lists and MetroPlan Orlando’s Multimodal System (TMA) lists to program projects for funding in future Work Programs based on both the MetroPlan Orlando TMA priorities and the FDOT FY 2024/25 – FY 2028/29 Tentative Five-Year Work Program.

It is important to note, most new projects or project phases are typically added into the fifth year of the Work Program. Once a project in the PPL has been fully funded through construction in the TIP and the FDOT Work Program, it will be listed on the PPL for continuity until the project is complete, but no additional funding for the project will be identified in the PPL. Any projects/phases remaining on the PPL can be advanced to a higher priority over time, and new projects can eventually be added to this list of priority projects.

# Contents

Introduction .....	5
Planning & Prioritization Process .....	6
Funding Programs and Priorities.....	10
Supplement A - Prioritized Project Lists.....	24
Interstate Highway System, Strategic Intermodal System, and National Highway Freight Network Projects....	25
State Highway System / State Road Projects .....	26
Off System Construction Assistance / TRIP Projects .....	32
Complete Streets Projects .....	33
TSM&O + ITS Projects.....	35
Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Projects.....	38
School Mobility / Safe Routes to School Projects.....	40
Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects.....	41
Regional Transit Projects.....	50
Supplement B - Prioritization Criteria & Scoring Summary .....	52

## Figures

Figure 1   PPL Development Schedule .....	6
Figure 2   Goals & Objectives .....	7
Figure 3   Evaluation Criteria .....	8
Figure 4   Goal Weighting and Emphasis.....	9
Figure 5   TMA Modal Allocation Policy .....	10
Figure 6   2045 MTP Funding Policies / Programs Implemented in PPL; 2028 - 2045 .....	11
Figure 7   PPL Funding Programs / Priority Lists .....	24

### Legal Information

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the State Planning and Research Program, Section 505 [or Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f)] of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

This document was developed for use by MetroPlan Orlando for planning purposes. MetroPlan Orlando is not liable for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages (such as, but not limited to, damages of loss of profits, business savings or data) related to the use of this document or information produced as a result of this document or its interpretation. This information is publicly available and is provided with no warranty or promises of any kind whatsoever, express or implied, including warranties for merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. While every effort is made to confirm the accuracy of the information provided within this document and any analytical methods used to develop the information, no assurance of accuracy can be or is given. By using this document and the information in any way, the User is acknowledging this limitation, and is agreeing to use the document and the information therein at their own risk.

# Abbreviations & Acronyms

## Planning Terms

- PPL** Prioritized Project List
- TIP** Transportation Improvement Program
- MTP** Metropolitan Transportation Plan (our region's 2045 long range transportation plan)
- UPWP** Unified Planning Work Program (MetroPlan Orlando's annual operating budget)
- TMA** Transportation Management Area
- LAP** Local Agency Program (FDOT program for local agencies to administer federal/state funds)
- SWB** Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundles

## Funding Categories

- CARU** Carbon Reduction funds (federal) – new funding program established in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill
- DDR** District Dedicated Revenue funds (State)
- FTA** Federal Transit Administration funds (Federal)
- MFF** Moving Florida Forward (State)
- NHS** National Highway System funds (Federal) – used for interstate highway projects
- TALU** Transportation Alternative funds (Federal) – used for Complete Streets, bicycle and pedestrian projects
- TMA** Transportation Management Area (Federal) – prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando
- SRTS** Safe Routes to School (State) – used for sidewalk projects within a radii of a school
- SU** Surface Transportation Program funds (Federal) – may be used for highway, transit, or enhancement (bicycle/pedestrian, beautification, etc.) projects in urban areas of greater than 200,000 population
- TRIP** Transportation Regional Incentive Program funds (State) - used for regionally significant projects with a minimum of 50% in local matching funds required

## Project Phases

- PLN** Planning / Feasibility Study
- PD&E** Project Development and Environmental Study
- PE** Preliminary Engineering (Design)
- ROW** Right-of-Way Acquisition
- CST** Construction
- CEI** Construction-Engineering Inspection
- OPS** Operations

# Introduction

The Prioritized Project List (PPL) is the annual technical process to determine which projects should be funded next within MetroPlan Orlando's five-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Both the TIP and the PPL are created in accordance with federal guidelines. While the TIP contains transportation projects that are currently or soon-to-be funded, the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or the MTP, looks further out into the future. The PPL is the bridge between these two documents. The TIP, the PPL, and the MTP, act as our guidance for what should be funded in the short-term and in the long run.



*For the more information about the above referenced plans, visit the MetroPlan Orlando webpages below:*

**2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) –**

<https://metroplanorlando.gov/plans/metropolitan-transportation-plan>

**Prioritized Project List (PPL) –**

<https://metroplanorlando.gov/plans/prioritized-project-list>

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) –**

<https://metroplanorlando.gov/plans/transportation-improvement-program>

**Progress on the Draft 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) under development –**

<https://metroplanorlando.gov/plans/2050-metropolitan-transportation-plan/>

# Planning & Prioritization Process

Consistent with FHWA's Transportation Performance Management (TPM) guidance, MetroPlan Orlando is using a data-driven and context-sensitive approach to identify and assess candidate transportation projects for the Prioritized Project List (PPL). The intent of this process is to identify, select, and fund projects which best address regional transportation goals, objectives, and targets. The use of comparative criteria and the evaluation process described in the following sections to select projects is intended to guide and assist MetroPlan Orlando and its partner agencies in establishing the order in which projects may be implemented, based on forecasted funding levels.

## Approach

The project assessment and prioritization process consists of two (2) key phases:

### 1. Project Assessment and Comparative Analysis


Utilizing the evaluation criteria documented in the Methodology section of this document, eligible candidate projects are evaluated. Rankings and associated project costs for all phases are also considered as part of the annual update of the Prioritized Project List. During this step, MetroPlan Orlando staff ensures consistency with the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Cost Feasible Plan.

### 2. Agency and Public Review of Preliminary Findings / Draft PPL

Following completion of project assessment and preparation of the draft PPL, MetroPlan Orlando staff, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) Advisory Committee members review the preliminary findings. Feedback from agency partners and other stakeholders is also considered during this step in the process.

This project prioritization process, summarized in Figure 1, is intended to complement MetroPlan Orlando's regional planning, congestion management, and overall decision-making process. While ultimate discretion is granted to the MPO Board, the data-informed and objective-driven findings yielded from the assessment phase provides decision-makers with the best information available, consistent with Transportation Performance Management best practices.

Figure 1 | PPL Development Schedule





# Method

The intention of this evaluation is to use comparative criteria to evaluate projects and their relationships to the planning goals listed below. This methodology was developed for consistency with the MTP. The criteria suggested in this process are not static and it is acknowledged that emphasis areas stressed by the federal and state government or special preferences by local governments and the MPO Board will change over time. This may lead to the addition of new factors and the elimination of others; these aspects can and will be considered in future updates of the MTP. As previously noted, the project assessment guidelines are intended to assist decision-makers in determining how well each transportation project, regardless of mode, reflects the planning objectives and performance targets.

Projects were evaluated and prioritized consistent with the MTP's Goals, Objectives, and Targets. These long-range transportation system goals are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 | Goals & Objectives



Source: MetroPlan Orlando, 2045 MTP

## Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis

By considering transportation industry evaluation best practices, local experience and professional judgment, the project prioritization process will use a Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) framework. MCDA is the term used to describe the formal approach of considering multiple criteria in helping individuals and groups of people make important decisions. In other words, it is a field of study that applies scientific methods and analysis to help decision-makers choose between a series of competing and sometimes conflicting options.

## Evaluation Criteria

MetroPlan Orlando’s regional goals and objectives blended with the planning factors set forth in the federal FAST Act yielded 28 criteria, or scoring factors, consistent with MPO funding policies to serve as the basis for the comparative evaluation. In this way, projects will be proposed, funded, and constructed, with their needs/benefits measured for consistency with the MTP’s goals and objectives. Figure 3 outlines the project evaluation criteria considered.

It should be noted that while priority programming determines the order in which projects are pursued, several factors such as available funding and the need for additional analysis or design can influence the order in which projects are implemented.

**For more information about scoring and analysis, see Supplement B.**

*Did you know?* Studies have shown that when making decisions, on average, people can only consider seven (± two) criteria when comparing different options.

For complex programmatic decision making, Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis ensures that influencing factors are not overlooked, which could result in un-informed decisions and/or missed opportunities.

Figure 3 | Evaluation Criteria

Goal Area	Evaluation Criteria
<b>Safety &amp; Security</b>	Crash Rate
	Fatal & Serious Injury Crash Rates
	Number of Pedestrian & Bicycle Crashes
	Evacuation Route Designation
<b>Reliability &amp; Performance</b>	Travel Time Reliability (Auto)
	Unreliability on Constrained Corridor
	Fiber Optic Presence
	Segment Actively Monitored/Managed
	Relative Change: Future Congested Speeds
<b>Access &amp; Connectivity</b>	Transit System Headways
	Population: ½ Mile of Non-Transit Corridor
	Jobs: ½ Mile of Non-Transit Corridor
	Food & Healthcare Locations: ½ Mile of Corridor
	Cultural & Recreational Locations: ½ Mile of Corridor
	MTP Centrality Analysis Score (Critical Sidewalk Need)
<b>Health &amp; Environment</b>	Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress
	Residential Density: ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility
	Non-Residential Density: ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility
	Public Health Indicator Rates
	Intensity & Proximity: Environmental Justice Populations
	Relative Change: Vehicle Miles Traveled (2020 vs. 2045)
<b>Investment &amp; Economy</b>	Percentage of Commercial Vehicle Traffic
	Statewide Truck Bottlenecks
	Intensity & Proximity: Freight Intensive Land Uses
	Relative Change: Vehicle Hours Traveled
	Cost Burdened Households: ¼ Mile of Corridor
	Percentage of Visitor Traffic
	Cost of Congestion




## Weighting

Criteria weighting can be used to represent the overall preference and significance of goal areas in relation to one another. Weighting is typically applied following additive scoring and normalization. In determining goal area weight distribution, MPO staff utilized multiple feedback methods including public surveys, advisory committee recommendations, and board direction. Public research findings showed little variation between the categories, as it was seen as all goals are important and transportation impacts all aspects of our lives. Advisory Committees advocated for increased emphasis on safety and accessibility; the MetroPlan Orlando Board agreed and directed staff to further emphasize vulnerable user safety in the project prioritization process.



Figure 4 summarizes the goal area weighting and emphasis based on the direction of the MetroPlan Orlando Board.

Figure 4 | Goal Weighting and Emphasis



Source: MetroPlan Orlando, Board Direction, February 2022 (Agenda Item: IX-B)

*It is important to note*, a project's overall score does not necessarily indicate that funding will be received. Rather, the evaluation process will:

1. Assist local entities in regional collaboration to identify high impact priority projects;
2. Align projects with national goals which are used during funding decisions in regional and statewide competitive/discretionary processes; and
3. Emphasize the use of data analytics and performance-based planning as required by federal law.

# Funding Programs and Priorities

The PPL is organized considering funding availability, project eligibility, and board direction. Consistent with the MTP, the priority list integrates board policy setting with project-level programming to advance mobility needs in the region.


## TMA Modal Allocation

Beginning in 1992, the MetroPlan Orlando Board established a policy to distribute Transportation Management Area (TMA) Surface Transportation Program (SU+TALU) funds (i.e. federal funds that MetroPlan Orlando is responsible for prioritizing and programming) among the modal categories for capital projects. This policy creates four modal categories to which TMA funding is allocated:

1. Multimodal / Complete Streets
2. Systems Management & Operations
3. Pedestrian and Bike Infrastructure
4. Transit Capital Improvements

The policy has been revisited regularly to allow for local input and investment direction. Effective FY 2020/21, funds are allocated to the established funding programs as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5 | TMA Modal Allocation Policy



Note: Percentages calculated over a five-year period.

## District Dedicated Revenue for Transit

In May 2015, the MetroPlan Orlando Board adopted a premium transit operations funding policy; Resolution #15-08. Up to 30% of MetroPlan Orlando’s State District Dedicated Revenue (DDR) funds can be allocated for the operation of the premium transit projects.

## 2045 MTP-Identified Funding Programs Implemented in the PPL


In response to public feedback and findings from the 2045 MTP, targeted funding programs and sub-allocations were identified and adopted as part of the Cost Feasible Plan. These programs are consistent with the state and federal funding guidelines and strategically invest funds in alignment with planning goals and regional needs.

Figure 6 illustrates the MTP-Identified funding programs and sub-allocations which are to be implemented in the PPL. To advance these funding programs, MetroPlan Orlando staff is committed to working with FDOT, local agencies, and the Technical and Transportation Systems Management and Operations Advisory Committees to identify eligible projects, analyze impacts/benefits, and fund near-term priorities.

## Fully Funded Projects Included in the PPL

Each project list in Supplement A (Prioritized Project Lists) includes a section of fully funded projects. This approach ensures planning consistency and continuity in the event of an unanticipated project delay or deferral.

Figure 6 | 2045 MTP Funding Policies / Programs Implemented in PPL; 2028 - 2045



Source: MetroPlan Orlando, 2045 MTP Cost Feasible Plan.

\* Priority list still under development with TSM&O / Technical Advisory Committees.

## Interstate Highway System and Strategic Intermodal System

This list contains projects on the Interstate Highway System (IHS), Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), and National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). These improvements are programmed and implemented directly by FDOT in coordination with local agencies and MetroPlan Orlando.



**Who may apply for this program?** Local Governments and FDOT.

**What projects are eligible?** IHS, SIS, and NHFN transportation improvements (including but not limited to capacity, safety, Complete Streets, TSM&O, ITS, and freight-focused projects) sponsored by a local government partner or FDOT.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for PD&E, Design, and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal and State “Other Arterial Funds” including District Dedicated Revenue (DDR) Funds. This list of projects is also funded using discretionary Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) funds administered by FDOT. Some projects on this list are part of Moving Florida Forward (MFF).

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where are these projects identified in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 6.

**What are the top Interstate Highway System / SIS priorities?**

- I-4 – New Truck Parking Rest Area, Osceola County Location
- I-4 – New Truck Parking Rest Area, Orange County Location
- I-4 (W of SR 528/Beachline Expy to SR 435/Kirkman Rd) – Interchange Improvements, Managed / Express Lanes
- I-4 (E of SR 522/Osceola Pkwy to W of SR 528/Beachline Expy) – Interchange Improvements, Managed / Express Lanes, New Interchange at Daryl Carter Pkwy
- I-4 (SR 434 to Seminole/Volusia County Line) – Interchange Improvements, Widening Lanes
- SR 60 (Grape Hammock Rd (Polk Co.) to E of Kissimmee River Bridge) – Widen from 2 to 4 Lanes
- I-4 (Seminole/Volusia Co. Line to SR 472) – Interchange Improvements, Widening Lanes

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on state and federally funded projects on the Interstate Highway and Strategic Intermodal Systems as well as National Highway Freight Program priorities.*

## State Highway System

This list encompasses projects of all types on the State Highway System. This includes capacity improvements, complete streets, safety, operations, and ITS investments. These improvements are programmed and implemented directly by FDOT in coordination with local agencies and MetroPlan Orlando.

**Who may apply for this program?** Local governments and MetroPlan Orlando in coordination with FDOT.

**What projects are eligible?** On-state system transportation and mobility improvements (including but not limited to capacity, safety, Complete Streets, TSM&O, ITS projects).

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for PD&E, Design and Construction/CEI.


**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal and State “Other Arterial Funds” including FDOT District Dedicated Revenue (DDR). In some cases, MetroPlan Orlando TMA funds are applied to these priority projects.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where are these projects identified in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 9.

**What are the top State Highway System priorities?**


- SR 434 at Ronald Reagan Blvd/CR 427 – Intersection Improvements
- SR 526 / Robinson St (Rosalind Ave to Maguire Blvd) – Complete Streets
- SR 535 / S. Apopka-Vineland Rd (US 192 to SR 536/World Center Dr) – Widen to 6 lanes
- US 17/92 (Polk/Osceola County Line to Poinciana Blvd) – Widen to 4 lanes
- SR 434 (Franklin St to SR 417) – Complete Streets with Shared Use Path
- US 17/92 / John Young Pkwy (Pleasant Hill Rd to Portage St) – Widen to 6 lanes with Urban Interchange
- US 17/92 / Orlando Ave (Nottingham St to Monroe St) – Construct Medians and Improve Bike/Ped. Safety
- SR 535 / Apopka-Vineland Rd (SR 536 to I-4) – Construct Medians / Improve Bike/Pedestrian Facilities
- US 17/92 (South of W 27<sup>TH</sup> St to W 25<sup>TH</sup> St) – Complete Streets



*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on state and federally funded projects on the State Highway System.*

## Off-System Construction Assistance (and TRIP)

The program acknowledges the need for additional capacity and multimodal improvements off the State Highway System. To help local governments address existing safety, reliability, and future congestion challenges, MetroPlan Orlando in cooperation with FDOT will explore opportunities to fund these local transportation needs. In addition, the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) provides funds to improve regionally significant transportation facilities in the area. These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies in coordination with FDOT.



**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Any off-state system transportation improvement sponsored by a local government partner with prior phases identified in a Capital Improvement Plan.

**How may funds be used?** Funds may only be used for Construction / CEI. Local agency must fund all other required phases.

**What type of funding supports this program?** State TRIP funds and Federal SA Funds (“Other Arterial Funds”)

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to advancing planning, PD&E, design, and ROW phases; and be prepared to receive construction funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where is funding identified for these projects in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 10.

**What are the unranked off-system construction assistance priorities?**

- Old Lake Wilson Rd (Sinclair Rd to SR 532) – Widen to 4 Lanes with Median
- Econlockhatchee Trl (Curry Ford Rd to Lee Vista Blvd) – Widen to 4 Lanes with Shared Use Path
- President Barack Obama Pkwy, Ph. 2 (Metrowest Blvd to Raleigh St) – New 4 Lane Road with Shared Use Path
- CR 532/Canoe Creek Rd (Pine Tree Dr to US 192/441/ 13<sup>TH</sup> St) – Widen to 4 Lanes with Median
- CR 532/Canoe Creek Rd (Deer Run Rd to Pine Tree Dr) – Widen to 4 Lanes with Median
- Kelly Park Rd (Golden Gem Rd to Plymouth Sorrento Rd) – Widen to 4 Lanes with Shared Use Path

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on the construction assistance projects.*



## Complete Streets & Context-Sensitive Improvements

The Complete Streets project list includes projects off the state road system that are functionally classified. The projects in this list include non-capacity multimodal context-sensitive projects – in other words, a combination of bicycle & pedestrian, transit, and intersection improvements that improve safety and efficiency on roads without adding lanes. These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies; in coordination with FDOT.



**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Complete Streets and other context-sensitive improvements (non-capacity multimodal projects that use a combination of bicycle & pedestrian, transit, and intersection improvements to improve safety and efficiency on constrained roadways without adding lanes) located off the State Highway System sponsored by a local government partner.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for PD&E, Design, and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU).

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where are these projects identified in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 12.


**What are the top TMA-funded Complete Streets priorities submitted for funding?**

- Construction of Edgewater Dr, Seg. B (Lakeview St to Shady Lane Dr) – Complete Streets
- Construction of Edgewater Dr, Seg. C (Shady Lane Dr to Bryn Mawr St) – Complete Streets
- Construction of Edgewater Dr, Seg. D (Bryn Mawr St to W Par St) – Complete Streets
- Design for Winter Park Dr, Ph. 2 (Seminola Blvd to SR 434) – Complete Streets / Safety Improvements
- Design for Winter Park Dr, Ph. 3 (Red Bug Lake Rd to Cannon Way) – Complete Streets / Safety Improvements
- Design for S Park Ave / Clarcona Rd (US 441 / Main St to Cleveland St) – Complete Streets
- Design for Goldsboro Community Gateway Project (SR 46 to Persimmon Ave) – New 2-Lane Complete Street
- Design for W Michael Gladden Blvd (S Park Ave to Bradshaw Rd) – Complete Streets
- Construction for North Central Ave, Ph. 1 (Dankin Ave to US 192/Vine St) – Complete Streets
- Construction for North Central Ave, Ph. 2 (US 192/Vine St to W Columbia Ave) – Complete Streets
- Construction for North Central Ave, Ph. 3 (W Columbia Ave to W Donegan Ave) – Complete Streets

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on TMA funded Multimodal System Roadway & Complete Streets projects.*

## Safety Emphasis Projects

MetroPlan Orlando is committed to providing a safe and secure transportation system for all users. To provide targeted funding, the 2045 MTP established a new funding program to address regional safety issues off the state highway system. This list will include projects in areas with known safety issues and projects must show evidence of safety improvement/crash reduction potential. These projects will be prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies; in coordination with FDOT.



As noted in Figure 6, *this list of priority safety emphasis projects is under development.*


In early 2023, MetroPlan Orlando was awarded \$3.79 Million as part of the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) grant program. This planning grant is being used to create individual Vision Zero Action Plans for the region, and each of the participating partner counties and municipalities. The Vision Zero Action Plans will identify safety emphasis projects, which will be used as the Safety Needs Assessment for the 2050 MTP. This list of priority safety emphasis projects will be populated based on criteria laid out in the 2050 MTP.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

## TSM&O Corridor and Intersection Projects

A list of Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O) projects is also included in the PPL. These are projects that use innovative strategies or leverage existing technology deployments to improve travel time reliability on existing roadways without adding capacity and utilize such methods as adding turn lanes at intersections, computerized traffic signal systems, integrated corridor management, traveler information, etc. The TSM&O category includes projects pertaining to incident management, Transportation Demand Management, and other related activities.

These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies, in coordination with FDOT. The TSM&O Master Plan will be completed in 2024, and that study will serve as the TSMO Needs Assessment for 2050 MTP. This list will be populated by projects from the 2050 MTP at that time.



**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Any non-capacity project designed to improve safety and travel time reliability, facilitate data sharing, or enhance “future readiness”.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU).

**What are the terms?** Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT’s Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable. Per TSM&O Advisory Committee guidance, the maximum federal/state funding per project is \$5 million (all phases); local agency to fund costs greater than \$5 million.

**Where are these projects identified in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 11.

**What are the top TMA-funded TSM&O + ITS priorities submitted for funding?**

- Construction for Lawrence Silas Blvd / Neptune Rd Bundle (ID# B46) – ITS / Technology Improvements
- Construction for Garland Ave Bundle (ID # B27) – Operational / Safety Improvements
- Construction for Hughey Ave Bundle (ID # B26) – Operational / Safety Improvements
- Construction for W South St / W Anderson St Bundle (ID # B25) – ITS / Technology Improvements
- Construction for Livingston St Bundle (ID # B22) – ITS / Technology Improvements
- Design for Lakeview Ave / Story Rd Bundle (ID # B30) – ITS / Technology Improvements
- Construction for Carrier Dr / Mandarin Dr Bundle (ID # B33B) – ITS / Technology Improvements
- Design for Amelia St from US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trail to N Parramore Ave – ITS / Technology Improvements

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on TMA funded Multimodal TSM&O/ITS projects.*

## ITS Area Wide Projects

The intent of this program is to fund bundles of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects or technology upgrades that are located throughout a city/county and/or across multiple corridors or intersections. The individual projects use innovative strategies or leverage existing technology deployments to improve safety and reliability on existing roadways, facilitate data-sharing or implement smart/technology upgrades over a prescribed area. The ITS category of projects includes incident management, transportation demand management, and other related activities.

As noted in Figure 6, *this list of areawide ITS projects is under development.*

This process is guided by MetroPlan Orlando's TSM&O Advisory Committee. A Working Group of this committee is currently overseeing the development of the TSM&O Master Plan. The TSM&O Master Plan project recommendations will be incorporated into the 2050 MTP. At that time, the guidelines and eligibility requirements within the PPL below will be updated accordingly.

**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Non-capacity projects designed to improve safety and travel time reliability and enhance "future readiness" using innovations of technology.


**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Implementation/Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU).

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's project readiness process and must be prepared to receive funding as scheduled.


**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable. The specific locations (and project scope, as applicable) for project implementation must be listed and a map or GIS shapefile must also be provided.

**Where is funding identified for these projects in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 11.



## ACES Demonstration Projects

The intent of this program is to fund projects that will test various technologies and broaden the regional knowledge base around automated, connected, electric, and shared (ACES) vehicles, as identified in MetroPlan Orlando's 2020 CAV Readiness Study. These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies, in coordination with FDOT.



As noted in Figure 6, *this list of ACES demonstration projects is still under development.*

This process is guided by MetroPlan Orlando's TSM&O Advisory Committee. Preliminary priority list guidelines and eligibility requirements, described below, were developed by a Working Group of the Advisory Committee. This committee is currently overseeing the development of the TSM&O Master Plan, which is estimated to be completed in November 2023. Upon adoption, the TSM&O Master Plan will identify projects to be incorporated into the 2024 update of the Prioritized Project List (PPL) and the guidelines and eligibility requirements below will be updated accordingly.

**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Automated, connected, electric or shared vehicle pilot and demonstration projects that are consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) ACES plan or address a regional need/issue.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Implementation/Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU and TALU) and Local Funding.

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support or include a community outreach component to educate members of the traveling public and enhance awareness of these emerging technologies. Project sponsors of selected/funded projects are required to present/share lessons learned to the TSM&O Advisory Committee following project implementation.

**Where is funding identified for these projects in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 11.

## Pedestrian & Bicycle Infrastructure Projects

The list of Pedestrian and Bicycle cost feasible projects and programs include: local and regional trail projects that can be used by cyclists and pedestrians for recreational and/or commuting, on-street bicycle lanes, critical sidewalk improvements (particularly for safety purposes around public schools and transit routes), and other projects that will improve overall bicycle and pedestrian mobility. These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies, in coordination with FDOT. The 2050 Regional Active Transportation Plan will serve as a bicycle and pedestrian needs assessment for the 2050 MTP.



**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Sidewalks, shared use paths, bike lanes, and paved trails for commuting or recreation.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU), SunTrail Funds.

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where are these projects identified in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 13.

**What are the top TMA-funded Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure priorities submitted for funding?**

- Construction for Little Econ Trail, Ph. 3 (Baldwin Park St to Richard Crotty Pkwy) – Trail Bridge
- Construction for West Orange Trail, Ph. 4A (along Rock Springs Rd from W Lester Rd to Kelly Park/Rock Springs) – Shared Use Path\*
- Design for West Orange Trail, Ph. 4B (along Welch Rd from Rock Springs Rd to Wekiva Springs State Park Entrance) – Shared Use Path\*
- Design for West Orange Trail, Ph. 4C (along Ponkan Rd from Jason Dwelley Pkwy to Rock Springs Rd) – Shared Use Path\*
- Construction for West Orange Trail, Ph. 4D (from Kelly Park/Rock Springs to Wekiva Pkwy) – Shared Use Path\*
- Design for Church Trail (S Lakemont Ave to Cady Way Trail) – Shared Use Path
- Design for Lake Nona SE Trails (Lake Nona Blvd / Narcoossee Rd to Moss Park Rd) – Shared Use Path\*
- Design for Toho Valencia Bridge (E Vine St to Valencia College – Osceola Campus) – Shared Use Path
- Design for Horizon West (Tiny Rd to West Orange High School) – Shared Use Path
- Design for Orlando Bicycle Study (Orlando Health SunRail Station to Lake Ivanhoe) – Shared Use Path

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on TMA funded Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure projects and projects eligible for the SunTrail program.*

\*INDICATES PROJECT IS ELIGIBLE FOR SUNTRAIL FUNDING.



## School Mobility / Safe Routes to School

The School Mobility and Safe Routes to School program was identified in the 2045 MTP to address projects off the state highway system that promote walking and bicycling to school through infrastructure improvements, enforcement, tools, safety education, and incentives to encourage walking and bicycling to school. The program's initiatives improve safety and levels of physical activity for students. These projects are prioritized and programmed by MetroPlan Orlando and implemented by local agencies, in coordination with FDOT.



**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Projects that do not receive funding from FDOT's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** State SRTS Funds and Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU).

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where is funding identified for these projects in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 13.

**What are the top School Mobility / Safe Routes to School priorities?**

- Hickory Tree Elementary School, Ph. 1 (Beechwood Dr / Oak Wind Ct / Jan Lan Blvd / Englewood Dr)
- Hickory Tree Elementary School, Ph. 3 (Jan Lan Blvd from Englewood Ct S to Hickory Tree Rd)
- Hickory Tree Elementary School, Ph. 4 (Jan Lan Blvd from Englewood Ct N to Old Hickory Tree Rd)
- Longwood Elementary School (N Grant Ave / Orange Ave / Highland Ave / Logan Ave)
- Neptune Middle School (Ames Haven Rd / Delmar Ave / Patricia St / Florence Dr)
- Boggy Creek Elementary School / Parkway Middle School Phase 2 (Zacalo Wy from Florida Pkwy to Tulpan Dr)

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on TMA funded School Mobility / Safe Routes to School projects.*

## Critical Sidewalk Gaps (Bundles)

MetroPlan Orlando's Bicycle and Pedestrian assessment identified sidewalk gaps and a subset of "critical" gaps. The Critical Sidewalk Gaps program was established in the 2045 MTP to provide a mechanism to advance "critical" gaps off the state highway system. There are currently over 4,000 centerline miles of roadway in the region without sidewalk facilities and over 1,500 centerline miles of roadway with sidewalk facilities on only one side of the roadway.



A study was performed to identify critical gaps, which were then bundled/packaged following FHWA best practices to streamline project programming and implementation.

After soliciting input from the Vulnerable Users Working Group, a scoring and weighting formula was created to prioritize the critical gap bundles for programming. This formula was applied by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to create a prioritized list, which is included in Supplement A. This formula is included in Supplement B. These projects are implemented by local agencies, in coordination with FDOT.

**Who may apply for this program?** LAP-Certified local governments.

**What projects are eligible?** Identified critical sidewalk gap projects within the Federal Aid Network. Projects which include local sidewalk gap segments outside of the Federal Aid Network, which are ineligible for federal funding, are denoted by \*\* in the detailed Priority List in Supplement A.

**How may funds be used?** Funds can be used for Design and Construction/CEI.

**What type of funding supports this program?** Federal TMA Funds (SU / TALU / CARU).

**What are the terms?** Funding is provided through a competitive process. Local agencies must show commitment to complying with FDOT's Project Intake process and must be prepared to receive project-phase funding as scheduled.

**Are there additional requirements?** Project must demonstrate community support and environmental review must be completed/acceptable.

**Where is funding identified for these projects in the 2045 MTP?** Cost Feasible Plan, Table 13.

**What are the top TMA-funded Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle priorities?**

- Design for Sidewalk Bundle #4/8/9/11 (Orlando)
- Design for Sidewalk Bundle #6/12/14/15/16 (Osceola County)
- Design for Sidewalk Bundle #7 (Sheeler Ave / Alabama Ave / Apopka Blvd / SR 436)
- Design for Sidewalk Bundle #10 (Southwest Rd / Country Club Rd / Persimmon Ave / SR 46 / US 17/92/ French Ave)
- Design for Sidewalk Bundle #13 (Douglas Ave / Lake of the Woods Blvd / Spring Lake Rd / O'Brien Rd)

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on TMA funded Critical Sidewalk Gap projects.*

## Regional Transit Projects

The list of transit projects shown in the PPL includes what are known as “premium transit” projects. These projects are defined by the Federal Transit Administration as “transit modes that provide higher comfort, capacity, speed and frequency than typical local bus operations or create a positive perception to users.” Projects meeting this definition include commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit (BRT), streetcars, etc. The PPL transit section also includes ongoing federal formula transit projects pertaining to the fixed-route bus service operated by LYNX, the local transit provider. Fixed-route bus service is not considered to be premium transit.



The transit projects in the PPL are split into five categories and ranked separately based on the types of the projects and the status of the planning/feasibility studies for the projects. The five transit project categories include:

**Category A** – Projects identified as premium transit with construction funded in the 2045 MTP including completed transit planning/feasibility studies. Transit Concept and Alternatives Review (TCAR) are studies included in this section with the aim of advancing transit projects that qualify. Category A projects are eligible for DDR operating funds consistent with the MetroPlan Orlando Board resolution #15-08.

**Category B** – Projects requiring or have completed planning/feasibility studies. These projects are eligible for DDR operating funds once construction is fully funded.

**Category C** – This category includes enhancements to LYNX’s fixed route bus system. These projects are eligible for DDR funds except for operations and maintenance costs.

**Category D** – This category encompasses ongoing federal formula transit projects including Transit Asset Management projects. Thirty percent of SU funds are allocated to projects in this category. These projects are eligible for DDR Funds except for operations and maintenance costs.

**Category E** – This category includes local initiatives and service development projects for local jurisdictions to explore transportation alternatives that best serve the region. These projects may include CAV shuttles, circulators, trolleys, and other service expansion projects.

Note: Estimated costs of remaining phases identified in the transit priority list do not include operational funds.

*See detailed Priority List in Supplement A for additional information on regional transit projects.*

# Supplement A - Prioritized Project Lists

The Prioritized Project List is categorized based on network designation, funding eligibility and board policy. Figure 7 summarizes the individual lists which are elements of the regional transportation portfolio of projects.

## Figure 7 | PPL Funding Programs / Priority Lists

### **Interstate Highway System + Strategic Intermodal System + National Highway Freight Network**

This program identifies Interstate Highway System (IHS) and Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) projects with unfunded phases identified in the FY 2024/25 – FY 2028/29 TIP. List also includes National Highway Freight Network regional priorities.

### **State Highway System / State Road Projects**

This list of multimodal projects includes roadway widening, Complete Streets, TSM&O, pedestrian and bicycle, and safety improvements on the State Highway System.

### **Off-System Construction Assistance (+TRIP)**

Ten percent from “Other Arterial Funds” are allocated to the Construction and CEI costs of regionally significant Off-State Highway System projects. List also includes projects identified for Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funds.

### **Complete Streets**

MetroPlan Orlando’s TMA funding policy allocates 32% of Urbanized Area funds to Off-State Highway System Complete Streets, context-sensitive, and safety improvements.

### **Safety Emphasis**

TMA funds are allocated to addressing regional safety issues off the State Highway System. Eligible agencies must complete concept development and prepare a design scope. Projects will be evaluated by the Vulnerable User Safety Working Group.

### **Transportation System Management & Operations & ITS (Intersections and Corridors)**

MetroPlan Orlando’s TMA policy allocates 21% of Urbanized Area funds to Transportation Systems Management & Operations, safety, and technology improvements off the state highway system.

### **ITS Area Wide Improvements**

Projects may include multiple locations and expenses such as detection equipment, signal cabinets, CAV technology, and other eligible equipment as identified and prioritized by the TSM&O Advisory Committee.

### **ACES Demonstration**

TMA funds are allocated to the demonstration of Automated, Connected, Electric, and Shared (ACES) vehicle technologies on the Federal Aid System as identified and prioritized by the TSM&O Advisory Committee.

### **Regional Trails / Shared Use Paths**

MetroPlan Orlando’s TMA policy allocates 17% of Urbanized Area funds to off-State Highway System Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements including safety projects, paved trails and shared use paths.

### **School Mobility / Safe Routes to School**

TMA funds are also allocated to address School Mobility (Safe Routes to Schools) projects that do not receive funding from the Florida Department of Transportation’s Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) program.

### **Critical Sidewalk Gaps (Bundles)**

TMA funds are allocated to addressing critical sidewalk improvements, particularly for purposes of improving safety around public schools and near transit activity centers as identified and evaluated by the Vulnerable User Safety Working Group.

### **Regional Transit**

MetroPlan Orlando’s TMA policy allocates 30% of Urbanized Area funds for eligible transit capital investments that expand the Public Transportation System. The regional transit list also includes asset management and service development projects.

# Interstate Highway System + Strategic Intermodal System + National Highway Freight Network Projects

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
242484-3	-	I-4	SR 435 / Kirkman Rd	E of SR 434	20.58	I-4 Ultimate	TIP	TIP							Seminole Co. / Orange Co.
431456-1	-	I-4	W of CR 532	E of CR 522 / Osceola Pkwy	7.88	Moving Florida Forward Interchange Improvements, Managed / Express Lanes	TIP	TIP							Osceola Co.
446445-1	-	I-4	Seminole County Site	-	-	New Truck Parking Rest Area	TIP	TIP							Seminole Co.
107	1	I-4	Osceola County Site	-	-	New Truck Parking Rest Area	CST	\$ 19.98							Osceola Co.
107	2	I-4	Orange County Site	-	-	New Truck Parking Rest Area	PE	\$ 2.50				✓	✓	\$ 10.000	Orange Co.
102	3	I-4	W of SR 528 / Beachline Expy	SR 435 / Kirkman Rd	3.66	Interchange Improvements, Managed / Express Lanes	CST	\$ 126.33							Orlando / Orange Co.
104	4	I-4	E of CR 522 / Osceola Pkwy	W of SR 528 / Beachline Expy	5.65	Interchange Improvements, Managed / Express Lanes, New Interchange at Daryl Carter Pkwy	CST	\$ 1,321.63							Orange Co. / Osceola Co.
105	5	I-4	SR 434	Seminole / Volusia CL	8.90	Interchange Improvements, Widening Lanes	CST	\$ 943.14							Seminole Co.
2255	6	SR 60	Grape Hammock Rd (Polk Co.)	E of Kissimmee River Bridge (Osceola Co.)	1.76	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	PE	\$ 1.33				✓	✓	\$ 151.654	Osceola Co. / Polk Co.
108	7	I-4	Seminole / Volusia CL	SR 472	10.10	Interchange Improvements, Widening Lanes	ROW	\$ 82.60					✓	\$ 1,000.125	Volusia Co.

# State Highway System / State Road Projects

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
239203-7	-	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Avalon Park Blvd	Chuluota Rd	2.43	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes and Safety Improvements	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
239203-8	-	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Chuluota Rd	SR 520	3.22	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
239422-1	-	SR 434 / Forest City Rd	SR 424 / Edgewater Dr	Seminole Co. Line	2.11	Add Lanes / Reconstruct	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
418403-7	-	US 17/92 / John Young Pkwy	Pleasant Hill Rd	-	0.40	Intersection Improvement	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Osceola Co.
437131-1	-	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Irvington Ave	Maguire Blvd	0.13	Drainage Improvements	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
445696-1	-	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	Kingsland Ave	-	0.02	Intersection Improvement	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
450974-1	-	Michigan Ave Safety Improvements	US 192	E of Osceola Parkway	0.44	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
451245-1	-	SR 434 / Alafaya Trl	Lokanotosa Trl / Science Dr	-	0.10	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
451246-1	-	SR 435 / Kirkman Rd	At SR 526 / CR 526 / Old Winter Garden Rd	-	0.10	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
451255-1	-	SR 482 / Sand Lake Rd / Mccoy Rd	At Presidents Dr	-	0.10	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
451256-1	-	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	At University Blvd / Scarlet Rd	-	0.10	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
451372-1	-	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	Lake Stanley Rd	Hiawassee Rd	1.46	Safety Project	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orange Co.
451545-1	-	Funie Steed Rd	At Lindfields Blvd / At Formosa Gardens	-	-	Intersection Improvement	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Osceola Co.
-	-	Regional TSM&O Projects on the National and State Roadway System. Projects may include multiple locations and expenses such as detection equipment, signal cabinets, CAV technology, and other eligible equipment as identified by the TSM&O Advisory Committee in consultation with FDOT.			N/A	TSM&O / ITS Improvements	N/A	\$ 2.000						\$ 18.000	FDOT-D5 in Coordination with MetroPlan Orlando



## State Highway System / State Road Projects - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
EC419	1	SR 434	Ronald Reagan Blvd / CR 427	-	0.46	Intersection Improvement	CST	\$ 3.698						\$ -	Longwood / Seminole Co.
2210	2	SR 526 / Robinson St	SR 527 / Rosalind Ave	Maguire Blvd	1.89	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 3.000					✓	\$ 12.918	Orlando / Orange Co.
2252	3	SR 535 / S. Apopka-Vineland Rd	US 192	SR 536 / World Center Dr	2.04	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	PE	\$ 3.769				✓	✓	\$ 31.372	Orange Co. / Osceola Co.
2207	4	US 17/92	Polk / Osceola CL	Poinciana Blvd	4.53	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	ROW	\$ 22.582				✓	✓	\$ 63.982	Osceola Co.
2251	5	SR 434	Franklin St	SR 417	2.30	Complete Streets w/Shared Use Path	CST	\$ 16.666						\$ -	Oviedo / Winter Springs / Seminole Co.
2250	6	US 17/92 / John Young Pkwy	Pleasant Hill Rd	Portage St	2.37	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes w/Urban Interchange	CST	\$ 54.624						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
2006	7	US 17/92 / Orlando Ave	Nottingham St	Monroe St	1.93	Construct Medians / Improve Bike/Ped	CST	\$ 18.200						\$ -	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2253	8	SR 535 / Apopka-Vineland Rd	SR 536 / World Center Dr	I-4	1.42	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	CST	\$ 4.937						\$ -	Orange Co.
2142	9	US 17/92	S of W 27th St	W 25th St	0.77	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 1.215				✓	✓	\$ 7.658	Sanford / Seminole Co.
2200, 2201, 2203, 2204, 2205	10	SR 551 / Goldenrod Rd	Beatty Dr	University Blvd	7.95	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	PD&E	\$ 6.707			✓	✓	✓	\$ 149.849	Orange Co.
2148	11	US 17/92 / French Ave	SR 417	SR 46 / 1st St	2.89	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 4.575				✓	✓	\$ 28.851	Sanford / Seminole Co.
2164	12	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	SR 451	Errol Pkwy	0.59	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.392			✓	✓	✓	\$ 8.592	Apopka / Orange Co.
2036	13	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	From WB SR 436	Alabama Ave	0.19	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.123			✓	✓	✓	\$ 3.349	Apopka / Orange Co.

## State Highway System / State Road Projects - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
2058	14	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	Alabama Ave	S Park Ave	0.46	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.306			✓	✓	✓	\$ 8.290	Apopka / Orange Co.
2152	15	US 441 / N Main St	US 192 / Vine St	Osceola Pkwy	2.26	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 1.192			✓	✓	✓	\$ 39.489	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
2155	16	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	SR 429 / Western Beltway	Bluford Ave	0.87	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.460			✓	✓	✓	\$ 10.569	Ocoee / Orange Co.
2192	17	SR 426 / Aloma Ave	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	SR 551 / Palmetto Ave	1.19	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.782			✓	✓	✓	\$ 17.147	Orange Co.
2184	18	SR 15 / Hoffner Ave	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	SR 15 / Conway Rd	1.25	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.826			✓	✓	✓	\$ 22.399	Orange Co.
2120	19	US 192 / Vine St	Hoagland Blvd	John Young Pkwy	1.76	Safety Improvements	PE	\$ 1.026				✓	✓	\$ 7.027	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
2062	20	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Dean Rd	Rouse Rd	1.28	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 1.207				✓	✓	\$ 7.611	Orange Co.
2047	21	US 17/92 / Orlando Ave	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	SR 423 / Lee Rd	0.88	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.583			✓	✓	✓	\$ 12.773	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2185	22	SR 552 / Curry Ford Rd	SR 15 / Conway Rd	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	1.26	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.832			✓	✓	✓	\$ 18.240	Orlando / Orange Co.
2118	23	US 17/92 / John Young Pkwy	Palmetto Ave	US 17/92	1.46	Operational / Safety (Freight Bottleneck)	PE	\$ 0.868				✓	✓	\$ 5.475	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
2150	24	SR 434	Rangeline Rd	US 17/92	2.14	Complete Streets w/Shared Use Path	PD&E	\$ 1.412			✓	✓	✓	\$ 28.248	Longwood / Seminole Co.
2195	25	SR 527 / Orange Ave	Holden Ave	Michigan St	1.26	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.833			✓	✓	✓	\$ 18.246	Orlando / Edgewood / Orange Co.
2115	26	SR 527 / Orange Ave	South St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	1.02	Safety Improvements	PE	\$ 0.503				✓	✓	\$ 2.852	Orlando / Orange Co.
2167	27	SR 426 / Aloma Ave	Lakemont Ave	Mayflower Ct	0.51	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.336			✓	✓	✓	\$ 6.729	Winter Park / Orange Co.

## State Highway System / State Road Projects - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
2198	28	SR 426 / Aloma Ave	Mayflower Ct	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	0.78	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.512			✓	✓	✓	\$ 10.238	Orange Co.
2188	29	SR 527 / Orange Ave	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	Park Ave	0.33	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.218			✓	✓	✓	\$ 4.773	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2165	30	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Summerlin Ave	Bumby Ave	1.01	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.666			✓	✓	✓	\$ 14.587	Orlando / Orange Co.
2055	31	SR 435 / Kirkman Rd	Conroy Rd	Raleigh St	2.35	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 2.210				✓	✓	\$ 13.934	Orlando / Orange Co.
2181	32	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	I-4	Washington St	2.30	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 1.212			✓	✓	✓	\$ 27.827	Orlando / Orange Co.
2132	33	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	Pine Hills Rd	Hiawassee Rd	1.49	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 1.065				✓	✓	\$ 6.035	Orange Co.
2189	34	US 17/92 / Mills Ave	Virginia Dr	SR 438 / Princeton St	0.43	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.284			✓	✓	✓	\$ 5.686	Orlando / Orange Co.
2168	35	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	SR 527 / Orange Ave	Summerlin Ave	0.64	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.338			✓	✓	✓	\$ 7.415	Orlando / Orange Co.
2033	36	SR 434	Wekiva Springs Rd	I-4	0.97	Operational / Safety	ROW	\$ 1.819					✓	\$ 3.915	Seminole Co.
2178	37	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	Washington St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.66	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.346			✓	✓	✓	\$ 7.582	Orlando / Orange Co.
2194	38	SR 15 / Hoffner Ave	SR 551 / Goldenrod Rd	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	1.39	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.732			✓	✓	✓	\$ 19.867	Orlando / Orange Co.
2022	39	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	at Plymouth Sorrento Rd	-	0.40	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 0.373				✓	✓	\$ 2.349	Orange Co.
2030	40	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	at Lake View Dr	-	0.40	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 0.373				✓	✓	\$ 2.349	Orange Co.
2172	41	SR 527 / Orange Ave	Michigan St	Gore Ave	1.25	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.826			✓	✓	✓	\$ 16.527	Orlando / Orange Co.
2158	42	SR 482 / Sand Lake Rd.	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	SR 527 / Orange Ave	2.26	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 1.192			✓	✓	✓	\$ 26.122	Orange Co.

## State Highway System / State Road Projects - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
2098	43	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Fairvilla Rd	Bumby Ave	4.87	Safety Improvements	PE	\$ 2.410				✓	✓	\$ 15.199	Orlando / Orange Co.
2154	44	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Bumby Ave	Old Cheney Hwy	1.90	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 1.251			✓	✓	✓	\$ 27.426	Orlando / Orange Co.
2145	45	SR 434	SR 414 / Maitland Blvd	SR 436	1.77	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 1.170			✓	✓	✓	\$ 25.640	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
2179	46	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	SR 527 / Orange Ave	1.00	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PE	\$ 1.980				✓	✓	\$ 8.250	Orlando / Orange Co.
2144	47	SR 434	Research Pkwy	McCulloch Rd	1.68	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 1.109			✓	✓	✓	\$ 24.307	Orange Co.
2131	48	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Kirkman Rd	Tampa Ave	3.10	Safety Improvements	PE	\$ 1.163				✓	✓	\$ 6.588	Orlando / Orange Co.
21620	49	SR 527 / Orange Ave	US 17/92	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	0.74	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.296			✓	✓	✓	\$ 5.928	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2190	50	SR 426 / Aloma Ave	Goldenrod Rd	Orange / Seminole CL	0.17	Complete Streets with Shared Use Path	PD&E	\$ 0.113			✓	✓	✓	\$ 2.256	Orange Co.
2176	51	SR 15 / Narcoossee Rd	Lee Vista Blvd	SR 551 / Goldenrod Rd	1.17	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.620			✓	✓	✓	\$ 13.585	Orlando / Orange Co.
2169	52	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	I-4	Clay St	0.59	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.391			✓	✓	✓	\$ 8.575	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2173	53	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	Clay St	US 17/92 / Orlando Ave	0.50	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.331			✓	✓	✓	\$ 7.258	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2161	54	SR 426 / Fairbanks Ave	US 17/92 / Orlando Ave	Pennsylvania Ave	0.50	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.332			✓	✓	✓	\$ 7.266	Winter Park / Orange Co.
2010	55	SR 15 / Narcoossee Rd	SR 551 / Goldenrod Rd	SR 528 / Beachline Expy	2.58	ITS/Technology	PE	\$ 0.765					✓	\$ 3.293	Orlando / Orange Co.
2166	56	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Tampa Ave	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.61	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PE	\$ 1.211				✓	✓	\$ 7.634	Orlando / Orange Co.
2170	57	SR 15 / Lake Underhill Rd	SR 15 / Conway Rd	SR 15 / Anderson St	0.84	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.558			✓	✓	✓	\$ 12.222	Orlando / Orange Co.

## State Highway System / State Road Projects - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
2193	58	US 17/92 / Mills Ave	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Virginia Dr	0.75	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.495			✓	✓	✓	\$ 8.620	Orlando / Orange Co.
2031	59	SR 426 / Aloma Ave	Palmetto Ave	Hall Rd	0.64	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 0.603				✓	✓	\$ 3.419	Seminole Co.
2153	60	SR 527 / Orange Ave	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	SR 438 / Princeton St	1.44	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PE	\$ 2.859				✓	✓	\$ 18.029	Orlando / Orange Co.
2175	61	SR 15 / Mills Ave	SR 526 / Robinson St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.50	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.333			✓	✓	✓	\$ 6.652	Orlando / Orange Co.
2163	62	SR 527 / Orange Ave	Gem St	Kelsey Rd	1.55	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 1.198			✓	✓	✓	\$ 28.207	Edgewood / Orange Co.
2182	63	SR 527 / Orange Ave	End of One-Way Split	Holden Ave	0.74	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PD&E	\$ 0.575			✓	✓	✓	\$ 13.552	Edgewood / Orange Co.
2187	64	SR 482 / Sand Lake Rd	SR 435 / Kirkman Rd	SR 423 / John Young Pkwy	1.86	Complete Streets	PD&E	\$ 0.981			✓	✓	✓	\$ 21.494	Orange Co.
2038	65	SR 414 / Maitland Blvd	Maitland Ave	US 17/92	0.57	Operational / Safety	PE	\$ 0.537				✓	✓	\$ 3.044	Orange Co.
2112	66	SR 527 / Orange Ave	Holden Ave	Gatlin Ave	0.07	Safety Improvements	PE	\$ 0.388				✓	✓	\$ 10.127	Edgewood / Orange Co.
EC478	67	SR 434 Roundabouts	W of Jetta Pt	Artesia St	2.06	Roundabouts								\$ -	Oviedo / Seminole Co.

## Off System Construction Assistance / TRIP Projects (SA and TRIP Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
8114	-	Old Lake Wilson Rd	Sinclair Rd	CR 532	2.50	Widen to 4 Lanes with Median							\$ -	Osceola Co.	
7423	-	Econlockhatchee Trl	Lee Vista Blvd	Curry Ford Rd	2.33	Widen to 4 Lanes with Shared Use Path	CST	\$26.298					\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.	
7567	-	President Barack Obama Pkwy - Phase 2	Metrowest Blvd	Raleigh St	0.82	New 4 Lane Roadway	CST	\$14.026					\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.	
8001	-	Canoe Creek Rd / CR 532	Pine Tree Dr	US 192/441 / 13th St	3.32	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	CST	\$40.139					\$ -	St. Cloud / Osceola Co.	
8002	-	Canoe Creek Rd / CR 532	Deer Run Rd	Pine Tree Dr	1.35	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	CST	\$46.500					\$ -	St. Cloud / Osceola Co.	
7371	-	Kelly Park Rd	Golden Gem Rd	Plymouth Sorrento Rd	1.01	Widen to 4 Lanes with Shared Use Path	CST	\$12.010					\$ -	Apopka / Orange Co.	

\*Note: Projects shown in this table are not prioritized or listed in priority order.



## Complete Streets Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
446493-1	-	Winter Park Dr (Ph. 1)	Marigold Rd	Seminola Blvd	1.50	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Casselberry / Seminole Co.
437932-2	-	N Central Ave (Design Only)	Martin Luther King Blvd	W Donegan Ave	1.51	Complete Streets	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
446485-1	-	Virginia Dr, Forest Ave & Corrine Dr	SR 527/Orange Ave	Bennett Rd	2.60	Complete Streets with Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
446903-1	-	E Church Ave	N Ronald Reagan Blvd	US 17/92	1.18	Complete Streets with Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Longwood / Seminole Co.
449477-1	-	Buenaventura Blvd	Simpson Road	Osceola Pkwy	2.37	Complete Streets	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Osceola Co.
437472-4	-	Downtown Kissimmee Corridor Study Ph. 1	S John Young Pkwy	US 192	0.59	Subarea Planning / Corridor Improvements	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Kissimmee
437472-4	-	Downtown Kissimmee Complete Streets Ph. 2	W Emmett St	Main St	0.85	Complete Streets	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Kissimmee
453486-1	-	Rock Springs Rd (Ph.1, Design Only)	N of Publix Entrance	Lester Rd	1.20	Complete Streets	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Apopka / Orange Co.
453486-1	-	Rock Springs Rd (Ph.3, Construction Only)	Welch Rd	Lester Rd	1.55	Complete Streets	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Apopka / Orange Co.
441275-1	-	Edgewater Dr (Design Only)	Lakeview St	Par St	1.50	Urban Corridor Improvement	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
441275-1	-	Edgewater Dr (Seg. A)	at Lakeview St	-	0.06	Roundabout	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
-	-	MetroPlan Orlando UPWP for Special Projects: \$1,000,000 a year from 2026 to 2045 of TMA funds to support performance-based planning, data collection and monitoring, corridor and sub-area planning and feasibility studies.			N/A	Regionwide Special Studies	N/A	\$ 1.000						\$ 19.000	MetroPlan Orlando
4034	1a	Edgewater Dr (Seg. B)	Lakeview St	Shady Lane Dr	0.29	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 4.496						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
4035	1b	Edgewater Dr (Seg. C)	Shady Lane Dr	Bryn Mawr St	0.67	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 10.371						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.

## Complete Streets Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
4036	1c	Edgewater Dr (Seg. D)	Bryn Mawr St	W Par St	0.65	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 10.408						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
4027	2b	Winter Park Dr (Ph. 2)	Seminola Blvd	SR 434	1.70	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PE	\$ 2.550					✓	\$ 9.350	Casselberry / Seminole Co.
4026	2a	Winter Park Dr (Ph. 3)	Red Bug Lake Rd	Cannon Way	0.25	Complete Streets / Safety / Ops	PE	\$ 0.580					✓	\$ 1.380	Casselberry / Seminole Co.
4006	3	S Park Ave / Clarcona Rd	US 441 / Main St	Cleveland St	1.26	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 2.004					✓	\$ 4.784	Apopka / Orange Co.
1807	4	Goldsboro Community Gateway	SR 46	Persimmon Ave / 8th St	0.50	New 2 Lane Roadway / Complete Streets	PE	\$ 0.764					✓	\$ 3.698	Sanford / Seminole Co.
4007	5	W Michael Gladden Blvd	S Park Ave	Bradshaw Rd	0.70	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 1.108					✓	\$ 4.434	Apopka / Orange Co.
4028	6a	N Central Ave (Ph. 1)	Dankin Ave	US 192 / Vine St	0.60	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 2.640						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
4029	6b	N Central Ave (Ph. 2)	US 192 / Vine St	W Columbia Ave	0.23	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 1.010						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
4030	6c	N Central Ave (Ph. 3)	W Columbia Ave	W Donegan Ave	0.68	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 2.990						\$ -	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
4005	7	W Gore St	S Rio Grande Ave	Delaney Ave	1.61	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 5.000						\$ -	Orlando / Orange Co.
4024	8	Park Ave	Votaw Rd	Welch Rd	1.50	Complete Streets	PE	\$ 2.380				✓	✓	\$ 5.980	Apopka / Orange Co.
4013	9	Mitchell Hammock Rd	SR 426 / Broadway St	Lockwood Blvd	2.85	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 6.334						\$ -	Oviedo / Seminole Co.
4009	10	W Warren Ave	St Laurent St	S Milwee St	0.61	Complete Streets with Shared Use Path	CST	\$ 4.627						\$ -	Longwood / Seminole Co.
4021	11	North St Phase II	Palm Springs Dr	CR 427 / S Ronald Reagan Blvd	1.75	Complete Streets	CST	\$ 7.700						\$ -	Seminole Co.

## TSM&O + ITS Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
447388-3	-	UPS Expansion Ph. 2 (Downtown Orlando)	Citywide	-	-	Install uninterruptable power supplies (UPS) at 53 intersections & install emergency vehicle preemption systems at 51 intersections & expansion and upgrade downtown DMS	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
443838-1	-	SR 434	Oleander St	West of US 17-92 / SR 15/600	0.31	Traffic Ops	TIP	TIP							Longwood / Seminole Co.
445772-1	-	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trail	Clarcona-Ocoee Rd	-	0.08	Traffic Signals	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
447593-1	-	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Primrose Dr.	Maguire Blvd	0.09	Traffic Signals	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
450329-1	-	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd.	Hastings St / Sheringham Rd	-	0.08	Intersection Traffic Control System	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
450435-1	-	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trail	Donegan Ave	-	-	Intersection Traffic Control System	TIP	TIP							Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
450531-1	-	SR 424 / Edgewater Dr	Satel Dr	Aloha St	0.09	Traffic Signals	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
452359-1	-	Kaley Ave	I-4	SR-527 / Orange Ave	0.69	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
452360-1	-	Church St	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	S Division Ave	0.75	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
452360-1	-	Church St	John Young Pkwy	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.99	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
452360-1	-	Church St	Hughey Ave	S Rosalind Ave	0.55	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
453466-1	-	John Young Pkwy	SR 482 / Sand Lake Rd	Hunters Creek Blvd	6.86	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453468-1	-	Carrier Dr	W of Universal Blvd	Grand National Dr	0.90	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando

## TSM&O + ITS Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
453487-1	-	Amelia St	Parramore Ave	Highland Ave	0.94	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
453499-1	-	Turnbull Dr	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	Commander Dr	0.19	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
453499-1	-	Commander Dr	Hoffner Rd	Turnbull Dr	0.31	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
453499-1	-	Commander Dr	Turnbull Dr	Gatlin Ave	0.72	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
453499-1	-	Commander Dr	Gatlin Ave	Pershing Ave	0.25	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
448775-1	-	Osceola ATMS Ph. 6 Buggy Creek Rd	Simpson Rd	Narcoossee Rd	5.90	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Osceola Co.
448728-1		Orange Co. Traffic Cabinets Upgrade Ph. 1	Countywide	-	-	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
448728-2	-	Orange Co. Traffic Cabinets Upgrade Ph. 2	Countywide	-	-	ITS/Technology	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
B46	1	Lawrence Silas Blvd	Neptune Rd	E Oak St	0.42	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 0.536							Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
B46	1	Neptune Rd	Partin Settlement Rd	Lakeshore Blvd	2.40	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 3.067							Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
B26/27	2	S Garland Ave	SR 526 / Robinson St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.51	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 0.555							Orlando / Orange Co.
B26/27	2	Garland Ave	South St	W Washington St	0.38	Operational / Safety	CST	\$ 1.303							Orlando / Orange Co.
B26/27	2	S Hughey Ave	W South St	W Washington St	0.38	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 0.415							Orlando / Orange Co.
B26/27	2	Hughey Ave	SR 526 / Robinson St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.51	Operational / Safety	CST	\$ 1.745							Orlando / Orange Co.

## TSM&O + ITS Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
B25	3	W South St	S Rio Grande Ave	S Division Ave	1.00	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 1.092							Orlando / Orange Co.
B25	3	W Anderson St	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	S Division Ave	0.75	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 0.820							Orlando / Orange Co.
B22	4	Livingston St	N Parramore Ave	Highland Ave	0.94	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 1.592							Orlando / Orange Co.
B22	4	Livingston St	Highland Ave	Mills Ave N	0.58	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 0.975							Orlando / Orange Co.
B30	5	Lakeview Ave	SR 438 / Plant St	Fullers Cross Rd	2.07	ITS/Technology	PE	\$ 0.723					✓	\$ 2.653	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
B30	5	Story Rd	SR 438 / Plant St	Dillard St S	1.24	ITS/Technology	PE	\$ 0.433					✓	\$ 1.589	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
B30	5	Lakeview Ave	Story Rd	E Plant St	0.48	ITS/Technology	PE	\$ 0.169					✓	\$ 0.619	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
B33b	6	Carrier Dr	International Dr	W of Universal Blvd	0.26	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 1.320							Orange Co.
B33b	6	Mandarin Dr	SR 482 / W Sand Lake Rd	Vanguard St	0.76	ITS/Technology	CST	\$ 1.302							Orange Co.
3061	7	Amelia St	US 17/92/441 / Orange Blossom Trl	N Parramore Ave	0.50	ITS/Technology	PE	\$ 0.176					✓	\$ 0.645	Orlando / Orange Co.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Projects (TMA-SU + TALU + SUNTrail Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
428047-2	-	Pine Hills Trail Ph. 2 (SUNTrail Eligible)	Bonnie Brae N	Clarcona Ocoee Rd	-	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
435521-1	-	St. Andrew's Trail (SUNTrail Eligible)	Cady Way Trail	Aloma Ave.	-	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
436433-1	-	Coast to Coast Trail - Orange Co. Gap Seg. 2 (SUNTrail Eligible)	Hiwassee Rd	North of SR 414	-	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
439878-5	-	Shingle Creek Trail Ph. 3B	Orange / Osceola CL	Town Loop Blvd	-	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
442334-3	-	Shingle Creek Trail (Yates Connector South, Ph. 2B) (SUNTrail Eligible)	Pleasant Hill Rd	Toho Vista	2.05	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
442870-2	-	Shingle Creek Trail Ph. 2C North	Orange / Osceola CL	CR 522 / Osceola Pkwy	2.08	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
444900-2	-	Town Center Sidewalks	Various	-	-	Sidewalk	TIP	TIP							Winter Springs / Seminole Co.
444994-1	-	North Village Connectivity	Various	-	-	Sidewalk	TIP	TIP							Winter Springs / Seminole Co.
446163-1	-	Central Casselberry Connectivity	Hibiscus Rd, Palm Dr & Marigold Rd	-	0.62	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Casselberry / Seminole Co.
448756-1	-	Shingle Creek / Kirkman Trail (SUNTrail Eligible)	Raleigh St	Old Winter Garden Rd	1.15	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orlando / Orange Co.
450919-2	-	Seminole Wekiva Trail Over/Underpass (SUNTrail Eligible)	at SR 434	-	1.00	Trail Bridge / Tunnel	TIP	TIP							Seminole Co.
450919-2	-	Seminole Wekiva Trail Over/Underpass (SUNTrail Eligible)	at SR 436	-	1.00	Trail Bridge / Tunnel	TIP	TIP							Seminole Co.
452289-1	-	Shingle Creek Trail Ph. 4 (SUNTrail Eligible)	Alhambra Dr	Old Winter Garden Rd	1.56	Shared Use Path	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.



## Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Projects (TMA-SU + TALU + SUNTrail Funds) - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
5012	N/A	Pine Hills Trail Ph. 3 (SUNTrail Eligible)	Orange / Seminole CL	Clarcona Ocoee Rd	2.55	Shared Use Path	SUNTrail		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	\$ 10.440	Orange Co.
5013	N/A	Clarcona-Ocoee Connector (SUNTrail Eligible)	N Hiwassee Rd	Pine Hills Trail	1.30	Shared Use Path	SUNTrail		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	\$ 5.351	Orange Co.
5078	1	Little Econ Trail Ph. 3	Baldwin Park St	Richard Crotty Pkwy	1.00	Trail Bridge	CST	\$ 10.920					✓	\$ 10.920	Orlando / Orange Co.
5077	2	West Orange Trail Ph. 4A (SUNTrail Eligible)	Kelly Park / Rock Springs	W Lester Rd	9.31	Shared Use Path	CST	\$ 5.358							Apopka / Orange Co.
5085	3	West Orange Trail Ph. 4B (SUNTrail Eligible)	Welch Rd / Rock Springs Rd	Wekiva Springs State Park Entrance	3.00	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.900				✓	✓	\$ 5.100	Apopka / Orange Co.
5021	4	West Orange Trail Ph. 4C (SUNTrail Eligible)	Ponkan Rd / Jason Dwelley Pkwy	Rock Springs Rd	2.27	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.680				✓	✓	\$ 3.860	Apopka / Orange Co.
5014	5	West Orange Trail Ph. 4D (SUNTrail Eligible)	Wekiva Pkwy	Kelly Park/ Rock Springs	2.69	Shared Use Path	CST	\$ 4.552							Apopka / Orange Co.
5026	6	Church Trail	S Lakemont Ave	Cady Way Trail	0.22	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.103				✓	✓	\$ 0.769	Winter Park / Orange Co.
5016	7	Lake Nona SE Trails (SUNTrail Eligible)	Lake Nona Blvd / Narcoossee Rd	Moss Park Rd/ Narcoossee Rd	0.65	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.304				✓	✓	\$ 2.278	Orlando / Orange Co.
5022	8	Toho Valencia Bridge	E Vine St	North Valencia College-Osceola Campus	0.45	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.207				✓	✓	\$ 1.552	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
5067	9	Horizon West	Tiny Rd	West Orange HS	6.29	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 3.869				✓	✓	\$ 21.925	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
EC200	10	Orlando Bicycle Study	Orlando Health SunRail Station	Lake Ivanhoe	1.32	Shared Use Path	PE	\$ 0.600					✓	\$ 2.200	Orlando / Orange Co.



## School Mobility / Safe Routes to School Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (In millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
443291-1	-	Deerwood Elementary School Ph. 2	Peabody Rd / Dudley Dr / Colchester Ct	Durham Pl / Dulverton Way / Dundee Ln	-	Safe Routes to School	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Osceola Co.
443395-1	-	Hungerford Elementary School	E Kennedy Blvd at College Ave	Monroe Ave at Margaret Sq	-	Safe Routes to School	TIP	TIP						\$ -	Eatonville / Winter Park / Orange Co.
-	-	Hickory Tree Elementary School Ph. 1	Englewood Dr / Oak Wind Ct / Jan Lan Blvd	Beechwood Dr / Oak Wind Ct / Jan Lan Blvd	-	Safe Routes to School	CST	\$ 0.787						\$ -	Osceola Co.
-	-	Hickory Tree Elementary School Ph. 3	Jan Lan Blvd	Englewood Ct S / Hickory Tree Rd	-	Safe Routes to School	CST	\$ 0.666						\$ -	Osceola Co.
-	-	Hickory Tree Elementary School Ph. 4	Jan Lan Blvd	Englewood Ct. N / Old Hickory Tree Rd	-	Safe Routes to School	CST	\$ 0.730						\$ -	Osceola Co.
-	-	Longwood Elementary School	N. Grant & Orange Ave	Highland St / Logan Dr	-	Safe Routes to School	PE	\$ 0.320					✓	\$ 2.854	Seminole Co.
-	-	Neptune Middle School	Ames Haven Rd & Delmar Ave	Patricia St / Florence Dr	-	Safe Routes to School	PE	\$ 0.091					✓	\$ 0.472	Osceola Co.
-	-	Boggy Creek Elementary School / Parkway Middle School Ph. 2	Zacalo Way	Florida Pkwy / Tulpan Dr	-	Safe Routes to School	CST	\$ 0.561						\$ -	Osceola Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds)

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
453494-1	TIP	Rio Grande Ave	N of Oak Ridge Rd	Heritage Pl Ln	0.52	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453494-1	TIP	Texas Ave	Americana Blvd	Honour Rd	0.26	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453494-1	TIP	Texas Ave	S of Towerpine Rd	Skan Ct	0.26	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453494-1	TIP	Rio Grande Ave	Honour Rd	S of Holden Ave	0.18	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453489-1	TIP	Old Cheney Hwy	Santa Rosa Dr	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	1.28	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453489-1	TIP	Old Cheney Hwy	Myrtle St	Kingston Ave	0.30	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453489-1	TIP	Old Cheney Hwy	June St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453489-1	TIP	Old Cheney Hwy	Commerce Blvd	Flowerdale Ave	0.78	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453497-1	TIP	White Rd	Olympic Cir	S Clark Rd	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Ocoee / Orange Co.
453497-1	TIP	White Rd	E of Natchez Trace Blvd	Good Homes Rd	0.59	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Ocoee / Orange Co.
453497-1	TIP	Good Homes Rd	Florence Vista Blvd	Silver Star Rd	0.89	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Ocoee / Orange Co.
453497-1	TIP	Pine Hills Rd	SR 408	N of Amelia St	0.04	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Ocoee / Orange Co.
453497-1	TIP	Vernon St / Balboa Dr	Vernon St	Hinckley Rd	0.02	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Ocoee / Orange Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
453498-1	TIP	Presidents Dr	Orlando Central Pkwy	Premier Row	0.29	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453498-1	TIP	Orlando Central Pkwy	Lake Ellenor Dr	W of US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.28	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453498-1	TIP	Luzon Dr	Lancaster Rd	Oak Ridge Rd	0.54	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453498-1	TIP	Chancellor Dr	Premier Row	Oak Ridge Rd	1.58	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
453498-1	TIP	Texas Ave	Chancellor Dr	E of Emperor Dr	0.28	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	TIP	TIP							Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Anderson St	Rio Grande Dr	W of US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.16	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.011				✓	✓	\$ 0.040	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	W South St	Clear Lake Way	Parramore Ave	0.44	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.029				✓	✓	\$ 0.108	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Robinson St	Westmoreland Dr	Garden Ave	0.18	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.012				✓	✓	\$ 0.044	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	SR 15 / Washington St	E of Terry Ave	Division Ave	0.11	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.029	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Garland Ave	Washington St	Robinson St	0.12	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.031	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Hughey Ave	Church St	South St	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.032	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Columbia St	W of Atlanta Ave	E of Atlanta Ave	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.012	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Columbia St	Hughey Ave	Sligh Blvd	0.03	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.002				✓	✓	\$ 0.008	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Parramore Ave	Kaley Ave	Miller St	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.062	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Avondale Ave	20th St	18th St	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.032	Orlando / Orange Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Kaley Ave	Kuhl Ave	Cook Ave	0.03	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.002				✓	✓	\$ 0.008	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Michigan St	Nashville Ave	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.08	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.021	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Kaley Ave	Division Ave	W of Lucerne Trl	0.37	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.025				✓	✓	\$ 0.090	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	33rd St	John Young Pkwy	Vision Blvd	0.23	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.016				✓	✓	\$ 0.058	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Mercy Dr	S Lake Orlando Pkwy	S of Lake Orlando Pkwy	0.08	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.005				✓	✓	\$ 0.020	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Shader Rd	W of Eunice Ave	John Young Pkwy	0.58	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.039				✓	✓	\$ 0.143	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Rosamond Dr	S of US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	Lake Orlando Pkwy	0.29	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.020				✓	✓	\$ 0.072	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Lake Breeze Dr	Lake Orlando Pkwy	E of Park Breeze Ct	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.032	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	John Young Pkwy	S of Pace St	S of Edgewater Dr	0.57	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.039				✓	✓	\$ 0.142	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Mercy Dr	Silver Star Rd	N of Mercy Industrial Ct	0.31	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.021				✓	✓	\$ 0.078	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Mercy Dr	Princeton St	Mercy Star Ct	0.27	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.018				✓	✓	\$ 0.067	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB 4, 8, 9, 11	1	Silver Star Rd	W of Mercy Dr	E of Commerce Loop	0.14	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.034	Orlando / Orange Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Marigold Ave	N of San Remo Rd	N of KOA St	0.52	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.035				✓	✓	\$ 0.130	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Doverplum Ave	Cypress Pkwy	Old Pleasant Hill Rd	1.15	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.078				✓	✓	\$ 0.285	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Boggy Creek Rd	W of Lakeside Dr	E of Lakeside Dr	0.31	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.021				✓	✓	\$ 0.076	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Columbia Ave	W of US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.012	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Neptune Rd	Idora Blvd	Fowler Blvd	0.27	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.018				✓	✓	\$ 0.067	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Donegan Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	E of Old Dixie Hwy	0.08	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.021	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	US 192	W of Aeronautical Dr	Aeronautical Dr	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.022	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Simpson Rd	US 192 / Irlo Bronson Memorial Hwy	Florida's Turnpike (overpass)	0.79	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.054				✓	✓	\$ 0.197	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Smith St	Columbia Ave	S of Mildred Ct	0.16	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.011				✓	✓	\$ 0.039	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Poinciana Blvd	Oren Brown Rd	N of Declaration Dr	1.75	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.119				✓	✓	\$ 0.436	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Oren Brown Rd	Poinciana Blvd	US 192 / Vine St	1.51	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.102				✓	✓	\$ 0.373	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Hoagland Blvd	W of 5th St	N of Clay St	2.58	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.174				✓	✓	\$ 0.639	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Mabbette St	N Thacker Ave	W of S John Young Pkwy	0.34	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.023				✓	✓	\$ 0.085	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	Clay St	Pleasant Hill Rd	W Martin St	2.12	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.143				✓	✓	\$ 0.525	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.
SWB 6, 12, 14, 15, 16	2	S Thacker Ave	S of W Martin St	Clay St	0.02	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.001				✓	✓	\$ 0.003	Kissimmee / Osceola Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB7	3	Sheeler Ave	S of SR 436	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.16	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.011				✓	✓	\$ 0.039	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	Alabama Ave / Apopka Blvd	S of SR 436	N of E 10th St	0.48	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.032				✓	✓	\$ 0.118	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	Alabama Ave	SR 436	N of E 6th St	0.12	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.030	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	SB Ramp to SR 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	E of McGee Ave	W of Sheeler Ave	0.50	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.034				✓	✓	\$ 0.123	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	NB Ramp to SR 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	E of McGee Ave	W of Sheeler Ave	0.44	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.030				✓	✓	\$ 0.109	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	E of McGee Ave	W of Sheeler Ave	0.30	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.020				✓	✓	\$ 0.074	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB7	3	EB Ramp to SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	E of McGee Ave	W of Sheeler Ave	0.55	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.038				✓	✓	\$ 0.138	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB10	4	Southwest Rd	Country Club Rd	Historic Goldsboro Blvd	1.08	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.073				✓	✓	\$ 0.266	Sanford / Seminole Co.
SWB10	4	Country Club Rd	Southwest Rd	W of Strickland Ave	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.011	Sanford / Seminole Co.
SWB10	4	Persimmon Ave	N of 8th St	4th St	0.15	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.010				✓	✓	\$ 0.037	Sanford / Seminole Co.
SWB10	4	SR 46	Persimmon Ave	Mangoustine Ave	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.032	Sanford / Seminole Co.
SWB10	4	US 17/92 / French Ave	Seminole Blvd	N of Fulton St	0.11	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.007				✓	✓	\$ 0.026	Sanford / Seminole Co.



# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB13	5	Douglas Ave	N of Loraine Dr	Central Pkwy	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.062	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Douglas Ave	SR 436	N of SR 436	0.06	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.004				✓	✓	\$ 0.014	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Lake of the Woods Blvd	Carolwood Blvd	Fontebranda Loop	0.23	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.016				✓	✓	\$ 0.057	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Hattaway Dr	Haines St	SR 436 / Semoran Blvd	0.03	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.002				✓	✓	\$ 0.008	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Oxford Rd	Fernwood Blvd	N of Fernwood Blvd	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.022	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Palm Springs Dr	SR 436	N of SR 436	0.10	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.007				✓	✓	\$ 0.025	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	Spring Lake Rd	E of Maitland Ave	Woodling Pl	0.23	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.016				✓	✓	\$ 0.057	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	O'Brien Rd	Beverly Ave	US 17/92	0.58	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.039				✓	✓	\$ 0.144	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB13	5	SR 436	W of Hattaway Dr	Hattaway Dr	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.022	Altamonte Springs / Seminole Co.
SWB17	6	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	E of S Thompson Rd	S Roger Williams Rd	0.27	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.018				✓	✓	\$ 0.067	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB17	6	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	Alpine Dr	Piedmont Wekiva Rd	1.29	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.087				✓	✓	\$ 0.320	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB17	6	Apopka Blvd	Sugar Pine Rd	SE of Fontaine Dr	0.32	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.022				✓	✓	\$ 0.079	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB17	6	Apopka Blvd	Armando Borjas Jr Way	N Hiawassee Rd	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.031	Apopka / Orange Co.
SWB17	6	Line Dr	Sand Lake Rd	N of Border Lake Rd	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.061	Apopka / Orange Co.



# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB18	7	Shader Rd	W of John Young Pkwy	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	0.64	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.044				✓	✓	\$ 0.160	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	Clemson Rd	John Young Pkwy	0.19	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.013				✓	✓	\$ 0.046	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	E of Hansrob Rd	Industrial Blvd	0.12	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.030	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	SR 438 / Silver Star Rd	Dinneen Ave	Regent Ave	0.07	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.005				✓	✓	\$ 0.017	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Silver Star Rd	US 441 / Orange Blossom Trl	W of Pinewood Dr	0.17	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.012				✓	✓	\$ 0.043	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Rio Grande Ave	Silver Star Rd	Ardsley Dr	0.29	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.020				✓	✓	\$ 0.073	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Rio Grande Ave	Vassar St	Bryn Mawr St	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.009				✓	✓	\$ 0.032	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Princeton St / Smith St	One-Way Split	Nichols Ave	0.08	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.021	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Westmoreland Dr	Golfview St	New Hampshire St	0.22	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.015				✓	✓	\$ 0.055	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Smith St	W of Princeton Ct	E of Ann Arbor Ave	0.04	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.010	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Virginia Dr	W of SR 527 / Orange Ave	E of Alden Rd	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.012	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	Winter Park Rd	Corrine Dr	Marble Ave	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.004				✓	✓	\$ 0.013	Orlando / Orange Co.
SWB18	7	General Rees Ave	Lower Park Rd	S of Glenridge Way	0.23	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.016				✓	✓	\$ 0.057	Orlando / Orange Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB19	8	Trevarthon Rd	Harrell Rd	W of Nelson Park Cir	0.82	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.056				✓	✓	\$ 0.204	Orange Co.
SWB19	8	Harrell Rd	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	N of Bexhill Blvd	0.51	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.034				✓	✓	\$ 0.125	Orange Co.
SWB19	8	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	SR 417 Ramp	Constantine St	0.41	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.028				✓	✓	\$ 0.101	Orange Co.
SWB19	8	Chickasaw Trl	SR 408 Ramp	William C Coleman Dr	0.01	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.001				✓	✓	\$ 0.003	Orange Co.
SWB19	8	Chickasaw Trl	Montezuma Trl	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.33	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.023				✓	✓	\$ 0.083	Orange Co.
SWB19	8	Chickasaw Trl	N of Crows Nest Cir	Millinockett Ln	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.063	Orange Co.
SWB20	9	9th St	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	Florida Ave	0.67	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.045				✓	✓	\$ 0.166	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	9th St	Maple St	Bay St	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.062	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Lakeview Ave	Story Rd	Vining St	0.12	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.029	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	SR 535 / Main St	Story Rd	Florida Ave	0.18	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.012				✓	✓	\$ 0.044	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Pennsylvania Ave	Dillard St	Summer St	0.25	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.017				✓	✓	\$ 0.062	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Pennsylvania Ave	Wilson St	9th St	0.13	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.008				✓	✓	\$ 0.031	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Story Rd	Lakeview Ave	Boyd St	0.07	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.005				✓	✓	\$ 0.017	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Story Rd	W of Woodland St	Dillard St	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.022	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Story Rd	Summer St	Wilson St	0.14	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.010				✓	✓	\$ 0.035	Winter Garden / Orange Co.

# Critical Sidewalk Gap Projects (TMA-SU + TALU Funds) - Continued

\*\*Local segment is not eligible for federal funding.

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Roadway / Facility	From	To	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Jurisdiction(s)
									PLN	PDE	PE	ROW	CST		
SWB20	9	SR 535 / Vineland Rd	Palmetto St	Cypress St	0.09	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.006				✓	✓	\$ 0.021	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	SR 535 / Vineland Rd	N of SR 50 / Colonial Rd	Morgan St	0.04	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.003				✓	✓	\$ 0.010	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	SR 535 / Winter Garden-Vineland Rd	S of Southern Pecan Pl	N of Southern Pecan Pl	0.05	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.004				✓	✓	\$ 0.013	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	SR 535 / Winter Garden-Vineland Rd	N of Florida's Turnpike	S of SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.18	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.012				✓	✓	\$ 0.045	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Beulah Rd	Beard Rd	S of Copenhagen Way	0.06	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.004				✓	✓	\$ 0.015	Winter Garden / Orange Co.
SWB20	9	Beulah Rd	S of Myrtle Ave	SR 50 / Colonial Dr	0.29	Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundle	PE	\$ 0.020				✓	✓	\$ 0.072	Winter Garden / Orange Co.

## Regional Transit Projects (TMA-SU + DDR + FTA Funds)

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Transit Category	Roadway / Facility	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Implementing Agency
								PLN	TCAR	PD	ROW + CST	OPS		
6002	2	A	SunRail - Phase III	-	Rail Connection from Orlando International Airport to Meadow Woods SunRail Station	TCAR	\$ 7.00			✓	✓	✓	\$ 294.95	FDOT
6003	3	B	LYNX - Southern Operations & Maintenance Facility	-	Per LYNX's Route Optimization Study (ROS), LYNX must acquire an additional operations and maintenance facility to support its growing fleet. This facility will house, refuel, and maintain CNG buses, ACCESS LYNX, NeighborLink, and VanPool Vehicles. It will have vehicle capacity for storing 60' articulated buses on the property to improve operational efficiencies.	ROW & CST	\$ 110.00						-	LYNX
6004	4	B	LYNX - Northern Operations Base	-	New Northern Operations base for System Expansion	PE	\$ 0.50				✓	✓	\$ 50.00	LYNX
6005	5	B	SunRail - Meadow Woods Station Parking Expansion	-	Parking Expansion	PD	\$ 24.22			✓	✓		-	SunRail
6006	6	B	SunRail - Tupperware Station Parking Expansion	-	Parking Expansion	PD	\$ 30.24			✓	✓		-	SunRail
6007	7	B	SunRail - Poinciana Station Parking Expansion	-	Parking Expansion	PD	\$ 5.32			✓	✓		-	SunRail
-	-	C	LYNX - New Service	-	13 New Regional Express Routes (UCF - Downtown; OIA - Disney Springs; OIA / Florida Mall / Universal Studios; Downtown - Universal Studios; Downtown-S. I-Drive; Downtown - Disney Springs; Ocoee - Disney; Pine Hills / Disney; S.R. 436 / Disney; UCF/Altamonte Springs; UCF/Lake Mary; BVL/Tupperware/Disney Springs; Poinciana/Disney Springs)	OPS	\$ 37.74					✓	-	LYNX
-	-	C	LYNX - New Service	-	55 New Local Routes (Disney/Four Corners; Winter Garden Rd / Ficquette Rd / Ocoee / Disney)	OPS	\$ 153.66					✓	-	LYNX
-	-	C	LYNX - New Service	-	2 New Commuter Express Route (Lake County; Waterford Lakes)	OPS	\$ 1.73					✓	-	LYNX
-	-	C	LYNX - New Service	-	9 High-Frequency, Limited-Stop Route (SR 436 Ltd.; US 441 Ltd.; SR 50 Ltd.; Pine Hills/ Kirkman/ Universal Ltd.; Oak Ridge Ltd.; I-Drive Ltd.; US 192/ Disney Springs Ltd.; US 192 WDW Ltd.; US 192)	OPS	\$ 51.70					✓	-	LYNX

## Regional Transit Projects (TMA-SU + DDR + FTA Funds) - Continued

MTP ID	PPL Rank	Transit Category	Roadway / Facility	Length (miles)	Project Type	Priority Phase	Phase Amount (in millions)	Remaining Phase(s)					Est. Cost of Remaining Phases (in millions)	Implementing Agency
								PLN	TCAR	PD	ROW + CST	OPS		
-	-	C	LYNX - New Service	-	17 On-Demand/Flexible Routes	OPS	\$ 6.59					✓	-	LYNX
6001	1	D	LYNX Capital Expenses & Transit Asset Management (Vehicles, Facilities, Passenger Amenities, Support Equipment, Technology, Safety & Security, LYMMO SGR)  Includes capital funding for five (5) fiscal years.	-	Administrative, Operations, and Maintenance Facility improvements and repairs: Concrete repairs; HVAC upgrades; Fuel island improvements; Parking lot and roadway repaving; Security gate installation. Passenger Amenity replacements and new installations at bus stops (shelters, benches, solar lighting, trash receptacles, bike parking). 15 New Transit Centers	Capital	\$ 1,640.69							LYNX
-	-	D	Bus Replacement	-	25 40' Gillig buses at \$565,000 per bus, 17 paratransit vehicles at \$120,000 per cutaway, 6 articulated vehicles at \$821,000 per vehicle, 5 NeighborLink vehicles at \$190,000 per vehicle, 2 Electric 35' LYMMO buses at \$890,000	Capital	\$ 163.88							LYNX
-	-	D	Shelter Replacement	-	67 shelters at \$46,000 per shelter	Capital	\$ 3.08							LYNX
-	-	D	VanPool Replacement	-	22 VanPool vehicles per year at \$33,000 per vehicle	Capital	\$ 0.73							LYNX
-	-	D	Miscellaneous Capital Expenses	-	Window Replacement, Diesel Generator Replacement to CNG Type LYNX, and LCS Generator Replacement to CNG	Capital	\$ 4.32							LYNX
3262	-	E	City of Altamonte - Enhanced ITS / CAV Mobility from SunRail Station to Uptown Altamonte	4.49	Enhanced ITS/CAV Circulator	OPS	\$ 2.87					✓		LYNX
3236	-	E	City of Altamonte - Enhanced ITS / CAV Mobility - Gateway Drive from Seminole State College to Maitland Center	2.37	Enhanced ITS/CAV Circulator	OPS	\$ 2.87					✓		LYNX
-	-	E	City of Kissimmee Circulator	-	Community Circulator	OPS	\$ 2.87					✓		LYNX
-	-	E	City of Sanford Trolley	2.37	Community Circulator	OPS	\$ 2.87					✓		LYNX

# Supplement B - Prioritization Criteria & Scoring Summary

## Framework

This update to the annual process will continue to follow a funding program approach to project prioritization. Consistent with MetroPlan Orlando's 2045 MTP: Cost Feasible Plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding categories and allocation policies, this method helps ensure funding eligibility and seamless implementation into FDOT's Five Year Work Program / State TIP.

## Evaluation Criteria

MetroPlan Orlando's regional goals and objectives blended with the planning factors set forth in the federal FAST Act yielded 28 criteria, or scoring factors, consistent with board funding programs/policies, to serve as the basis for the comparative evaluation. In this way, new projects will be proposed, funded, and constructed, with their need and impacts measured for consistency with the 2045 MTP's goals and objectives. Although there are no "right" or "wrong" evaluation criteria, there are useful and less useful ones. The characteristics of good evaluation criteria are:

- Accurate and unambiguous, meaning that a clear and accurate relationship exists between the criteria and the real impacts/consequences;
- Comprehensive but concise, meaning that they cover the range of relevant consequences, but the evaluation framework remains systematic and manageable with no redundancies;
- Direct and ends-oriented, meaning they report directly on the consequences of interest and provide enough information that informed value judgments can reasonably be made;
- Measurable and consistently applied to allow comparisons across alternatives. This means the criteria should distinguish the relative degree of impact across alternatives. It does not exclude qualitative characterizations of impact, or impacts that can't be physically measured in the field;
- Understandable, in that impacts and trade-offs can be understood and communicated by everyone involved;
- Practical, meaning that information can practically be obtained to assess them (i.e., data, models or expert judgment exist or can be readily developed);
- Sensitive to the alternatives under consideration, so that they provide information that is useful in comparing alternatives; and
- Explicit about uncertainty so that they expose differences in the range of possible outcomes (differences in risk) associated with different policy or project alternatives.

## Overview of Evaluation Criteria

Table B-1 outlines the project evaluation criteria to be considered. It should be noted that while priority programming determines the order in which projects are pursued, various factors such as available funding and the need for additional analysis or design can influence the order in which projects are implemented.

**Table B-1 | Project Evaluation Criteria**

Goal Area	Evaluation Criteria
<b>Safety &amp; Security</b>	Crash Rate
	Fatal & Serious Injury Crash Rates
	Number of Pedestrian & Bicycle Crashes
	Evacuation Route Designation
<b>Reliability &amp; Performance</b>	Travel Time Reliability (Auto)
	Unreliability on Constrained Corridor
	Fiber Optic Presence
	Segment Actively Monitored/Managed
	Relative Change: Future Congested Speeds
<b>Access &amp; Connectivity</b>	Transit System Headways
	Population: ½ Mile of Non-Transit Corridor
	Jobs: ½ Mile of Non-Transit Corridor
	Food & Healthcare Locations: ½ Mile of Corridor
	Cultural & Recreational Locations: ½ Mile of Corridor
	Centrality Analysis Score (Critical Sidewalk Need)
<b>Health &amp; Environment</b>	Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress
	Residential Density: ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility
	Non-Residential Density: ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility
	Public Health Indicator Rates
	Intensity & Proximity: Environmental Justice Populations
	Relative Change: Vehicle Miles Traveled
<b>Investment &amp; Economy</b>	Percentage of Commercial Vehicle Traffic
	Statewide Truck Bottlenecks
	Intensity & Proximity: Freight Intensive Land Uses
	Relative Change: Vehicle Hours Traveled
	Cost Burdened Households: ¼ Mile of Corridor
	Percentage of Visitor Traffic
	Cost of Congestion

Source: MetroPlan Orlando 2045 MTP



# Criteria and Scoring Logic

The criteria and scoring logic applied to the region’s corridors will provide a quantitative assessment that will serve as the foundation for project prioritization. This assessment will provide decision-makers with the best information available for qualitative reviews and will guide MetroPlan Orlando’s investments through a data-informed and performance-based process. The following section (Tables B-2 through B-6) provides an overview of the method, logic, and data source of the evaluation criteria. *Each component of the Criteria and Scoring Logic is summarized below:*

## Performance Indicator

Defines the metric which was used to align with the objectives of each goal. This alignment is the basis of the quantitative assessment and will be used to identify needs and prioritize based on the performance.

## Data Sources

Provides the source of each indicator used within the data model. An in-depth explanation of each of the data sources can be found in [Technical Series #2](#) of the adopted 2045 MTP.

## Method

Includes a brief methodology of how each indicator was derived and/or assigned to the corridors within the data model.

## Logic

Ties the performance indicator back to the objective and explains the thought process on why the assessment will result in a priority need.

## Scenario Planning

Shows the performance indicators which will be evaluated across all four of the 2045 MTP’s scenario alternatives. The evaluation across the alternative’s scenario is largely based on the timeframe of data and analyses of the indicators (existing versus future conditions).

## Scoring Thresholds

To distribute the scores within the modeling process, individual buckets were identified per dataset, based on the regional analyses. The identification of these buckets can be done in a variety of ways based on statistical distribution of data, as shown at right.

For this process, “Natural Breaks (Jenks)” were used to readily identify natural separation or “buckets” of data. These naturally occurring separators were also compared with standard deviation and quantile to verify that the natural breaks were indeed following a normalized approach. The individual values were rounded to the nearest whole number or decimal to present clear and logical buckets for each data set.

Lastly, each performance indicator has a maximum value of 1 point. It should be noted that the number of indicators in each goal area will have an impact on the scoring of each indicator. For example, the four indicators in the Safety & Security Goal each comprise of 25% of the total goal score, whereas the five (5) indicators in the Reliability & Performance Goal each account for 20% of the total goal score. This process is necessary to equalize the scoring and limit goal areas with more performance indicators from skewing results.

**Natural Breaks (Jenks)**  
Numerical values of ranked data are examined to account for non-uniform distributions, giving an unequal class width with varying frequency of observations per class.

**Quantile**  
Distributes the observations equally across the class interval, giving unequal class widths but the same frequency of observations per class.

**Equal Interval**  
The data range of each class is held constant, giving an equal class width with varying frequency of observations per class.

**Defined Interval**  
Specify an interval size to define equal class widths with varying frequency of observations per class.

**Manual Interval**  
Create class breaks manually or modify one of the preset classification methods appropriate for your data.

**Geometric Interval**  
Mathematically defined class widths based on a geometric series, giving an approximately equal class width and consistent frequency of observations per class.

**Standard Deviation**  
For normally distributed data, class widths are defined using standard deviations from the mean of the data array, giving an equal class width and varying frequency of observations per class.

Source: Microsoft, 2020

**Table B-2 | Safety & Security Criteria and Scoring Logic**

Performance Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Crash Rate</b></p> <p>Rate of vehicular crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</p> <p><i>Source: Signal 4 Analytics (2016-2020)</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Three-year crash rates were collected and assigned to each corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors which exhibit high crash rates should be prioritized for improvements which eliminate the safety concerns. For example, a corridor with a crash rate over 6 indicates that its exposure to crashes has been higher than statewide averages for the past three years.</p> <p><u>Greater the crash rate, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 2</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.01 - 4</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.01 - 6</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 6</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Rate</p>	Range	Score	0 - 2	0	2.01 - 4	0.5	4.01 - 6	0.75	Over 6	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 2	0													
2.01 - 4	0.5													
4.01 - 6	0.75													
Over 6	1													
<p><b>Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Rates</b></p> <p>Rate of crashes which result in a fatality or serious injury</p> <p><i>Source: Signal 4 Analytics (2016-2020)</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Three-year fatal and serious injury crash rates were collected and assigned to each corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors which exhibit a high rate of crashes involving a fatality or serious injury should be prioritized for improvements which eliminate the safety concerns.</p> <p><u>Greater the crash rate, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.01 - 1</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.01 - 3</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.01 - 5</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 5</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Rate</p>	Range	Score	0	0	0.01 - 1	0.25	1.01 - 3	0.50	3.01 - 5	0.75	Over 5	1
Range	Score													
0	0													
0.01 - 1	0.25													
1.01 - 3	0.50													
3.01 - 5	0.75													
Over 5	1													
<p><b>Number of Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes</b></p> <p>A crash which involves a pedestrian or a cyclist</p> <p><i>Source: Signal 4 Analytics (2016-2020)</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Three-year data for pedestrian and bicycle crashes were collected and assigned to each corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors which exhibit a high number of crashes involving a pedestrian or cyclist should be prioritized for improvements which eliminate the safety concerns.</p> <p><u>Greater the number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.01 - 1</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.01 - 3</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.01 - 5</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 5</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Number</p>	Range	Score	0	0	0.01 - 1	0.50	1.01 - 3	0.1	3.01 - 5	1.5	Over 5	2
Range	Score													
0	0													
0.01 - 1	0.50													
1.01 - 3	0.1													
3.01 - 5	1.5													
Over 5	2													
<p><b>Evacuation Route Designation</b></p> <p>A highway that is a specified route for an emergency evacuation</p> <p><i>Source: Division of Emergency Management</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors which serve as a designated evacuation routes were identified within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors with evacuation route designations provide critical infrastructure to help prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies. Designated evacuation routes will receive point allocation.</p> <p><u>Corridors designated as an evacuation route will receive point allocation for prioritization.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: N/A</p>	Range	Score	No	0	Yes	1						
Range	Score													
No	0													
Yes	1													

**Table B-3 | Reliability & Performance Criteria and Scoring Logic**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Travel Time Reliability (Auto)</b></p> <p>The consistency or dependability in travel times measured as a ratio of the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile travel time to the average travel time.</p> <p><i>Source: Streetlight</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Travel time reliability (TTR) data was obtained from Streetlight for automobiles (non-commercial) and assigned to each corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve travel time reliability on the transportation system, corridors with unreliable travel times should be prioritized for improvement. For example, if the TTR is 1.5 and your work commute takes 30 minutes on average, you would need to plan 45 minutes to ensure an on-time arrival, 80 percent of the time.</p> <p><u>Lesser the reliability, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 1.10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.11 - 1.25</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.26 - 1.5</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.51 - 1.8</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 1.8</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Ratio</p>	Range	Score	0 - 1.10	0	1.11 - 1.25	0.25	1.26 - 1.5	0.50	1.51 - 1.8	0.75	Over 1.8	1
Range	Score													
0 - 1.10	0													
1.11 - 1.25	0.25													
1.26 - 1.5	0.50													
1.51 - 1.8	0.75													
Over 1.8	1													
<p><b>Travel Time Reliability (Auto) on Constrained Corridors</b></p> <p>The consistency or dependability in travel times for automobiles on constrained corridors</p> <p><i>Source: Streetlight</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Travel time reliability (TTR) data was obtained from Streetlight for automobiles (non-commercial) and assigned to constrained corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve travel time reliability on the transportation system, corridors with unreliable travel times for autos on constrained corridors should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Lesser the reliability on constrained corridor, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 1.10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.11 - 1.25</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.26 - 1.5</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.51 - 1.8</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 1.8</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Ratio</p>	Range	Score	0 - 1.10	0	1.11 - 1.25	0.25	1.26 - 1.5	0.50	1.51 - 1.8	0.75	Over 1.8	1
Range	Score													
0 - 1.10	0													
1.11 - 1.25	0.25													
1.26 - 1.5	0.50													
1.51 - 1.8	0.75													
Over 1.8	1													
<p><b>Fiber Optics Presence</b></p> <p>Indication of fiber availability along a corridor</p> <p><i>Source: ITS Master Plan / Maintaining Agencies</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Data provided by the Maintaining Agencies was used to determine the presence of fiber along a corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> The presence of fiber allows the opportunity to implement active ITS solutions. For example, traffic signals which are connected via fiber allow operators and/or software to adapt and coordinate signal timings along a corridor.</p> <p><u>No fiber optics, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: N/A</p>	Range	Score	Yes	0	No	1						
Range	Score													
Yes	0													
No	1													
<p><b>Segment Actively Monitored and Managed</b></p> <p>Indication if a corridor is actively monitored or managed</p> <p><i>Source: ITS Master Plan / Maintaining Agencies</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Data provided by the Maintaining Agencies was used to determine if the corridor met the characteristics of an actively monitored and managed corridor. These characteristics include those with fiber in place; those with coordinated or interconnected signals; those with CCTVs, Bluetooth devices, DMS, electronic display signs, or MVDS in place; and those that are included within the Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) system being managed by FDOT.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> A segment that is actively monitored and managed allows the opportunity for better reliability &amp; performance.</p> <p><u>No active management, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: N/A</p>	Range	Score	Yes	0	No	1						
Range	Score													
Yes	0													
No	1													
<p><b>Relative Change: Future Congested Speeds</b></p> <p>Comparison of the 2045 speed to the existing speed</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The 2015 and 2045 travel demand model were evaluated to quantify the change in congested speeds along a corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors which exhibit the greatest decrease in future travel speed should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the decrease in speed, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Over 1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.0 - 0.82</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.81 - 0.62</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.61 - 0.30</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less than 0.30</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Ratio</p>	Range	Score	Over 1	0	1.0 - 0.82	0.25	0.81 - 0.62	0.50	0.61 - 0.30	0.75	Less than 0.30	1
Range	Score													
Over 1	0													
1.0 - 0.82	0.25													
0.81 - 0.62	0.50													
0.61 - 0.30	0.75													
Less than 0.30	1													

**Table B-4 | Access & Connectivity Criteria and Scoring Logic**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Transit System Headway</b></p> <p>The amount of time between transit vehicle arrivals at a stop</p> <p><i>Source: LYNX</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> GIS data was used to identify the transit headway along a corridor. An average headway was used when multiple transit lines were present.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Increased transit frequency provides riders with greater flexibility and improves reliability and confidence of using transit as a travel mode.</p> <p><u>Greater the headway, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 30</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31 - 45</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>46 - 60</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 60</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Minutes</p>	Range	Score	0 - 30	0	31 - 45	0.50	46 - 60	0.75	Over 60	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 30	0													
31 - 45	0.50													
46 - 60	0.75													
Over 60	1													
<p><b>Population within ½ mile of Non-Transit Corridor</b></p> <p>2045 population totals from CFRPM TAZs in proximity to a corridor without transit</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7, LYNX</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors without a transit stop were evaluated to determine the amount of population within ½ mile.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve housing access to high frequency transit, corridors with the largest population and no transit should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the population with no access to transit, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 2,000</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,001 - 7,000</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7,001 - 11,000</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 11,000</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Population</p>	Range	Score	0 - 2,000	0	2,001 - 7,000	0.50	7,001 - 11,000	0.75	Over 11,000	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 2,000	0													
2,001 - 7,000	0.50													
7,001 - 11,000	0.75													
Over 11,000	1													
<p><b>Jobs within ½ mile of Non-Transit Corridor</b></p> <p>2045 employment totals within CFRPM TAZs in proximity to a corridor without transit</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7, LYNX</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors without a transit stop were evaluated to determine the amount of employment within ½ mile.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve employment access to high frequency transit, corridors with the largest population and no transit should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the jobs with no access to transit, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 3,400</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3,401 - 7,000</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7,001 - 11,000</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 11,000</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Employees</p>	Range	Score	0 - 3,400	0	3,401 - 7,000	0.50	7,001 - 11,000	0.75	Over 11,000	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 3,400	0													
3,401 - 7,000	0.50													
7,001 - 11,000	0.75													
Over 11,000	1													
<p><b>Food &amp; Healthcare Locations within ½ mile of Corridor</b></p> <p>Proximity of land uses which provide food or healthcare opportunities</p> <p><i>Source: xWave, 4/2022</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Proximity data for grocery stores, restaurants, markets, coffee shops, fast food restaurants, gyms, hospitals, pharmacies, and clinics was obtained from xWave. The number of these land uses within ½ mile of the corridor were totaled and scored (max score of 9 based on the 9 land use categories)</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To provide access to essential services across all modes of transportation, corridors which are in close proximity to food &amp; healthcare locations should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the food and healthcare locations, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 2</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 - 4</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 - 6</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 - 8</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Number</p>	Range	Score	0 - 2	0	3 - 4	0.25	5 - 6	0.50	7 - 8	0.75	9	1
Range	Score													
0 - 2	0													
3 - 4	0.25													
5 - 6	0.50													
7 - 8	0.75													
9	1													

**Table B-4 | Access & Connectivity Criteria and Scoring Logic (Continued)**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds										
<p><b>Cultural &amp; Recreational Locations within ½ mile of Corridor</b></p> <p>Proximity of land uses which provide cultural &amp; recreational opportunities</p> <p><i>Source: xWave, 4/2022</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Proximity data for theme parks, golf courses, camping sites, libraries, and parks was obtained from xWave. The number of these land uses within ½ mile of the corridor were totaled and scored.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To provide access to essential services across all modes of transportation, corridors which are in close proximity to cultural &amp; recreational locations should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the cultural &amp; recreational locations, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Number</p>	Range	Score	1	0.25	2	0.50	3	0.75	4	1
Range	Score											
1	0.25											
2	0.50											
3	0.75											
4	1											
<p><b>Sidewalk Critical Needs</b></p> <p>Critical needs identified based on functional class, sidewalk gaps, and proximity to transit, schools and generators</p> <p><i>Source: xWave, 4/2022</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors where a sidewalk critical need has been identified were scored for improvement.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve pedestrian connectivity, corridors with sidewalk critical needs should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Corridors where sidewalk critical needs are identified will receive point allocation for prioritization.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1-4</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 - 12</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 12</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Percent</p>	Range	Score	1-4	0.5	5 - 12	0.75	Over 12	1		
Range	Score											
1-4	0.5											
5 - 12	0.75											
Over 12	1											

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

**Table B-5 | Health & Environment Criteria and Scoring Logic**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress</b></p> <p>Bicycle user’s level of comfort when using the roadway or bicycle facility</p> <p><i>Source: xWave, 4/2022</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridor Bicycle Level Traffic of Stress (LTS) average scores were based on presence and type of bicycle facility, roadway speed, number of lanes, and volume.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve bicycle user’s comfort, corridors with higher LTS scores should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the LTS, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Less than 2.75</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.76 - 3</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.1 - 3.5</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 3.5</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Score</p>	Range	Score	Less than 2.75	0	2.76 - 3	0.50	3.1 - 3.5	0.75	Over 3.5	1		
Range	Score													
Less than 2.75	0													
2.76 - 3	0.50													
3.1 - 3.5	0.75													
Over 3.5	1													
<p><b>Residential Density within ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility</b></p> <p>2045 residential dwelling unit totals from CFRPM TAZs in proximity to a corridor without multimodal facilities</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7, LYNX</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors were evaluated to determine the amount of residential density (single family and multifamily dwelling units) within ¼ mile. The corridors were then compared to the availability of alternative modes of travel (transit, sidewalk, bike lane). If a corridor has less than 1,200 population, it will not be scored.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To reduce delay and increase affordability for transportation and housing choices, corridors with the highest residential density should have access to a full range of travel modes.</p> <p><u>Greater the residential density with a lack of multimodal options, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Greater than 1,200</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 modes</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 modes</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 mode</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 modes</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Population</p>	Range	Score	Greater than 1,200		3 modes	0	2 modes	0.5	1 mode	0.75	0 modes	1
Range	Score													
Greater than 1,200														
3 modes	0													
2 modes	0.5													
1 mode	0.75													
0 modes	1													
<p><b>Non-Residential Intensity within ¼ Mile of Multimodal Facility</b></p> <p>2045 Non-Residential totals within CFRPM TAZs in proximity to a corridor without multimodal facilities</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7, LYNX</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors were evaluated to determine the amount of non-residential intensity (Employees for Commercial, Industrial, and Service) within ¼ mile. The corridors were then compared to the availability of alternative modes of travel (transit, sidewalk, bike lane). If a corridor has less than 1,400 employment, it will not be scored.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To reduce delay and increase affordability for transportation and housing choices, corridors with the highest non-residential intensity should have access to a full range of travel modes.</p> <p><u>Greater the non-residential intensity with a lack of multimodal options, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Greater than 1,400</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 modes</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 modes</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 mode</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 modes</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Employment</p>	Range	Score	Greater than 1,400		3 modes	0	2 modes	0.5	1 mode	0.75	0 modes	1
Range	Score													
Greater than 1,400														
3 modes	0													
2 modes	0.5													
1 mode	0.75													
0 modes	1													
<p><b>Public Health Indicator Rates</b></p> <p>Risk score for chronic disease risk factors associated with physical inactivity along a corridor</p> <p><i>Source: 5-year American Community Survey Data</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Quantify rate of population with health indicators associated with physical inactivity (Asthma, Obesity, Diabetes) then compare to the availability of sidewalks and bike facilities</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To reduce the health impacts associated with physical inactivity, corridors that serve areas with a higher risk for the associated chronic diseases should be prioritized.</p> <p><u>Greater the health risks, greater the need for active transportation facilities, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 0.4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.41 - 0.65</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.66 - 0.83</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 0.83</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Score</p>	Range	Score	0 - 0.4	0	0.41 - 0.65	0.50	0.66 - 0.83	0.75	Over 0.83	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 0.4	0													
0.41 - 0.65	0.50													
0.66 - 0.83	0.75													
Over 0.83	1													



**Table B-5 | Health & Environment Criteria and Scoring Logic (Continued)**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Environmental Justice (EJ) Populations</b></p> <p>Percentage of seven traditionally underserved communities (low income, minority, aging population, people with disabilities, zero-car households, limited English proficiency persons, female head of household with child), measured at the census tract level.</p> <p><i>Source: 5-year American Community Survey Data</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> A GIS assessment was conducted to determine the corresponding EJ score for the area adjacent to the corridor. The EJ score represents the number of underserved communities which exceed the regional average within a particular census block.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To ensure that transportation decisions do not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income and minority populations, corridors with higher EJ population will be prioritized for improvements.</p> <p><u>Greater the EJ population, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Range</i></th> <th><i>Score</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 - 3</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Unit: Score</i></p>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Score</i>	1	0.25	2 - 3	0.50	4	0.75	Over 4	1		
<i>Range</i>	<i>Score</i>													
1	0.25													
2 - 3	0.50													
4	0.75													
Over 4	1													
<p><b>Relative Change: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</b></p> <p>Comparison of a corridor's 2045 VMT to the existing VMT</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The 2015 and 2045 travel demand model were evaluated to quantify the change in VMT along a corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Increased VMT results in increased greenhouse gas emissions, therefore corridors which exhibit the greatest increase in future VMT should be prioritized for improvements to other modes of travel that provide increased occupancy (transit) or active transportation (bike/pedestrian facilities).</p> <p><u>Greater the VMT increase, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Range</i></th> <th><i>Score</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 1.10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.11 - 1.3</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.31 - 1.6</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.61 - 2.5</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 2.5</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Unit: Ratio</i></p>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Score</i>	0 - 1.10	0	1.11 - 1.3	0.25	1.31 - 1.6	0.50	1.61 - 2.5	0.75	Over 2.5	1
<i>Range</i>	<i>Score</i>													
0 - 1.10	0													
1.11 - 1.3	0.25													
1.31 - 1.6	0.50													
1.61 - 2.5	0.75													
Over 2.5	1													

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

**Table B-6 | Investment & Economy Criteria and Scoring Logic**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Percentage of Commercial Vehicles</b></p> <p>The number of heavy vehicles compared to the total traffic along a corridor</p> <p><i>Source: Streetlight</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The truck volume was divided by the total volume to derive the percentage of commercial vehicles on each corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To promote transportation projects that expand and enhance economic prosperity, corridors which serve higher percentages of commercial vehicles should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the truck percentage, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 - 15</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 - 20</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 20</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Percent</p>	Range	Score	0 - 10	0	11 - 15	0.50	16 - 20	0.75	Over 20	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 10	0													
11 - 15	0.50													
16 - 20	0.75													
Over 20	1													
<p><b>Statewide Truck Bottlenecks</b></p> <p>Corridors ranked as Top 10 and Top 100 Statewide bottlenecks</p> <p><i>Source: Truck Bottlenecks NPMRDS</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Top 10 and Top 100 truck bottlenecks within the MetroPlan Orlando region were reviewed and coded in the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To promote transportation projects that expand and enhance economic prosperity, corridors which have been identified as bottlenecks for commercial vehicles should be prioritized for improvement. Reduced congestion on these corridors will provide for efficient movement of goods and services throughout the region.</p> <p><u>Greater the rank of truck bottleneck, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Top 100</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Top 10</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Rank</p>	Range	Score	Top 100	0.75	Top 10	1						
Range	Score													
Top 100	0.75													
Top 10	1													
<p><b>Freight Intensive Land Use within 1-mile of Corridor</b></p> <p>2045 industrial employment totals within CFRPM TAZs in proximity to a corridor</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors were evaluated to determine the amount of freight intensive land use (Industrial employment) within 1 mile</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To promote transportation projects that expand and enhance economic prosperity, corridors which serve as the last mile connection for freight should be prioritized for improvement.</p> <p><u>Greater the freight intensive land use, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 50</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51 - 100</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>101 - 200</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 200</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Employees</p>	Range	Score	0 - 50	0	51 - 100	0.50	101 - 200	0.75	Over 200	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 50	0													
51 - 100	0.50													
101 - 200	0.75													
Over 200	1													
<p><b>Relative Change: Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)</b></p> <p>Comparison of a corridor's 2045 VHT to the existing VHT</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The 2015 and 2045 travel demand model were evaluated to quantify the change in VHT along a corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> Corridors which exhibit the greatest increase in future VHT should be prioritized for improvements. For example, if a corridor is projected to have a 3.0 ratio of VHT increase, the existing time spent traversing the corridor will be three times higher in the future</p> <p><u>Greater the VHT increase, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 1.10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.11 - 1.4</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.4 - 1.75</td> <td>0.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.76 - 2.8</td> <td>.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 2.8</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Ratio</p>	Range	Score	0 - 1.10	0	1.11 - 1.4	0.25	1.4 - 1.75	0.50	1.76 - 2.8	.75	Over 2.8	1
Range	Score													
0 - 1.10	0													
1.11 - 1.4	0.25													
1.4 - 1.75	0.50													
1.76 - 2.8	.75													
Over 2.8	1													

**Table B-6 | Investment & Economy Criteria and Scoring Logic (Continued)**

Indicator	Description	Scoring Thresholds												
<p><b>Cost Burdened Households within ¼ mile of Corridor</b></p> <p>The percentage of families which pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing.</p> <p><i>Source: 5-year American Community Survey Data</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> Corridors were evaluated to determine the percentage of cost burdened households within ¼ mile of the corridor.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To ensure that transportation decisions do not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on cost burdened households, corridors with higher percentages will be prioritized for improvements.</p> <p><u>Greater the cost burdened households, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10 - 22</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 - 27</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28 - 32</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 32</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Percentage</p>	Range	Score	10 - 22	0.25	23 - 27	0.5	28 - 32	0.75	Over 32	1		
Range	Score													
10 - 22	0.25													
23 - 27	0.5													
28 - 32	0.75													
Over 32	1													
<p><b>Percentage of Visitor Traffic</b></p> <p>The percentage of visitor traffic to total traffic along a corridor</p> <p><i>Source: FDOT Central Florida Visitor Study – 2019</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The percentage of visitor traffic was assigned to each corridor within the data model.</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To improve the transportation experience for visitors and supportive-industry worker, corridors which exhibit a high percentage of visitor traffic should be prioritized.</p> <p><u>Greater the percent of visitor traffic, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 10</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 - 25</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26 - 40</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 - 60</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 60</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Percentage</p>	Range	Score	0 - 10	0	11 - 25	0.25	26 - 40	0.5	41 - 60	0.75	Over 60	1
Range	Score													
0 - 10	0													
11 - 25	0.25													
26 - 40	0.5													
41 - 60	0.75													
Over 60	1													
<p><b>Cost of Congestion</b></p> <p>Comparison of a corridor’s cost of congestion between the 2045 cost and existing cost.</p> <p><i>Source: CFRPM v7, U.S. Census Data</i></p>	<p><b>Method:</b> The cost of congestion uses average delay along a corridor and multiplies by the estimated hourly income per county (average household income / average household occupancy / 2080 hours per year).</p> <p><b>Logic:</b> To reduce per capita delay for residents, visitors, and businesses, corridors with the highest cost per congestion should be prioritized for improvement. For example, if a 30 minute work commute takes you one hour, the additional 30 minutes spent in congestion was measured as a cost.</p> <p><u>Greater the cost of congestion, greater the need, greater the point allocation.</u></p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Range</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 - 3</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 - 5</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6 - 14</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 14</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit: Ratio</p>	Range	Score	0 - 3	0	4 - 5	0.5	6 - 14	0.75	Over 14	1		
Range	Score													
0 - 3	0													
4 - 5	0.5													
6 - 14	0.75													
Over 14	1													

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

# Data Model Development

The development of the automated GIS data model included combining multiple data sources and information into a singular base segmented roadway file that included the roads in the MetroPlan Orlando area.

## Prioritization Database and Roadway Network Development

Prior to building the actual prioritization model, MetroPlan Orlando and HDR conducted a coordination meeting and reviewed assumptions, methodology and data sources; and to discuss availability and quality of the numerous input datasets from various sources including FDOT’s statewide Roadway Characteristics Inventory (RCI), U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS), FDOT’s regional travel demand model (CFRPM), Signal Four Crash Database, regional/local land use data, LYNX transit routes/stops, and regional activity centers. The datasets then were compiled in a centralized file geodatabase (fGDB) and then processed as required for prioritization, as shown Figure B-1. A full list of data sources and model criteria is broken down in prior sections.

**Figure B-1 | Prioritization File Geodatabase**



A complete master roadway network forms the basis for developing a comprehensive regional prioritization. For this purpose, the existing MetroPlan Orlando base roadway network and segmentation was reviewed and updated to reflect both correct network geometry and attribute information. Updates included:

- Splitting segments at (major) intersections to create logical/coherent network
- Standardizing roadway names (spelling, abbreviations, leading with state road number followed by local name where applicable)
- Adding from/to descriptions for each segment
- Creating unique 5-digit roadway segment ID (starting with 1 for Seminole, 2 for Orange, 3 for Osceola)
- Adding database field to capture potential for future segment splits

For example, previously “Colonial Drive” appeared in many iterations in the database (e.g. “W Colonial Drive – SR50”, “SR 50 E Colonial Drive”, etc.). For consistency, the naming was standardized to “SR 50 / Colonial Dr” throughout the entire database. **Figure B-2** shows an extract of the updated and standardized roadway database schema.

**Figure B-2 | Base Network Database Schema**

Roadway_Network_MP_All									
Segment ID	Segment ID Split	Length (Mi)	Road Name	From Road	To Road	Road Status	Access Type	State Road	County
10001	<Null>	0.542	US 17/92	Seminole Blvd	Seminole/Volusia CL	Existing Road	Full Access	Yes	Seminole
10002	<Null>	0.896	I-4	Orange Blvd	Seminole/Volusia CL	Existing Road	Limited Access	Yes	Seminole
10003	<Null>	0.314	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	Orange Blvd	Seminole Blvd	Existing Road	Full Access	Yes	Seminole
10004	<Null>	2.58	Seminole Blvd	Mangoustine Ave	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	Existing Road	Full Access	No	Seminole
10005	<Null>	1.05	Orange Blvd	Oregon St	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	Existing Road	Full Access	No	Seminole
10006	<Null>	2.999	I-4	SR 46	Orange Blvd	Existing Road	Limited Access	Yes	Seminole
10007	<Null>	1.152	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	SR 46	Orange Blvd	Existing Road	Full Access	Yes	Seminole

Two (2) of the major inputs into the prioritization process, the xWave database and the latest Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM) model network, had to undergo a comprehensive network conflation. Network conflation is the process of merging transportation data associated with two or more linear networks of different geometry/segmentation with the intent of exchanging roadway segment characteristics between networks.

The process of conflation allowed these various data sources to be combined through spatial analytics. In some cases, the roadway segments were provided a buffer area in which select data was collected, such as the percent of population within ½ mile of the corridor; or in other cases used to identify which roadway segments have been identified as evacuation routes. For example, the xWave network segmentation is much more fine-grained than the segmentation of the MetroPlan Orlando base roadway network. In order to summarize xWave network characteristics at the base network segmentation level, each xWave segment was assigned the corresponding MetroPlan Orlando base network segment ID via a coding process. The same conflation concept was applied to both the base (2015) and future (2045) CFRPM model networks. Figure B-3 shows an extract of the CFRPM network database with the MetroPlan Orlando base network segment ID added during conflation.

**Figure B-3 | CFRPM Network Database Following Network Conflation**

CFRPM_Network_45_MP										
A45_A	A45_B	A45_ROAD_NAME	A45_TWOWAY	A45_DIR	A45_NUM_LANES	A45_POST_SPEED	A45_UA_TYPE	A45_UA_NAME	A45_FUNCLASS	MP_SEG_ID
70411	70062	Osceola Pkwy	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	2	55	1: Urban	7: Kissimmee	14: Urban - Principal Arterial	30049
64300	61951	Schofield Rd	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	40	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	<Null>
61951	61183	Schofield Rd	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	40	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	<Null>
61657	60951	Schofield Rd	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	40	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	<Null>
61183	61657	Schofield Rd	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	40	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	<Null>
90139	90148	SR 436	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	3	40	1: Urban	13: Orlando	14: Urban - Principal Arterial	10310
70143	74538	Osceola Pkwy	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	2	55	1: Urban	7: Kissimmee	14: Urban - Principal Arterial	30035
74538	70083	Osceola Pkwy	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	2	55	1: Urban	7: Kissimmee	14: Urban - Principal Arterial	30035
61119	64355	Laurel Valley Dr	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	35	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	21210
64355	61195	Laurel Valley Dr	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	1	35	1: Urban	13: Orlando	19: Urban - Local	21210
61888	64042	Buena Vista Dr	2: Two-Way Link	EB: Eastbound	3	50	1: Urban	13: Orlando	17: Urban - Major Collector	21505


Other datasets such as RCI and ACS layers were clipped to the MetroPlan Orlando study area in order provide full coverage of the three-county area. After completing the conflation of the various data sets, GIS models were used to deliver automated and adjustable scoring mechanisms which could be changed by users to place additional emphasis on select characteristics. These GIS models programmatically evaluate each performance measure and deliver a score and value which corresponds to occurrence of the measure in relation to other roadway segments and the emphasis that performance measure has been given.

## Building the Prioritization Model

The data-driven project evaluation and scoring was conducted utilizing *ModelBuilder* tools within the Esri ArcGIS Desktop environment. *ModelBuilder* is a visual programming language for building geoprocessing workflows. Geoprocessing models automate and document spatial analysis and data management processes. A model is represented as a diagram that chains together sequences of processes and geoprocessing tools, using the output of one process as the input to another process. An example of this script flow is shown in Figure B-4.




Figure B-4 | ModelBuilder Script Example



A series of models was developed to compute values and scores for the various performance indicators such as environmental justice regions identifying areas of underserved populations, demand scores for actively managed corridors, freight intensive areas, transit system headways, conducting crash data analysis, identifying sidewalk critical needs, and assigning aggregate scores to each base roadway network segment. The model scripts are stored inside a toolbox with the fGDB containing the base roadway network along with all the other input datasets (see Figure B-5).

Figure B-5 | Prioritization Model Script Toolbox



For each performance indicator, a model computes the respective value of each roadway segment and then computes the indicator score ranging from 0 to 1 depending on the thresholds outlined in Tables B-3 through B-7. Both the indicator value and score are appended to the roadway segment attribute table and feed into the aggregate scores for each goal area which are then used to compute the overall comprehensive score (see Figure B-6 for extract of roadway segment attribute table).

Figure B-6 | Base Roadway Network Database with Added Prioritization Results

Segment ID	Seg. Length (Mi)	Road Name	From Road	To Road	TTR	Constraint Corridor	Total Crashes	Total Crash Rate	Score Total Crashes
10001	0.541794	US 17/92	Seminole Blvd	Seminole/Volusia CL	1.29	Yes	128	3.922828	0.5
10002	0.896331	I-4	Orange Blvd	Seminole/Volusia CL	1.199	No	88	0.39556	0
10003	0.313658	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	Orange Blvd	Seminole Blvd	2.182	Yes	79	18.401232	1
10004	2.579966	Seminole Blvd	Mangoustine Ave	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	1.29	No	123	1.789268	0
10005	1.050456	Orange Blvd	Oregon St	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	2.331	Yes	35	3.04282	0.5
10006	2.998545	I-4	SR 46	Orange Blvd	1.199	No	403	0.541493	0
10007	1.152359	US 17/92 / Monroe Rd	SR 46	Orange Blvd	2.182	Yes	184	10.415688	1
10008	1.205946	Oregon St	SR 46	Orange Blvd	4.059	Yes	42	2.544469	0.5
10009	2.09981	Orange Blvd	SR 46	Oregon St	2.331	Yes	56	2.435532	0.5
10010	0.574873	Seminole Blvd	Mangoustine Ave	French Ave	0	No	25	1.632122	0
10011	0.312611	Mangoustine Ave	SR 46	Seminole Blvd	0	No	17	3.973023	0.5
10012	0.281617	French Ave	SR 46	Seminole Blvd	1.15	Yes	61	8.538722	1



## Executing and Updating the Prioritization Model

In order to conduct the prioritization, the model scripts need to be executed in sequence starting with Model 01. By default, each model points to the MetroPlan Orlando base roadway network (Roadway\_Network\_MP\_Final) to serve as the input. This can be changed as needed by pointing to an updated version of the network or a subset of it that could represent a set of projects. Note: For the models to properly execute, the input network or project segment data needs to have the same database schema (i.e. attribute table fields) as the base roadway network. Each model generates values and scores for a specific performance indicator at a roadway/project segment which are being derived from indicator-specific input data. For example, model '01 Priority Scoring – Crashes' computes values and scores for the three crash rate indicators under the safety & security goal area and utilizes the 5-year crash data from Signal Four which is contained in the GDB as 'Crashes\_All\_2017\_21\_MP'. If this data were to be changed or updated, the model would need to be adjusted accordingly by pointing to new crash data layer. The same concept applies to the other models.

Once all models have been executed, the prioritization is complete and values and scores for all performance indicators are created. The results are written in a tabular summary table (MP\_Network\_Prioritization.xls) listing values and scores for all performance indicators as well as aggregate scores by goal area along with the total composite score.

## Prioritization Results

The results of the prioritization process are summarized in a geo-database containing all roadway segments with descriptions and prioritization scores/results by goal area. The results are visualized in an interactive map depicting segment scores by goal area as well as the composite score. Segment-level information and attributes can also be accessed using MetroPlan Orlando's Online Data Viewer: <https://MetroPlanOrlando.gov/maps-tools/dataviewer> (see "Network Evaluation" tab).

# Methodology for Critical Sidewalk Gap Bundles (2023)

The critical sidewalk bundle prioritization methodology was developed by the Vulnerable Users Working Group in cooperation with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Evaluation criteria include Equity Areas, Bicycle / Pedestrian Safety and Crashes, Proximity to Schools, Proximity to Transit Stops by Ridership, and Proximity to Points of Interest. The prioritization methodology is detailed in Table B-7. This method was applied to the individual sidewalk segments using GIS and then compiled (weighted-average based on segment lengths) to create an overall score for each bundle.

**Table B-7 | Criteria and Weighting Methodology for Critical Sidewalk Bundles**

Category	Data Source	Criteria	Score	Weight
Equity Areas	US Census ACS 2020; USDOT	Historically Underserved/Disadvantaged Populations (sum of 7 socio-economic indicators identified in the MPO's Title VI Plan or USDOT defined Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities)		30%
		Sum 5-7 <b>or</b> identified as USDOT's APP/HDC <b>or</b> in an area with > 18% of households are Zero Car Households	100	
		Sum 3-4 <b>or</b> in an area with ≥ 12% of households are Zero Car Households	75	
		Sum 1-2 <b>or</b> in an area with ≥ 6.3% of households are Zero Car Households	50	
Bicycle / Pedestrian Safety and Crashes	Signal Four Analytics	Pedestrian / Bicycle Crashes and Fatalities (2017-21)		25%
		More than 5 crashes <b>or</b> any pedestrian / bicycle fatalities	100	
		3.01–5 crashes	75	
		1.01–3 crashes	50	
		0.01–1 crashes	25	
Schools	Wave	Proximity to Schools		20%
		< 1/4 mile	100	
		1/4 to 1/2 mile	50	
Transit Stops	Wave	Proximity to Transit Stops		15%
		Within ¼ mile of Transit Stop with ≥ 100 Avg Daily Ons/Offs.	100	
		Within ¼ mile of Transit Stop with 67 to 99 Avg Daily Ons/Offs.	75	
		Within ¼ mile of Transit Stop with 34 to 66 Avg Daily Ons/Offs.	50	
		Within ¼ mile of Transit Stop with ≤ 33 Avg Daily Ons/Offs.	25	
Points of Interest	Wave	Proximity to Essential Points of Interest (grocery stores, health care facilities, parks)		10%
		< 1/4 mile	100	
		1/4 to 1/2 mile	50	
<b>Total</b>				<b>100%</b>

**250 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200  
Orlando, FL 32801  
(407) 481-5672  
[www.MetroPlanOrlando.gov](http://www.MetroPlanOrlando.gov)**

