



INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
MPO
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Commissioner Susan Adams
Commissioner Joseph E. Flescher
Commissioner Joe Earman
Commissioner Deryl Loar
Commissioner Laura Moss
Linda Moore – City of Vero Beach
Aaron Vos – City of Vero Beach
Alternate – Taylor Dingle
David Dyer – IRC School Board
Alternate – Jacqueline Rosario

Ben Baker – City of Fellsmere
Alternate – Inocensia Hernandez
Bob Auwaerter – Town of Indian River Shores
Alternate – Brian Foley
Ed Dodd – City of Sebastian
Alternate – Sherrie Matthews

Non-voting Ex-Officio-Member
Daniel McEvoy – Town of Orchid

FDOT District 4 Representative

Bob McPartlan, City of Sebastian - Chairman

AGENDA

The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will meet at 10:00 AM on Wednesday December 10, 2025, in Building B, First Floor Conference Room (B1-501), 1800 27th Street, Vero Beach.

-
- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Pledge of Allegiance
 - 3) Approval of Minutes
October 29, 2025
Action Required
 - 4) Status Report of MPO Advisory Committees
No Action Required

- 5) **Adoption of the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan**
Action Required
Roll Call Vote
- 6) **Consideration of the 2025 Public Participation Plan Update**
Action Required
- 7) **Crash Data Presentation**
No Action Required
- 8) **Extension of the General Planning Consultants Contracts**
Action Required
- 9) **Other Business**
- 10) **Comments from the Public**
- 11) **Adjournment**

Next Meeting: MPO – February 11, 2026 - 10:00 AM.

If you have any questions concerning the items on this agenda, please contact MPO staff at (772) 226-1455. Anyone who may wish to appeal any decision which may be made at this meeting will need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which includes the testimony and evidence on which the appeal is based. Anyone who needs a special accommodation for this meeting must contact the County's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator at 772 226-1223 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

For complaints, questions or concerns about civil rights or nondiscrimination; or for special requests under the American with Disabilities Act, please contact MPO staff at (772) 226-1455 or mpo@indianriver.gov/mpo.

Except for those matters specifically exempted under State Statute and Local Ordinance, the Committee shall provide an opportunity for public comment prior to the undertaking by the Committee of any action on the agenda. Public comment shall also be heard on any proposition which the Committee is to take action which was either not on the agenda or distributed to the public prior to the commencement of the meeting. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact MPO staff at (772) 226-1455 or mpo@indianriver.gov/mpo at least seven days prior to the meeting.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

A meeting of the Indian River County (IRC) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) was held at 10:00 AM on Wednesday, October 29, 2025, in County Administration Building "B", First Floor Conference Room B1-501, 1800 27th Street, Vero Beach.

Note: Audio and video recordings of the meeting can be found at [https://indianriver.gov/government/boards_and_committees/metropolitan_planning_organization_\(mpo\)/index.php](https://indianriver.gov/government/boards_and_committees/metropolitan_planning_organization_(mpo)/index.php)

MPO Members in Attendance:

Chair, Mayor Bob McPartlan, City of Sebastian
Vice Chair, Bob Auwaerter, Vice Mayor, Indian River Shores
Commissioner Susan Adams, District 1
Commissioner Joseph E. Flescher, District 2
Commissioner Joe Earman, District 3
Commissioner Deryl Loar, District 4
Commissioner Laura Moss, District 5
Aaron Vos, Council Member, City of Vero Beach
Ben Baker, Council Member, City of Fellsmere
Ed Dodd, Council Member, City of Sebastian
David Dyer, IRC School Board
Daniel McEvoy, Town of Orchid (non-voting)

Members Absent:

Linda Moore, Vice Mayor, City of Vero Beach (excused)

Staff in Attendance:

Brian Freeman, MPO Staff Director
Mark Vietze, MPO Senior Planner
Patti Johnson, MPO Staff Assistant III/Recording Secretary
Ryan Sweeney, Acting Planning & Development Services Director
Nancy Bunt, Assistant County Administrator
Alex Laffey, County Engineering
Dan Hale, County Public Works

Others Present:

FDOT: James Hughes, Cesar Martinez, Tony Norat, James Brown, Mark Madgar, John Krane, Tom Turberville, Binod Basnet, Kris Kehres, Rana Keel, and Victoria Peters
Kimley-Horn & Associates: William Roll
Senior Resource Association: Karen Deigl & Chris Stephenson
City of Fellsmere: Armando Martinez & Kenny Evans

City of Vero Beach: John Carroll
WGI: Bill Evans
Vero Lake Estates: William McCaslin
Residents: Honey Minuse

Call to Order.

Chair McPartlan called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. It was noted that a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of the MPO Meeting on August 13, 2025.

Action Required

Chair McPartlan asked if there were any additions or corrections to the MPO meeting minutes of August 13, 2025.

There being none, the item was open for motion.

ON MOTION by Mr. Dodd and SECONDED by Commissioner Moss, the members voted (9-0) to approve the minutes of the Metropolitan Planning Organization August 13, 2025, meeting as presented.

Recognition of Senior Resource Association (SRA) Award.

No Action Required

Mr. Freeman recognized the Senior Resource Association, operator of GoLine, which was recognized by the Florida Public Transportation Association (FPTA) as being the System of the Year for 2025.

Ms. Deigl added, this is the third time they have received this award in the past ten years. As far as we can tell, no other transit system has received this award three times. Ms. Deigl further stated, it takes a village to run a good system, and the relationship with the MPO, the planning part of it, working with them is an outstanding relationship, as well as the support received from the MPO is appreciated. Our goal is to continue to be the best we can be, thank you.

Status Report of MPO Advisory Committees.

No Action Required

Commissioner Flescher entered @ 10:04am

Mr. Freeman reviewed his memorandum, dated October 21, 2025, included in the

agenda packet and on file in the MPO Office.

Review of FDOT's Draft Tentative Five-Year Work Program for FY 2027-2031.
Action Required

Mr. Baker entered @ 10:11am

Mr. Freeman introduced Mr. John Krane, District 4 Director of Transportation. Mr. Freeman also noted the large number of FDOT staff in attendance for this presentation.

Mr. Krane remarked that District Secretary Steve Braun sends his regrets that he could not attend this meeting; these types of meetings are his favorite. Mr. Krane introduced all the FDOT staff in attendance. A power point presentation was shown, and a copy of this presentation is on file in the MPO office.

During the presentation, Mr. Krane covered project highlights which include SR 60 resurfacing and US 1 resurfacing from Davis Street to south of the Sebastian Inlet Bridge, which have been completed. Projects under construction are 17th Street Bridge (the east end), as well as the Oslo Road Interchange and Widening. Mr. Krane also summarized the MPO's priority projects as follows: 45th Street, from 58th Avenue to 43rd Avenue, CR 510 from 87th Street to 58th Avenue, and CR 510 from 58th Avenue to US 1, 82nd Avenue from 26th Street to 69th Street and from 69th Street to CR 510, US 1 Intersection at Aviation Blvd., Aviation Blvd. from 43rd Avenue to US 1, and US 1 from 53rd Street to CR 510. The other funded projects include CR 512 from Willow Street to I-95 which is funded through the Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) and 41st Street sidewalk from 32nd Avenue to US #1 which is funded through the Transportation Alternative (TA) Program.

Ms. Victoria Peters, also from District 4 FDOT, provided an overview on the cycle that is involved in the work program

Vice Chair Auwaerter asked about the estimated date of completion for the new A1A bridge in St. Lucie County, which some Indian River County residents use occasionally. This bridge is scheduled for completion early next year, January/February 2026. There will still be a lot of work in the area as the old bridge will need to be demolished.

There being no further comments, Chair McPartlan opened the floor for motion.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Flescher and SECONDED by Vice Chair Auwaerter, the members voted (11-0) to approve FDOT's Draft Tentative Five-Year Work Program, as presented.

Consideration of the Draft 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Action Required

Mr. Freeman provided a brief overview on the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Mr. Freeman introduced Mr. William Roll, from Kimley-Horn and Associates. Mr. Roll conducted a power point presentation and was there to answer any questions. A copy of this presentation is on file in the MPO office.

Mr. Roll reminded the Board the deadline to approve this plan is December 2025. Failure to adopt the plan by the deadline risks the denial of federal funding for transportation projects. Mr. Freeman stated this item will be on display for public comment for a period of 30 days. Then Mr. Freeman expounded on the projects included in this plan.

There being no further comments, Chair McPartlan opened the floor for motion.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Adams and SECONDED by Vice Chair Auwaerter, the members voted (11-0) to approve the draft Long Range Transportation Plan and open the 30 day public comment period.

Consideration of a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment.

Action Required

Mr. Freeman commented this Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment is due to more funding being programmed for 82nd Avenue's right-of-way acquisition.

Chair McPartlan opened the floor for any additional comments from the Board.

There being none, the item was open for a motion.

Mr. Freeman stated this item requires a roll call of the vote.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Flescher and SECONDED by Commissioner Adams, the members voted (11-0) to approve the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment, as presented. (Commissioners Adams, Flescher, Earman, Loar, and Moss, Mr. McPartlan, Mr. Auwaerter, Mr. Voss, Mr. Baker, Mr. Dodd and Mr. Dyer all voted aye. Ms. Moore was absent from the vote.)

Review of the Annual MPO Certification.

Action Required

Mr. Freeman explained the certification process and reviewed the findings from

FDOT of the MPO Annual Certification. As it has in the past, FDOT identified several noteworthy practices undertaken by the MPO and found no deficiencies in this evaluation. Some the of the highlights include: long range planning efforts and visioning, excellence in public transportation (1.36 million riders, the 13th consecutive year of 1 million + riders, even during COVID), the most efficient public transportation system in Florida (number one ranking in cost per passenger trip), implemented transit service enhancements recommended by the TDP, bike/ped safety programming reaching out to the PE classes in elementary schools (issuing helmets to all participants), and cooperation in regional planning activities, also the completion of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan update.

There being no further comments, the item was open for motion.

ON MOTION by Commissioner Adams and SECONDED by Mr. Baker, the members voted (11-0) to approve the Annual Certification Statement, as presented.

Other Business.

Mr. Freeman presented the 2026 MPO and MPO Advisory Committees meeting schedule, noting meeting invites will be sent out for all meetings.

Comments from the Public.

There were none.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:58 AM.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

MEMORANDUM

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

THROUGH: Ryan Sweeney
Acting Planning and Development Services Director

FROM: Brian Freeman, AICP
MPO Staff Director

DATE: December 2, 2025

SUBJECT: Status Report of MPO Advisory Committees

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of December 10, 2025.

Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB)

At its November 20th meeting, the TDLCB considered the Progress Report/Reimbursement Invoice #1 for FY 2025/26, the Annual Operating Report for FY 2024/25, and the Bylaws and Grievance Procedures for FY 2025/26. The TDLCB approved all items.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

At its December 2nd meeting, the CAC considered the Final 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the 2025 update to the Public Participation Plan. The CAC recommended approval of both items. The CAC also considered a presentation on crash data.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The TAC is scheduled to meet on December 5, 2025. At the December 10th MPO meeting, MPO staff will provide an update on the TAC meeting.

Upcoming Meetings

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

TAC Meeting: January 23, 2026 – 10:00am

BPAC Meeting: January 27, 2026 – 2:00 pm

CAC Meeting: February 3, 2026 – 2:00 pm

MPO Meeting: February 11, 2026 – 10:00 am

TDLCB Meeting: February 26, 2026 – 10:00 am

MEMORANDUM

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

THROUGH: Ryan Sweeney
Acting Planning & Development Services Director

FROM: Brian Freeman, AICP
MPO Staff Director

DATE: December 2, 2025

SUBJECT: **Consideration of the Final 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan**

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of December 10, 2025.

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

Among the most important tasks undertaken by any MPO is the development and adoption of a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). One reason why the LRTP is important is that a roadway widening or other major transportation project must first be identified in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan before it can receive state and federal gas tax funding. In order to reflect changing conditions, new Long Range Transportation Plan updates must be adopted every five years and typically cover a 25-year planning horizon.

To comply with federal and state requirements, the Indian River County MPO must adopt its 2050 LRTP Update by December of 2025. That plan has been under preparation for over a year by Kimley-Horn and Associates, one of the MPO's general planning consultants, and has included significant public outreach activities.

At its October 29th meeting, the MPO approved the draft 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and opened the official 30-day public comment period.

ANALYSIS

Earlier this year, a Needs Assessment was prepared that identifies all projects needed to address future congestion deficiencies on the County's roadway network. After projecting the cost of those projects as well as future transportation revenues, staff and consultants determined that not all of the Needs Plan projects would be affordable in Indian River County by 2050.

Because the LRTP must be cost affordable, the Needs Plan projects were subsequently refined into a set of affordable transportation improvements through the year 2050 (see pages 4-8 through 4-14). This set of cost-feasible projects includes the following projects, several of which are long-standing MPO priorities:

- CR 510: widen to four lanes from CR 512 to US 1.
- US 1: widen to six lanes from 53rd Street to CR 510.
- 53rd Street: new two-lane road from 66th Avenue to 58th Avenue.
- Aviation Blvd. Extension: new two-lane from US 1 to 35th Lane (west side of Cleveland Clinic).
- 82nd Avenue: new two-lane road from 26th Street to Concha Drive.
- Aviation Blvd.: widen to four lanes from 43rd Avenue to US 1.
- CR 512: widen to four lanes from Willow Street to I-95.
- 26th Street: widen to four lanes from 66th Avenue to 43rd Avenue.
- 45th Street: multimodal improvements from 58th Avenue to 43rd Avenue.
- Indian River Blvd.: strategic improvements from US 1 to 37th Street.
- 43rd Avenue: widen to four lanes from St. Lucie County line to 18th Street (partially funded).
- CR 512: widen to six lanes from I-95 to CR 510 (partially funded).

That set of projects has been organized into an implementation schedule based on projected financial resources.

As structured, the 2050 LRTP accommodates travel demand projected through the year 2050. The plan is multi-modal, incorporating highway, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Accordingly, the plan will be the basis for developing the MPO's future priority projects lists and transportation improvement programs. It will also serve as a guide for programming federal, state, and local transportation funds through 2050.

At its December 2nd meeting, the CAC voted to recommend approval of the 2050 LRTP. The TAC is scheduled to consider the 2050 LRTP at its December 5th meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the MPO adopt the resolution and approve the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (*a roll call vote is required*).

ATTACHMENT

1. Adoption Resolution
2. Indian River County MPO 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

MPO RESOLUTION NO. 2025-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION ADOPTING THE 2050 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS THE OFFICIAL LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN OF INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

WHEREAS, the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the responsible entity for conducting a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning program for Indian River County, Florida;

WHEREAS, under Federal and State regulations, the Indian River County MPO has, as one of its primary duties, the responsibility for developing and adopting a 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan conforming to the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA);

WHEREAS, the MPO has conducted an extensive public involvement program throughout the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan development process, including advertised workshops and hearings, has provided significant comment period prior to taking final action on the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan in accordance with the adopted Public Involvement Plan, and has held the required, duly noticed public hearing on December 10, 2025;

WHEREAS, the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan identifies project costs and reasonably available revenues to fund projects and programs to assure that the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan is cost affordable. and

WHEREAS, the MPO has coordinated the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan development with all involved state, regional, and local agencies, including consideration of locally adopted comprehensive plans and the Florida Transportation Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Indian River County MPO, in regular session duly assembled on the 10th day of December 2025, and having fulfilled all Federal and State requirements, certifies that the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan is the adopted transportation plan for Indian River County and, as such, shall be the basis for future plans, programs, and policies of the Indian River County MPO.

ADOPTED this 10th day of December 2025.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Bob McPartlan, Chair

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
LEGAL SUFFICIENCY:

Susan J. Prado
Deputy County Attorney



INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
mpo
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Indian River County MPO 2050 LRTP

Adoption Report

Draft: December 10, 2025



[Resolution Text Here]

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Purpose of the LRTP	1-1
1.2	Legislation and Guidance.....	1-1
2.0	Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Performance	2-1
2.1	Goals.....	2-2
	Goal 1 – Efficiency	2-2
	Goal 2 – Mobility.....	2-3
	Goal 3 – Environmental Protection	2-4
	Goal 4 – Safety	2-4
	Goal 5 – System Preservation	2-5
	Goal 6 – Implementation	2-6
2.2	Development of the Goals Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	2-6
	Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)	2-6
	IIJA (Federal) Goals	2-7
	IIJA (Federal) Planning Factors	2-7
	Florida Transportation Plan (FTP).....	2-9
	Local Plans	2-11
2.3	Indian River County MPO System Performance Report	2-11
	Safety Performance Targets (PM1).....	2-12
	Bridge and Pavement Condition Performance Targets (System Preservation) (PM2).....	2-12
	Highway System Performance (PM3)	2-13
	Transit Asset Management Performance Measures	2-14
	Transit Safety Performance Measures.....	2-16
3.0	Planning Assumptions	3-1
3.1	Population and Employment Growth.....	3-1
3.2	Integrating Housing Patterns into the LRTP	3-4
3.3	LRTP Consistency with Future Land Use Elements, Goals, and Objectives of Local Comprehensive Plans.....	3-4
4.0	Transportation Needs	4-1

4.1	Projected Revenues.....	4-1
4.2	Phasing and Prioritization	4-4
4.3	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).....	4-5
4.4	Cost Feasible Plan.....	4-8
4.5	Public Transportation	4-15
	Indian River county Transit Devevelopment Plan 2025 Annual Update.....	4-15
4.6	Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	4-16
4.7	Intercity Travel.....	4-17
	Greyhound	4-17
	Brightline	4-17
4.8	Travel and Tourism	4-17
4.9	Congestion Management	4-18
4.10	Regional Coordination	4-18
4.11	Transportation Operations and Management Strategies (TSM&O)	4-19
4.12	Transportation Safety	4-20
4.13	Environmental Mitigation	4-20
5.0	Public Involvement.....	5-1
5.1	Public Involvement Activities	5-1
5.2	Agency Outreach and Coordination	5-2
6.0	Performance Evaluation.....	6-1
6.1	FHWA Goal Performance	6-1
6.2	IRC 2050 Goal Performance	6-2
6.3	Travel Demand	6-7
7.0	Implementation.....	7-1
7.1	Plan Amendment Process.....	7-1
7.2	The Next Five Years	7-2

TABLES

Table 2-1. IJJA Goals and Planning Factors and 2050 LRTP Goals	2-8
Table 2-2. 2050 LRTP Goals and FTP Goals Comparison	2-10
Table 2-3. Statewide and MPO PM1 Targets and Performance	2-12
Table 2-4. Statewide and MPO PM2 Targets and Performance	2-13
Table 2-5. Indian River County MPO and Statewide PM3 Targets	2-14
Table 2-6. Performance Measures for Transit Vehicles and Equipment.....	2-14
Table 2-7. Performance Measures for Transit Facilities.....	2-15
Table 2-8. Transit Safety Performance Targets.....	2-16
Table 3-1. Population and Employment Forecast Summary.....	3-1
Table 4-1. Projected Revenues in Present-Day Value (PDV, 2025 Dollars)	4-2
Table 4-2. Projected Revenues in Year of Expenditure (YOE) Cost.....	4-3
Table 4-3. Prioritization Criteria	4-4
Table 4-4. Roadway Capacity Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-5
Table 4-5. Operations & Maintenance and Safety Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-5
Table 4-6. Transit and Transit Development Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-6
Table 4-7. Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trail Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-6
Table 4-8. Aviation Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-6
Table 4-9. Planning Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030.....	4-7
Table 4-10. Capital Improvement Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030	4-7
Table 4-11. 2050 Fully Funded Roadway Capacity Needs Projects	4-9
Table 4-12. Partially Funded and Unfunded Roadway Capacity Needs Projects	4-10
Table 4-13. Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint (Present-Day Value (PDV)).....	4-14
Table 4-14. Potential Environmental Mitigation Opportunities.....	4-21
Table 5-1. Public Engagement Activities Hosted by Indian River County MPO	5-1
Table 6-1. Performance Measure 1 (PM1) – Safety	6-1
Table 6-2. Performance Measure 2 (PM2) – Pavement and Bridge	6-2
Table 6-3. Performance Measure 3 (PM3) – System Performance and Freight.....	6-2
Table 6-4. Goal 1 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators.....	6-3

Table 6-5. Goal 2 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	6-4
Table 6-6. Goal 3 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	6-5
Table 6-7. Goal 4 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	6-5
Table 6-8. Goal 5 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	6-6
Table 6-9. Goal 6 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators	6-6

FIGURES

Figure 3-1. Population Growth Results Map	3-2
Figure 3-2. Employment Growth Results Map.....	3-3
Figure 4-1. Phasing Tiers Graphic.....	4-4
Figure 4-2. 2030 Existing + Committed Roadway Network.....	4-11
Figure 4-3. 2050 Cost Feasible Projects.....	4-12
Figure 4-4. Partially and Unfunded 2050 Unfunded Roadway Needs.....	4-13
Figure 6-1. Annual Average Daily Traffic (2050 Network).....	6-8
Figure 6-2. Volume to Capacity (2050 Network)	6-9

APPENDICES

Appendix A: 2050 LRTP Checklist

Appendix B: FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Transportation Improvement Program Overview

Appendix C: Cost Feasible Projects in Present-Day Value (PDV)

Appendix D: Cost Feasible Projects in Year of Expenditure (YOE) Costs

Appendix E: Stakeholder Outreach Responses

Appendix F: System Performance Report

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION



1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Indian River County 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is a comprehensive, multimodal blueprint designed to guide the development and enhancement of the county's transportation network over the next 25 years. Developed through close coordination with local municipalities, regional agencies, and state partners, and shaped by meaningful public and stakeholder input, the plan reflects a shared vision for a safe, efficient, and accessible transportation system. It is fiscally constrained to ensure financial feasibility and compliance with applicable state and federal requirements. The LRTP delivers countywide benefits while striving to avoid disproportionate adverse impacts to any community and supports a balanced approach to mobility that includes roadway improvements, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and freight infrastructure.

The plan considers the adopted Comprehensive Plan for Indian River County and its municipalities and adheres to federal standards for metropolitan transportation planning. **Appendix A** provides a checklist demonstrating how and where long range transportation planning requirements identified in State Statutes and Federal Regulations have been addressed.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE LRTP

The purpose of the LRTP is to establish a federally required framework for addressing both short- and long-term multimodal transportation needs within the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) planning area. The LRTP identifies a fiscally constrained set of projects that align with projected revenues, ensuring that planned improvements are financially feasible and sustainable. These projects are designed to meet the evolving demands of the county's transportation network, enhance mobility across all modes of travel, expand travel choices, and improve safety for all users. Through strategic planning and investment, the LRTP supports a resilient and efficient transportation system that meets future needs while complying with federal and state planning requirements.

1.2 LEGISLATION AND GUIDANCE

The development of the Indian River County 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is guided by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), which reauthorizes and builds upon the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST) Act of 2015 and the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act of 2012. While the previous LRTP (Connecting IRC 2045) was shaped by the priorities and requirements of the FAST Act, the 2050 LRTP reflects the expanded vision and updated policy direction introduced under the IIJA. The legislation emphasizes resilience, equity, sustainability, and innovation, introducing new priorities to address contemporary transportation challenges such as climate change, emerging technologies, and infrastructure modernization. The LRTP aligns with these federal mandates to ensure consistency, eligibility for funding, and responsiveness to evolving national and regional transportation goals.

CHAPTER 2

VISION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND PERFORMANCE



2.0 GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND PERFORMANCE

This chapter outlines the strategy for maintaining, enhancing, and expanding the transportation network and systems of Indian River County. In compliance with federal and state regulations, the Indian River County MPO has established a set of goals, objectives, and performance measures to provide a basis for performance-based planning that will best serve the community and environment now and in the future.

The Indian River County MPO's goals, objectives, and performance measures align with the current federal transportation planning requirements, including those set forth in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and the Florida Transportation Plan.

The MPO's approach incorporates the latest Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) guidance on transportation planning, including:

- A focus on data-driven decision-making and performance-based planning
- Consideration of emerging technologies and their impact on transportation systems
- Emphasis on safety, particularly for vulnerable road users
- Integration of multimodal transportation options
- Addressing environmental sustainability
- Promoting accessibility in transportation planning

By adhering to these updated guidelines, the Indian River County MPO's LRTP will remain current and responsive to both federal and state priorities while addressing local needs.



2.1 GOALS

The MPO is committed to developing a comprehensive and effective transportation strategy guided by a structured framework of goal elements. These goals serve as the foundation for planning and decision-making, each supported by measurable objectives that promote accountability and enable progress tracking. To evaluate success, each objective is further reinforced by specific performance measures and indicators, providing quantifiable metrics that help assess outcomes over time.

In addition to objectives and performance measures, each goal is also supported by corresponding policies that help translate strategic intent into actionable guidance. This integrated approach fosters transparency, encourages continuous improvement, and ensures that transportation initiatives align with the broader vision for a safer, more efficient, and sustainable transportation system serving all communities in Indian River County.

GOAL 1 – EFFICIENCY

Goal 1 is defined as providing an efficient transportation system that is connected, responsive, aesthetically pleasing, and meets the needs of all users. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and performance indicators are listed below.

- Objective 1.01 – Maintain the adopted level of service standard for all functionally classified roads through the year 2050
 - Policy 1.01.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan, consistent with the Interim Year Roadway Improvement Sets
 - Performance Indicator 1.01.1.1 – Percent of lane miles meeting the adopted level of service standard
- Objective 1.02 – Maintain a 12-hour hurricane evacuation clearance time on roads designated as hurricane evacuation routes through the year 2050
 - Policy 1.02.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan for roadways designated as hurricane evacuation routes
 - Performance Indicator 1.02.1.1 – Hurricane evacuation clearance time measured through actual event
 - Performance Indicator 1.02.1.2 – Lane miles of roadway improvements on hurricane evacuation routes
- Objective 1.03 – Enhance the grid roadway network by constructing an average of two centerline miles of new roadway corridors each year from 2025 to 2050
 - Policy 1.03.1 – Implement new corridor roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan
 - Performance Indicator 1.03.1.1 – Average annual centerline miles of new roadway corridors constructed during the period from 2025 to 2050
- Objective 1.04 – Enhance the FDOT’s Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) by constructing one FEC railway flyover by 2050
 - Policy 1.04.1 – Implement improvements to the SIS at the FEC Railroad by 2050
 - Performance Indicator 1.04.1 – New flyover at the FEC Railroad

- Objective 1.05 – Optimize functionality and efficiency of existing infrastructure and ROW through 2050
 - Policy 1.05.1 – Incorporate Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and/or Connected Vehicle architecture into all new roadway projects
 - Performance Indicator 1.05.1.1 – Number of new roadways that incorporate ITS and Connected Vehicle architecture
- Objective 1.06 – Ensure that 50% of Person-Miles (Non-Interstate) and 75% of Person-Miles (Interstate) on the National Highway System are Reliable
 - Policy 1.06.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan, consistent with the Interim Roadway Improvement Sets
 - Performance Measure 1.06.1.1 – Percent of Person Trips that are Reliable (50% of Person-Miles (Non-Interstate) and 75% of Person-Miles (Interstate))

GOAL 2 – MOBILITY

Goal 2 is defined as enhancing mobility for people and freight and provide travel alternatives. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and indicators are listed below.

- Objective 2.01 – Maintain Transit Quality and LOS “A” for reliability
 - Policy 2.01.1 – Make Capital and Operational improvements consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.01.1.1 – Percentage of buses arriving within 5 minutes of schedule
- Objective 2.02 – Maintain Transit Quality and LOS “B” for Service Coverage
 - Policy 2.02.1 – Improve service coverage consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.02.1.1 – System compliance with adopted level of service standard
- Objective 2.03 – Expand weekday hours of service to 15 hours a day on at least one bus route every two years during the period from 2025 to 2050 so that all weekday bus routes operate at least 15 hours per day by 2050
 - Policy 2.03.1 – Expand weekday hours of operation on fixed-route bus network consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.03.1.1 – Average number of weekday bus routes with 15 hours of service added during the period from 2025 to 2050
- Objective 2.04 – Maintain Bike/Ped LOS “D” on 80% percent of roadways in Indian River County through 2050
 - Policy 2.04.1 – Implement sidewalk improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
 - Policy 2.04.2 – Implement bicycle facility improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/ Pedestrian Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.04.1.1 – Percentage of roadways meeting adopted level of service standard
- Objective 2.05 – Add an average of two miles of bicycle facilities on functionally classified roadways or trails each year during the period from 2025 to 2050
 - Policy 2.05.1 – Implement bicycle facility improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/ Pedestrian Plan

- Policy 2.05.2 – Adapt abandoned railroad corridors, roadway alignments and military trails for bicycle facilities, wherever possible
 - Performance Indicator 2.05.1.1 – Average annual number of new bicycle facilities added during the period from 2025 to 2050
- Objective 2.06 – Enhance freight mobility by ensuring that the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index on the Interstate Highways is less than 2.00
 - Policy 2.06.1 – Implement the freight mobility improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.06.1.1 – TTTR on the Interstate Highway System (Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index on the Interstate Highways is less than 2.00)
- Objective 2.07 – Increase the efficiency and convenience of connecting multiple modes by adding an average of one shelter or transfer facility per year through 2050
 - Policy 2.07.1 – Add bus shelters and improve hubs consistent with the Transit Development Plan
 - Performance Indicator 2.07.1.1 – Number of new shelters/improved transit hubs

GOAL 3 – ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Goal 3 is defined as protecting the natural and social environment. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and indicators are listed below.

- Objective 3.01 – Limit average increase in CO, HC, and NO emissions to less than 15 percent from the previous five-year period for each five-year period from 2025 to 2050
 - Policy 3.01.1 – Implement the transportation improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan
 - Performance Indicator 3.01.1.1 – Percent change in CO, HC, and NO emissions (in kilograms) for each five-year period from the base year for the period from 2025 to 2050
- Objective 3.02 – Ensure that all collector roadways are less than six lanes through the year 2050
 - Policy 3.02.1 – Implement the transportation improvements in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan
 - Performance Indicator 3.02.1.1 – Centerline miles of collector roadways with six or more lanes
- Objective 3.03 – Increase resiliency of transportation infrastructure
 - Policy 3.03.1 – Incorporate higher elevations, increased drainage capacity, and more resilient construction materials as appropriate into new projects
 - Performance Indicator 3.03.1.1 – Percentage of new projects incorporating enhanced features

GOAL 4 – SAFETY

Goal 4 is defined as maintaining a safe transportation system for all users. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and indicators are listed below

- Objective 4.01 – By 2050, reduce the number and rate of crash Fatalities to 0
 - Policy 4.01.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan including Congestion Management Process plan
 - Performance Indicator 4.01.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of Fatalities
- Objective 4.02 – Reduce the number and rate of Serious Injuries to 0 by 2050
 - Policy 4.02.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan including Congestion Management Process plan
 - Performance Measure 4.02.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of Serious Injuries
- Objective 4.03 – Reduce the number and rate of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries to 0 by 2050
 - Policy 4.03.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan and Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
 - Performance Measure 4.03.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of non-motorized crashes

GOAL 5 – SYSTEM PRESERVATION

Goal 5 is defined as preserving and maintaining the transportation system and transportation infrastructure. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and indicators are listed below.

- Objective 5.01 – Ensure that over 60% of the pavement area on the National Highway System (NHS) are rated “Good” by FDOT while less than 5 % are rated “Poor” by FDOT
 - Policy 5.01.1 – Evaluate the structural integrity of pavement on the major road network and implement rehabilitation projects as appropriate in coordination with FDOT
 - Performance Measure 5.01.1.1 – FDOT Pavement Condition Rating
- Objective 5.02 – Ensure that over 50% of the bridge deck area on the National Highway System (NHS) are rated “Good” by FDOT while less than 10% are rated “Poor” by FDOT
 - Policy 5.02.01 – Evaluate the structural integrity of bridges on the major road network and implement rehabilitation projects as appropriate in coordination with FDOT
 - Performance Measure 5.02.1.1 – FDOT Bridge Condition Rating
- Objective 5.03 – Provide adequate funding to maintain and operate the non-state highway system and multimodal infrastructure
 - Policy 5.03.1 – Program on an annual basis appropriate funding for maintenance and operations
 - Performance Indicator 5.03.1.1 – Funding included for maintenance and operations

GOAL 6 – IMPLEMENTATION

Goal 6 is defined as ensure effective execution of improvements and maintenance. The supporting objectives, policies, and performance measures and indicators are listed below.

- Objective 6.01 – Identify projects that can be funded for implementation within a 5-10 year time band
 - Policy 6.01.1 – Prioritize and define a clear set of actionable projects that are eligible for funding within the 5-10 year timeframe, based on feasibility, impact, and alignment with long-term goals
 - Performance Measure 6.02.1.1 – Number of projects identified for funding by the Plan interim year of 2040
- Objective 6.02 – The plan will identify planning studies to prepare future projects for funding and implementation
 - Policy 6.02.1 – Allocate resources for the identification and development of planning studies aimed at preparing future transportation projects for funding, ensuring that they meet regulatory and community needs
 - PI 6.03.1.1 – Number of studies identified for funding

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE GOALS OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES & INDICATORS

Early in the planning process, the MPO developed goals, objectives, and performance measures and indicators to align closely with its long-term vision. These elements were crafted through a collaborative approach involving stakeholders, public input, and technical analysis to ensure they reflected community values and priorities. By establishing clear objectives and measurable outcomes from the outset, the MPO ensured that each step of the planning process could be evaluated for consistency with its overarching vision and strategic direction.

The MPO Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures and Indicators were developed based on federal, state, and local guidance. The requirements and guidance used to develop the Goals, Objectives, and Performance for the 2050 LRTP are described below.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT AND JOBS ACT (IIJA)

Signed into law on November 15, 2021, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) provides long-term funding for infrastructure planning and investment in surface transportation. The IIJA builds upon and expands programs included in the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act.

The IIJA continues to support a streamlined, performance-based surface transportation program that builds on many of the multimodal transportation policies first established under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

Additionally, establishing a performance- and outcome-based program requires investment of financial resources in projects that will collectively make progress toward achieving national multimodal transportation goals. The 2050 LRTP has been developed to ensure compliance with the requirements of the IIJA and includes performance-based approach to the transportation decision-making process.

IIJA (FEDERAL) GOALS

The IIJA maintains and expands upon the national goals established in previous legislation. These goals are as follows:

- **Safety** – To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- **Infrastructure Condition** – To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- **Congestion Reduction** – To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
- **System Reliability** – To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** – To improve the National Highway Freight Network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- **Environmental Sustainability** – To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment, with a new emphasis on reducing transportation-related carbon emissions
- **Reduced Project Delivery Delays** – To reduce costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies work practices.



IIJA (FEDERAL) PLANNING FACTORS

The federal legislation has established planning factors that address the relationship between transportation, land use, and economic development. The federal planning factors are applied to the 2050 LRTP and include the following:

- Support the economic **vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency
- Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Increase the **security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Increase the **accessibility and mobility** of people and freight
- Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns
- Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight
- Promote **efficient system management** and operation
- Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system

- Improve the **resiliency and reliability** of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation
- Enhance **travel and tourism**

The IIJA prescribes policy requirements and programmatic framework related to performance measures and targets for the national transportation system in the metropolitan planning process. These directly impact the Indian River County MPO and the planning activities of the agency. As such, the MPO is required to coordinate with state and public transportation providers to establish targets to continue to develop and assess a focused, performance-based multimodal transportation system. In the development and assessment, Indian River County MPO must:

- Describe the performance measures and targets used in assessing system performance and progress in achieving the performance targets within the L RTP
- Develop the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) to make progress toward established performance targets and include a description of the anticipated achievements
- Incorporate strategies to improve transportation facility resilience
- Ensure that planning processes promote economic opportunity

A matrix showing consistency between the L RTP Goals and the planning factors from the IIJA is shown in **Table 2-1**.

Table 2-1. IIJA Goals and Planning Factors and 2050 L RTP Goals

IIJA Planning Factors	2050 L RTP Goals					
	Providing an efficient transportation system that is connected, responsive, aesthetically pleasing, and meets the needs of all users	Enhancing mobility for people and freight and provide travel alternatives	Protecting the natural social environment	Maintaining a safe transportation system for all users	Preserving and maintaining the transportation system and transportation infrastructure	Ensure effective execution of improvements and maintenance
Economic Vitality	•	•			•	•
Safety	•	•	•	•	•	
Security	•	•	•	•	•	
Movement of People & Freight	•	•		•	•	•
Environment & Quality of Life	•	•	•	•	•	
Integration / Connectivity	•	•		•	•	•

IIJA Planning Factors	2050 LRTP Goals					
	Providing an efficient transportation system that is connected, responsive, aesthetically pleasing, and meets the needs of all users	Enhancing mobility for people and freight and provide travel alternatives	Protecting the natural social environment	Maintaining a safe transportation system for all users	Preserving and maintaining the transportation system and transportation infrastructure	Ensure effective execution of improvements and maintenance
System Management & Operation	•	•		•		•
System Preservation		•			•	•
Resiliency	•	•	•	•	•	
Tourism	•	•		•		•

FLORIDA TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FTP)

The Florida Transportation Plan (FTP) is the single overarching statewide plan guiding Florida’s transportation future. FDOT has begun the process of updating the FTP, with the new plan targeted for 2055. This update will continue to provide direction to FDOT, and all organizations involved in planning and managing Florida’s transportation system, including statewide, regional, and local partners such as the Indian River County MPO.

The 2055 FTP will contain statewide goals and regional objectives, empowering communities to develop unique local strategies that align with the FTP. This approach aims to connect communities, policies, and programs across the state.

While the specific goals for the 2055 FTP are still in development, Five Focus Groups have been determined around the major topic areas of Safety, Resilient Infrastructure, Economic Development/Supply Chain, Technology, and Workforce Development. The FTP is expected to be adopted in November 2025.



The existing 2045 FTP follows similar topic areas, requiring MPOs to address the following goals:

- Safety and security for residents, visitors, and businesses
- Agile, resilient, and quality infrastructure

- Connected, efficient, and reliable mobility for people and freight
- Transportation choices that improve equity and accessibility
- Transportation solutions that strengthen Florida's economy
- Transportation solutions that enhance Florida's communities
- Transportation solutions that enhance Florida's environment

The 2055 FTP update process involves extensive public and stakeholder engagement, including regional workshops, focus groups, and online participation opportunities. This collaborative approach ensures that the plan will reflect community visions and goals across Florida.

As the 2055 FTP is still in development, MPOs should stay informed about updates and be prepared to align their plans with the new FTP once it is finalized. The updated FTP is expected to provide a comprehensive blueprint for Florida's transportation future over the next 30 years.

A matrix showing consistency between the LRTP Goals and the FTP Goals is shown in **Table 2-2**.

Table 2-2. 2050 LRTP Goals and FTP Goals Comparison

FTP 2045 Goals	2050 LRTP Goals					
	Providing an efficient transportation system that is connected, responsive, aesthetically pleasing, and meets the needs of all users	Enhancing mobility for people and freight and provide travel alternatives	Protecting the natural social environment	Maintaining a safe transportation system for all users	Preserving and maintaining the transportation system and transportation infrastructure	Ensure effective execution of improvements and maintenance
Safety and Security	•	•	•	•	•	
Resilience	•	•	•	•	•	
Efficiency	•	•				•
Transportation Choices	•	•		•	•	•
Economic Competitiveness	•	•			•	•
Quality Places	•	•	•		•	•
Environment	•	•	•	•	•	

LOCAL PLANS

Local agencies involved in planning and managing Florida's transportation system follow guidelines set forth by the FTP. Local agencies establish goals and objectives as part of the long-range transportation planning process, representing the desired vision of how the statewide transportation should evolve over the next 20 years with actionable guidelines on how to achieve them within each community.

Performance measures and targets are established to provide measurable guidelines focusing the plans on outcomes rather than just activities and policies. The following is a list of the documents developed by partner agencies with which this document will be consistent. This list may not be inclusive of all documents referenced throughout the development of this LRTP.

- FDOT Strategic Highway Safety Plan
- The Florida Transportation Plan
- Comprehensive Plans for Indian River County and municipalities located within the county
- Indian River County Transit Development (TDP)
- Indian River County MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP)
- Indian River County MPO Congestion Management Process (CMP)
- Indian River County MPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)



2.3 INDIAN RIVER COUNTY MPO SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT

Pursuant to federal guidance, FDOT and MPOs must apply a transportation performance management approach in carrying out their federally required transportation planning and programming activities. The process requires the establishment and use of a coordinated, performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals for the federal-aid highway and public transportation programs.

FDOT is required to establish statewide targets for the required performance measures. MPOs are required to either support the statewide targets or adopt their own. Based on this information, the Indian River MPO has adopted the transportation performance measure targets included in this section. In addition, local transit agencies must also adopt performance targets in their Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM). MPOs must consider including the TAM targets in their LRTP and TIP updates.

On August 31, 2024, FDOT established statewide performance targets for the safety measures for calendar year 2025. On February 12, 2025, the Indian River County MPO again agreed to support FDOT's statewide safety performance targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the statewide targets.

SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS (PM1)

Effective April 14, 2016, the FHWA established five highway safety performance measures to carry out the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These performance measures are:

- Number of Fatalities
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT

On August 31, 2024, FDOT established statewide safety performance targets for calendar year 2025. On February 12, 2025, the Indian River County MPO agreed to support FDOT's statewide performance targets. The MPO supports FDOT's Safety Performance Targets of a Vision Zero Policy.

The Indian River County MPO and statewide PM1 targets are listed in **Table 2-3**.

Table 2-3. Statewide and MPO PM1 Targets and Performance

Performance Measure	Florida Statewide Baseline Performance (Five-Year Rolling Average, 2020-2024)	FDOT Statewide Targets (Calendar Year 2025)	Indian River County Conditions (Five-Year Rolling Average, 2020-2024)	Indian River County MPO Safety Targets (Calendar Year 2025)
Number of Fatalities	3,423.2	0	21.4	0
Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT	1.510	0	1.220	0
Number of Serious Injuries	15,564.2	0	100.8	0
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT	6.868	0	5.727	0
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	3,145.2	0	18.0	0

BRIDGE AND PAVEMENT CONDITION PERFORMANCE TARGETS (SYSTEM PRESERVATION) (PM2)

The second of the performance measure rules issued by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to require state DOT's to establish two-year and four-year targets for bridge and pavement condition measures. On December 16, 2022, FDOT established measures to assess pavement and bridge condition on the National Highway System (NHS). These requirements involve measuring the condition of these facilities and reporting conditions that are considered "Good" and those considered "Poor." Facilities rated as Good suggest that no major investments are needed. Facilities rated as Poor indicate that major investments will be needed in the near term.

FDOT has the capability to collect and maintain data regarding bridge and pavement condition. In April 2023, the MPO adopted pavement and bridge condition performance targets in support of the measures and targets set by FDOT. **Table 2-4** presents the statewide and MPO pavement and bridge (PM2) targets and performance.

Table 2-4. Statewide and MPO PM2 Targets and Performance

Performance Measure	2023 Statewide Target	2024 Statewide Performance	2024 MPO Performance	2025 Statewide Target
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good condition	≥50.0%	53.9%	87.2%	≥50.0%
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in poor condition	≤10.0%	0.8%	0.0%	≤5.0%
Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition	≥60.0%	67.6%	83.1%	≥60.0%
Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition	≤5.0%	0.1%	0.0%	≤5.0%
Percent of non-Interstate pavements in good condition	≥40.0%	50.2%	49.8%	≥40.0%
Percent of non-Interstate pavements in poor condition	≤5.0%	0.5%	0.1%	≤5.0%

HIGHWAY SYSTEM PERFORMANCE (PM3)

FHWA's System Performance/Freight Performance Measures Final Rule, which is referred to as the PM3 Rule, requires state DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for the following six performance measures:

National Highway Performance Program

- Percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate NHS that are reliable
- Percent of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable

National Highway Freight Program

- Truck Travel Time Reliability Index



The first two performance measures assess the percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate or the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable. Reliability is defined as the ratio of longer travel times compared to a normal travel time over all applicable roads, across four time periods between the hours of 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. each day. The third performance measure assesses the reliability of truck travel on the Interstate system. The TTTR assesses how reliable the Interstate network is by comparing the worst travel times for trucks against the travel time they typically experience.

On December 16, 2022, FDOT established statewide performance targets for the system performance measures. On April 12, 2023, the Indian River MPO agreed to support FDOT's statewide system performance targets. **Table 2-5** presents the statewide and MPO targets.

Table 2-5. Indian River County MPO and Statewide PM3 Targets

Performance Measure	2024 Statewide Performance	2023 Statewide Target	2025 Statewide Target	2024 Indian River County MPO Performance	2025 Indian River County MPO Target
Percent of person-miles on the Interstate NHS that are reliable	80.7%	≥75.0%	≥75.0%	100.0%	≥75.0%
Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	90.0%	≥50.0%	≥60.0%	96.3%	≥60.0%
Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTR)	1.54	≤1.75	≤2.00	1.09	≤2.00

TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

MPO's are now required to establish performance targets for the management of transit assets. On September 30, 2022, the Indian River County MPO established the transit asset performance targets shown in **Table 2-6** and **Table 2-7** for the MPO's planning area. **Table 2-6** summarizes the required performance targets for transit vehicles and equipment as well as the current status of each performance measure. Transit vehicles have a useful life benchmark of 4-12 years, based on vehicle type. The performance measure for vehicles is the percent of vehicles that are within their respective useful life benchmark.

Table 2-6. Performance Measures for Transit Vehicles and Equipment

Asset Category	Asset Class	Individual Assets	# of Vehicles	Vehicle Age (Years)	Useful Life Benchmark (Years)	FY 26 Target	Current Status (Active Fleet)	Current Status (Active + Spares)
Revenue Vehicles (Fixed Route)	Bus (BU)	2013 Gillig Low Floor Bus	3	12	12	33%	0%	0%
		2015 Gillig Low Floor Bus	2	10	12			
		2016 Gillig Low Floor Bus	1	9	12			
		2024 Gillig Low Floor Bus	3	1	12			

Asset Category	Asset Class	Individual Assets	# of Vehicles	Vehicle Age (Years)	Useful Life Benchmark (Years)	FY 26 Target	Current Status (Active Fleet)	Current Status (Active + Spares)
	Cutaway Bus (CU)	2016 Odyssey	5	9	5	33%	0%	35%
		2018 Defender	3	7	7			
		2019 Defender	1	6	7			
		2021 Defender	2	4	7			
		2021 Odyssey XL	3	4	5			
Revenue Vehicles (Demand Response)	Cutaway Bus (CU)	2013 Defender	1	12	7	67%	88%	88%
		2015 Van Terra	2	10	5			
		2017 Challenger	1	8	5			
		2017 Van Terra	1	8	5			
		2018 Challenger	1	7	5			
		2018 Crusader	2	7	5			
		2021 Van Terra	1	4	5			
	Van (VN)	2012 MV1	2	14	4	67%	100%	100%
		2018 Entervan (Caravan)	1	8	4			
Equipment	Truck	2021 Ranger	1	4	5	50%	0%	0%
		2021 Explorer	3	4	5			
		2021 F-150	1	4	5			
		2024 F-150	1	1	5			

Table 2-7 summarizes the required performance targets for transit facilities as well as the current status of each performance measure. Transit facilities are rated using the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale. The TERM scale has a range of 1 to 5, with 5 representing facilities in the best condition. A TERM rating of 3.0 represents a facility in adequate condition. Each facility is assigned a rating based on its condition.

Table 2-7. Performance Measures for Transit Facilities

Asset Category	Asset Class	Individual Assets	Condition Assessment – TERM Rating	FY 26 Target (% Under TERM 3.0)	Current Status	Notes
Facilities	Administrative/Maintenance	Transit Administration & Maintenance Facility	5	0	0	Constructed in 2012
Facilities	Passenger	Main Transit Hub	5	0	0	Constructed in 2017

TRANSIT SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) established transit safety performance management requirements in the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) final rule, which was published on April 9, 2024. This rule requires providers of public transportation systems that receive federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 to develop and implement a PTASP based on a Safety Management Systems approach.

In 2025, the Senior Resource Association (SRA) and MPO staff prepared a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) based on federal guidance. Within that PTASP, performance targets were established for five transit safety measures:

- Preventable Accident Rate
- Injuries
- Fatalities
- Safety Events
- System Reliability



The Indian River County PTASP was approved by the Board of County Commissioners on February 4, 2025. The MPO's transit safety performance targets are listed in **Table 2-8**.

Table 2-8. Transit Safety Performance Targets

Safety Concerns		Rate	Goal
Preventable accident rate	Per 100,000 miles		<0.1
Injuries	Per 100,000 miles		<0.1
Fatalities	Per 100,000 miles		0
Safety Events	Per 100,000 miles		<0.1
System Reliability	Mean distance between Mechanical Failure		>42,500 miles
Pedestrian Collisions	Per 100,000 miles		0
Vehicular Collisions	Per 100,000 miles		<0.1
Assaults on Transit Workers	Per 100,000 miles		0

CHAPTER 3

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS



3.0 PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

A critical component of the planning process is ensuring that identified transportation needs are balanced with anticipated available funding, which informs the Cost Feasible Plan—a prioritized set of improvements that can be implemented within projected revenue limits. One of the initial steps in this process involves forecasting the geographic distribution of population and employment growth across the MPO’s planning area. This forecast serves as the basis for estimating travel demand through the year 2050. Using a regional travel demand forecast model, population and employment data are converted into trip estimates, which are then assigned to the roadway and transit networks. This modeling approach helps identify future congestion points, evaluate multimodal travel patterns, and support data-driven decision-making for long-term transportation investments.

3.1 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

Indian River County is expected to experience significant growth through the year 2050. This projection is based on an analysis of local, regional, and national trends, as well as population and employment data. Anticipated growth plays a critical role in shaping future transportation needs, as both the type and scale of development influence travel demand and infrastructure requirements.

Table 3-1 presents the forecasted population and employment growth for Indian River County, as incorporated into the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model (TCRPM) version 5.1. These growth allocations were developed using Future Land Use maps, current development activity, and input from local government planning staff. Population and employment projections were sourced from the University of Florida’s Bureau of Economic and Business Research. The travel demand model translates these projections into estimated trips, which are then assigned to the roadway and transit networks to inform long-range planning decisions.

Table 3-1. Population and Employment Forecast Summary

Year	Population	Employment
2020	158,309	83,855
2050	208,932	111,769
Total Projected Growth	50,623	27,914
Projected 30-year Growth (%)	32%	33%

Figure 3-1 and **Figure 3-2** illustrate the geographic distribution of anticipated population and employment growth across Indian River County. These maps display growth by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)—the standard geographic units used in transportation planning to analyze and forecast travel behavior. The socioeconomic data shown at the TAZ level reflects expected concentrations of residents and jobs, which are key inputs for modeling future travel demand.

As population and employment increase, pressure on the county’s transportation network will grow, reinforcing the need for continued investment in infrastructure and expanded mobility options. The Indian River County MPO remains committed to addressing these evolving needs by supporting a sustainable, multimodal transportation system that serves residents, visitors, and the local economy.




Figure 3-1. Population Growth Results Map




Figure 3-2. Employment Growth Results Map

3.2 INTEGRATING HOUSING PATTERNS INTO THE LRTP

The 2050 LRTP supports major housing and development themes for Indian River County by aligning transportation investments with local comprehensive plans and future land use maps. It addresses projected population and employment growth to inform transportation improvement priorities and supports infill and redevelopment within the Urban Service Area by prioritizing multimodal strategies and infrastructure projects that facilitate access to existing and future residential areas. While the LRTP ensures transportation improvements are consistent with anticipated development patterns, it does not set new housing policies or conduct scenario planning for housing—those details remain in the local comprehensive plans and the Land Use Vision Study completed in August 2022.

3.3 LRTP CONSISTENCY WITH FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

The 2050 LRTP has been developed through close coordination with local municipalities and is designed to align with the adopted comprehensive plans of Indian River County and its cities, including Vero Beach, Fellsmere, Sebastian, Indian River Shores, and Orchid. The plan incorporates population and employment growth forecasts based on Future Land Use maps and input from local planning staff, ensuring that transportation improvements are planned in harmony with anticipated development patterns. This approach supports the integration of transportation and land use planning, promoting consistency between transportation investments and the housing, growth, and economic development objectives outlined in each municipality's comprehensive plan.

The LRTP's goals and objectives emphasize efficient system management, multimodal mobility, environmental protection, safety, and system preservation, all of which reflect and reinforce the priorities found in local comprehensive plans. By establishing performance measures and targets that address accessibility, connectivity, and sustainability, the LRTP ensures that transportation projects contribute to the creation of vibrant, resilient communities. The plan's fiscally constrained project list and multimodal strategies—including roadway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements—are designed to support future land use visions, accommodate projected growth, and enhance quality of life for residents across Indian River County and its municipalities.



VERO BEACH
FLORIDA

CHAPTER 4

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS PLAN



4.0 TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

The Transportation Needs Plan serves as the cornerstone of the Indian River County MPO's LRTP, offering a fiscally constrained and forward-thinking strategy to address the region's mobility needs through the 2050 planning horizon. This section brings together key elements such as the projected revenues, project phasing, and prioritization criteria to support the development of a Cost Feasible Plan that reflects available funding. In addition to identifying funded improvements, the plan highlights unfunded roadway needs to showcase future investment opportunities beyond current fiscal limitations. Building on the existing and committed roadway network, the plan adopts a multimodal approach through the inclusion of the multimodal priority map, transit strategies, and coordination with the Transit Development Plan. It also emphasizes regional connectivity through targeted regional projects and enhances system performance via operations and management strategies, congestion mitigation, and safety initiatives. The plan integrates the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, addresses vulnerable roadways with appropriate mitigation strategies, and places safety at the forefront of all planning efforts. Collectively, these components establish a comprehensive framework to support a safe, efficient, and resilient transportation system for all users.

4.1 PROJECTED REVENUES

Existing revenue sources are not sufficient to fully meet Indian River County's future mobility needs, especially in light of the anticipated growth in population and employment by the year 2050. As the county's transportation demands increase, it becomes essential to prioritize investments that can be supported within the limits of projected funding.

The 1% Local Government Infrastructure Surtax is a key revenue source for Indian River County, funding a range of public facility and infrastructure projects with a life expectancy of five or more years. In 2016, voters in Indian River County approved an extension of the surtax, which took effect in January 2017 and would be active through December 2034. Revenue generated is distributed between the county and its municipalities according to an interlocal agreement. As a dedicated funding stream for capital outlay, the surtax enables essential transportation investments, such as road improvements and new construction, that directly support the goals outlined in the 2050 LRTP.

Projected revenues through 2050 are summarized in **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2**, which detail roadway funding totals by source and by timeframe. These revenue estimates are presented in both Present-Day Value (PDV)—reflecting 2024 dollars—and Year of Expenditure (YOE), which accounts for inflation and represents the estimated cost at the time the funds are spent. This dual approach helps ensure that financial planning remains realistic and responsive to future economic conditions.

Table 4-1. Projected Revenues in Present-Day Value (PDV, 2025 Dollars)

Revenue Source		2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2050	2031-2050 Total
Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) ¹		\$643,411	-	\$4,639,175	\$5,282,586
State Highway System (Non-SIS) – Non-TMA ²		\$2,643,411	\$2,282,051	\$3,747,423	\$8,672,885
SHS (Non-SIS) – Product Support ³		\$581,550	\$502,051	\$824,433	\$1,908,035
Other Roads (Non-SIS, Non-SHS) “Off-System”		\$2,403,101	\$2,064,103	\$3,381,443	\$7,848,647
Other Roads (Non-SIS, Non-SHS) Product Support ³		\$528,682	\$453,846	\$743,814	\$1,726,343
Surface Transportation Block Grant – Non-TMA (SL) ⁴		\$10,162,791	\$8,403,846	\$13,515,464	\$32,081,101
Surface Transportation Block Grant – (SA - Any Area) ⁵		\$28,000,000	\$28,000,000	\$56,000,000	\$112,000,000
Transportation Alternatives – Any Area (TALT, TALN, TALM, TALL) ⁴		\$1,940,000	\$1,940,000	\$3,880,000	\$7,760,000
Subtotal Non-SIS Federal/State Revenues (For Capacity)		\$44,319,535	\$41,705,897	\$78,212,577	\$164,238,010
State Levied Fuel Taxes	County Gas Tax	\$4,075,000	\$4,075,000	\$8,150,000	\$16,300,000
	Constitutional Gas Tax	\$9,350,000	\$9,350,000	\$18,700,000	\$37,400,000
Locally Levied Fuel Taxes	Local Option Gas Tax	\$17,940,000	\$17,940,000	\$35,880,000	\$71,760,000
	9 th Cent Gas Tax	\$975,000	\$975,000	\$1,950,000	\$3,900,000
Infrastructure Sales Tax (1%) ⁶		\$51,463,566	\$48,778,846	\$94,566,495	\$194,808,907
Road Impact Fees		\$25,710,000	\$30,010,000	\$79,760,000	\$135,480,000
Subtotal Local Revenues (For Capacity)		\$77,173,566	\$78,788,846	\$174,326,495	\$330,288,907
Grand Total (Available for Capacity)		\$121,493,101	\$120,494,744	\$252,539,072	\$494,526,917

1. Based on SIS First Five Year Plan FY 2024/2025 – FY 2028/2029 and SIS Cost Feasible Plan 2035-2050
2. Estimated Indian River County MPO allocation of funding eligible for non-TMA MPOs
3. According to the FDOT 2050 Revenue Forecast. MPOs can also assume that an additional 22 percent of estimated SHS (non-SIS) funds are available
4. Estimated IRC MPO allocation of funding (Assumed 100% of districtwide amount)
5. Estimated IRC MPO allocation of funding based on current and historical amounts
6. Infrastructure Sales Tax assumes 34% to be used for transportation projects
(Banded items are identified as revenue sources to be used for roadway capital projects)

Table 4-2. Projected Revenues in Year of Expenditure (YOE) Cost

Revenue Source		2031-2035	2036-2040	2041-2050	2031-2050 Total
Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) ¹		\$830,000	-	\$9,000,000	\$9,830,000
State Highway System (Non-SIS) – Non-TMA ²		\$3,410,000	\$3,560,000	\$7,270,000	\$14,240,000
SHS (Non-SIS) – Product Support ³		\$750,200	\$783,200	\$1,599,400	\$3,132,800
Other Roads (Non-SIS, Non-SHS) “Off-System”		\$3,100,000	\$3,220,000	\$6,560,000	\$12,880,000
Other Roads (Non-SIS, Non-SHS) Product Support ³		\$682,000	\$708,000	\$1,443,000	\$2,833,000
Surface Transportation Block Grant – Non-TMA (SL) ⁴		\$13,110,000	\$13,110,000	\$26,220,000	\$52,440,000
Surface Transportation Block Grant – (SA - Any Area) ⁵		\$36,120,000	\$43,680,000	\$108,640,000	\$188,440,000
Transportation Alternatives – Any Area (TALT, TALN, TALM, TALL) ⁴		\$1,940,000	\$1,940,000	\$3,880,000	\$7,760,000
Subtotal Non-SIS Federal/State Revenues (For Capacity)		\$57,172,200	\$65,061,200	\$151,732,400	\$273,965,800
State Levied Fuel Taxes	County Gas Tax	\$5,256,750	\$6,357,000	\$15,811,000	\$27,424,750
	Constitutional Gas Tax	\$12,061,500	\$14,586,000	\$36,278,000	\$62,925,500
Locally Levied Fuel Taxes	Local Option Gas Tax	\$23,142,600	\$27,986,400	\$69,607,200	\$120,736,200
	9 th Cent Gas Tax	\$1,257,750	\$1,521,000	\$3,783,000	\$6,561,750
Infrastructure Sales Tax (1%) ⁶		\$63,388,000	\$76,095,000	\$183,459,000	\$325,942,000
Road Impact Fees		\$33,165,900	\$46,815,600	\$154,734,400	\$234,715,900
Subtotal Local Revenues (For Capacity)		\$99,553,900	\$122,910,600	\$338,193,400	\$560,657,900
Grand Total (Available for Capacity)		\$156,726,100	\$187,971,800	\$489,925,800	\$834,623,700

1. Based on SIS First Five Year Plan FY 2024/2025 – FY 2028/2029 and SIS Cost Feasible Plan 2035-2050
2. Estimated Indian River County MPO allocation of funding eligible for non-TMA MPOs
3. According to the FDOT 2050 Revenue Forecast. MPOs can also assume that an additional 22 percent of estimated SHS (non-SIS) funds are available
4. Estimated IRC MPO allocation of funding (Assumed 100% of districtwide amount)
5. Estimated IRC MPO allocation of funding based on current and historical amounts
6. Infrastructure Sales Tax assumes 34% to be used for transportation projects
(Banded items are identified as revenue sources to be used for roadway capital projects)

4.2 PHASING AND PRIORITIZATION

At the beginning of the plan, an initial Needs Assessment was performed. From here, the needs were divided up based on funding status. Roadway and Highway projects in the plan are grouped into five categories based on funding status and implementation readiness. These tiers identify the relative level of priority and funding status as indicated in **Figure 4-1** below.

	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4	TIER 5	TIER 6
	Existing and Committed Roadway Improvements	Interim Cost Feasible Plan (2031-2040)	Cost Feasible Plan (2041-2050)	Illustrative Projects Other Priority Projects	Other Unfunded Needs	Vision Roadway Improvements
Needs Assessment?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
High Priority?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cost Feasible?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Should funds become available		

Figure 4-1. Phasing Tiers Graphic

Prioritizing transportation projects is a complex process that requires balancing data, policy, and public input—there is no single formula that can capture all the nuances of regional needs and values. **Table 4-3** summarizes a brief exploration of strengths and limitations of three key approaches used to inform project prioritization: Data-Driven Scoring & Performance-Based, Policy and Planning Consistency, and Stakeholder and Public Input-Based. Each method offers unique insights and plays a complimentary role in shaping a well-rounded, transparent, and context-sensitive prioritization strategy.

Table 4-3. Prioritization Criteria

Approach	Pros	Cons
Data-Driven Scoring & Performance-Based	- Generally objective and transparent - Repeatable and scalable - Reflective of past exercises	- Dependent on data availability and accuracy - May overlook local context - Can favor high-volume urban corridors
Policy and Planning Consistency	- Supports long-term regional/state goals - Aligns with funding frameworks - Reduces redundancy across plans	- May reinforce outdated priorities - Less responsive to emerging needs - Can limit innovative solutions
Stakeholder and Public Input-Based	- Reflects community values - Builds public trust and buy-in - Highlights needs not captured by data	- Can be subjective or politically influenced - May lack technical justification - Input quality can vary

4.3 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

The first five years of the Cost Feasible LRTP comprise the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is included in **Appendix B**. While federal regulations require a four-year TIP, Florida extends this requirement to five years and recognizes the full-five-year program for planning and funding purposes.

Because the TIP is a dynamic document that is frequently amended to reflect updated priorities and funding, the most current version is available on the Indian River County MPO website. Any amendments or major changes to the TIP follow a formal process, which includes a public hearing for significant modifications to ensure transparency and public involvement.



Table 4-4. Roadway Capacity Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
82 nd Ave	26 th St	69 th St	New 2 Lane
Aviation Blvd	43 rd Ave	SR 5/ US 1	Widen to 4 Lane and Add Improvement
CR 510	58 th Ave	E SR 5/US 1	Widen to 4 Lane
CR 510	CR 512	87 th St	Widen to 4 Lane
CR 510	W of 82 nd Ave	58 th Ave	Widen to 4 Lane
CR 510	87 th St	W of 82 nd Ave	Widen to 4 Lane
I-95	Oslo Road		Landscaping (Interchange)
Oslo Road	SW 82 nd Ave	58 th Ave	Widen to 4 Lane
US 1	Aviation Blvd		Intersection Improvements

Table 4-5. Operations & Maintenance and Safety Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
43 rd Ave	1 st St SW	6 th St	Resurfacing
43 rd Ave	6 th St	12 th St	Resurfacing
43 rd Ave	5 th St SW	1 st St SW	Resurfacing
45 th St	58 th Ave	43 rd Ave	Bike Lane/Sidewalk Retrofit
CR 512	I-95	W of 106 th Ave	Widen/Resurface (Interchange)
			IRC Mowing
			IRC State Highway System Bridges
			IRC State Highway System Roadway

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
			Interstate Highway Bridges
			Interstate Highways Maintenance
SR 60	SR 60 to US 1	IR Blvd & 11 th Ave	Resurfacing
SR 60	E of Ft Drum Wildlife Entrance	W of CR 512	Resurfacing
SR A1A	Sebastian Inlet Bridge		Bridge Replacement
SR A1A	IRC/St. Lucie County Line	Jasmine Ln	Resurfacing
SR A1A	Sand Dollar Ln	S of Sebastian Inlet Bridge	Resurfacing
			Traffic Signal Maintenance
			Traffic Signal Maintenance
US 1	N of 87 th St	S of Sebastian Blvd	Resurfacing

Table 4-6. Transit and Transit Development Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
			Operations/Administrative Assistance
			Purchase Vehicles and Equipment
			Operating for Fixed Route
			Operating/Administrative Assistance

Table 4-7. Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trail Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
43 rd Ave	45 th St	49 th St	Sidewalk Construction
Trans Florida Railroad	Broadway St	Grant Ave	Bicycle Path/Trail

Table 4-8. Aviation Projects Listed in TIP Fy 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
Sebastian Airport			Construction Access Road & Uti. West
Sebastian Airport			Construction Golf Apron Phase 1
Sebastian Airport			Construction Terminal Apron Expansion
Sebastian Airport			Construction Aircraft Wash Rack
Sebastian Airport			Construction Taxiway Golf
Sebastian Airport			Engineering and Design Golf Apron Phase 1

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
Sebastian Airport			Update Airport Master Plan
Sebastian Airport			Design Access Road and Utility
Vero Beach Airport			Rehabilitate Taxiway A (Design)
Vero Beach Airport			Airfield Electrical Upgrades
Vero Beach Airport			AWOS Relocation
Vero Beach Airport			Rehabilitate Airport Drain System
Vero Beach Airport			Rehabilitate Taxiway A (Construction)
Vero Beach Airport			Replace Hangar Roof
Vero Beach Airport			Extend/Mark/Light Taxiway East
Vero Beach Airport			Extend/Mark/Light Taxiway East
Vero Beach Airport			Extend Runway 4/22 Phase 1 Environment

Table 4-9. Planning Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
			Indian River FY25-26 UPWP
			Indian River FY27-28 UPWP
			Indian River FY29-30 UPWP

Table 4-10. Capital Improvement Projects Listed in TIP FY 2025/2026-2029/2030

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
1 st St SW	27 th Ave		Left Turn Lane/Traffic Signal
8 th St	66 th Ave	74 th Ave	Reconstruction
8 th St	74 th Ave	82 nd Ave	Reconstruction
16 th St	58 th Ave		Intersection Improvement
17 th St SW	27 th Ave	43 rd Ave	
20 th Ave	8 th St	12 th St	Sidewalk East Side
26 th St	43 rd Ave		Intersection Improvement
26 th St	43 rd Ave	58 th Ave	4/5 Lanes (1 mile)
26 th St	58 th Ave	66 th Ave	4/5 Lanes (1 mile)
27 th Ave	Oslo Road		NB Right & Long Left
37 th St	Indian River Blvd		Intersection Improvement
Aviation Blvd	US 1	37 th & 41 st St	Extension

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement
41 st St	32 nd Ave	US 1	Sidewalk North Side
41 st St	US 1		Intersection Improvements/Old Dixie
43 rd Ave	5 th St SW	1 st St SW	Bridge Replacement/Pedestrian Crossing
43 rd Ave	5 th St SW	1 st St SW	Pedestrian & Bicycle Access Improvement
43 rd Ave	1 st St SW	6 th St	Pedestrian & Bicycle Access Improvement
43 rd Ave	6 th St	12 th St	Pedestrian & Bicycle Access Improvement
43 rd Ave	45 th St	49 th St	Sidewalks Both Sides
45 th St	US 1		Left Turn Lane
49 th St & 28 th Ct	FS 12 & 47 th St	Old Dixie & 49 th St	Sidewalks North & Both Sides
49 th St	US 1		Intersection Improvement
53 rd St	58 th Ave	66 th Ave	Widening 900 ft 4 Lane
53 rd St	58 th Ave W	66 th Ave	Widening 1,545 ft Upgrade to 4 Lane
53 rd St	58 th Ave W	66 th Ave	Widening 2,745 ft 4 Lane
58 th Ave	33 rd St		Left Turn Lanes
58 th Ave	37 th St		Left Turn Lanes
58 th Ave	77 th St		Intersection Improvement
66 th Ave	49 th St	69 th St	4 Lanes (2.5 miles)
66 th Ave	69 th St	85 th St	4 Lanes (2.0 miles)
82 nd Ave			Bridge Replacement - Temporary Culvert
CR 510	CR 512	US 1	4 Lanes
CR 512	Willow St	I 95	4 Lanes
Highland Drive			Sidewalk
IR Blvd	17th St Bridge	US 1	Pedestrian & Bicycle Access Improvement
			Miscellaneous ROW Acquisition
64 th Ave	64 th Ave	Wabasso Park	Sidewalk Extension
2 nd St	Old Dixie Hwy	20 th Ave	Sidewalks (1.25 miles)
			Sidewalks and Designated Bike Lanes

4.4 COST FEASIBLE PLAN

Detailed tables of the Cost Feasible projects are included in **Appendix C** and **Appendix D** of this document. **Appendix C** includes the projects in terms of Present-Day Value (PDV), while **Appendix D** includes the projects in terms of Year of Expenditure (YOE) costs.

2050 LRTP-identified projects include an estimated \$854 million (PDV) of roadway costs. Unfunded needs account for about a third of that total, valuing at about \$283 million. Many high-priority unfunded projects are on the SIS and would be eligible for future funding based on statewide priorities. Indian River County will also continue to consider opportunities to increase funding for transportation. The tables included in **Appendices C** and **D** ensure that the proposed improvements included in the Cost Feasible Plan are identified sufficiently per 23 C.F.R. 450.322 (f)(6).

The 2050 fully funded roadway capacity needs projects are identified in **Table 4-11**. Partially funded and unfunded projects are shown in **Table 4-12**. **Figure 4-2** through **Figure 4-4** present the geographic distribution of all projects identified during the full needs assessment for the LRTP. The maps identify the Existing and Committed (E+C) roadway network in **Figure 4-2**, the Cost Feasible Projects in **Figure 4-3**, and Unfunded Needs in **Figure 4-4**.

There is a specific amount of projected revenue designated for the capital costs of roadway capital projects. Other roadway revenues are designated for operations and maintenance (O&M) of the county's roadways throughout the planning period of the LRTP. **Table 4-13** presents the demonstration of fiscal constraint.

Table 4-11. 2050 Fully Funded Roadway Capacity Needs Projects

On Street	From Street	To Street	Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Total Cost Remaining ¹	Funding Source(s)	Tentative Status for 2050 LRTP
CR 510	W of 82 nd Ave	58 th Ave	3.02	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$31,006,375	Mix	Funded 2031 - 2035
CR 510	58 th Ave	US 1	0.60	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$102,703,100	Mix	Funded 2031 - 2035
45 th St	60 th Ave	43 rd Ave	1.03	Multimodal Improvements	\$10,088,282	Mix	Funded 2031 - 2035
US 1	53 rd St	CR 510	4.32	Widen 4 to 6 Lanes	\$72,282,177	Mix	Funded 2036 - 2040
53 rd St	66 th Ave	58 th Ave	1.03	New 2 Lanes	\$3,390,407	Local	Funded 2036 - 2040
Aviation Blvd Ext	US 1	35 th Ln	0.89	New 2 Lanes	\$8,086,797	Local	Funded 2041 - 2050
82 nd Ave	26 th St	69 th St	5.02	New 2 Lanes	\$32,833,580	State/Federal	Funded 2041 - 2050
82 nd Ave	69 th St	CR 510	2.02	New 2 Lanes	\$20,183,481	State/Federal	Funded 2041 - 2050
82 nd Ave	CR 510	Concha Dr	0.97	New 2 Lanes	\$16,321,844	Mix	Funded 2041 - 2050
Aviation Blvd	43 rd Ave	US 1	1.95	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$40,317,646	Mix	Funded 2041 - 2050

On Street	From Street	To Street	Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Total Cost Remaining ¹	Funding Source(s)	Tentative Status for 2050 LRTP
CR 512	Willow St	I-95	2.45	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$52,034,688	Mix	Funded 2041 - 2050
26 th St	66 th Ave	58 th Ave	1.02	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$13,194,065	Local	Funded 2041 - 2050
26 th St	58 th Ave	43 rd Ave	1.00	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$12,928,901	Local	Funded 2041 - 2050
Indian River Blvd	US 1/4 th St	37 th St	3.71	Strategic Improvements	\$10,000,000	Local	Funded 2041 - 2050

1. Reflective of unfunded costs remaining beyond the 5-year Transportation Improvement Program timeframe (FY 2025/2026-2029/2030)

Table 4-12. Partially Funded and Unfunded Roadway Capacity Needs Projects

On Street	From Street	To Street	Length (miles)	Improvement Type	Total Cost Remaining ¹	Funding Source(s)	Tentative Status for 2050 LRTP
CR 512	I-95	CR 510	2.56	Widen 4 to 6 Lanes	\$43,989,681	Mix	Partially Funded
43 rd Ave	St. Lucie County Line	18 th St	5.28	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$112,098,272	Local	Partially Funded
Florida's Turnpike	St. Lucie County Line	Osceola County Line	10.20	Widen 4 to 6 Lanes	\$300,000,000 ²	Florida's Turnpike Enterprise	Unfunded
53 rd St	82 nd Ave	66 th Ave	1.99	New 2 Lanes	\$33,554,721	TBD	Unfunded
12 th St	74 th Ave	66 th Ave	1.00	Improved 2 Lanes	\$18,840,209	TBD	Unfunded
5 th St SW	20 th Ave	Old Dixie Hwy	1.42	Improved 2 Lanes	\$26,934,909	TBD	Unfunded
66 th Ave	CR 510	Barber St	0.80	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$17,017,710	TBD	Unfunded
Roseland Rd	CR 512	US 1	4.70	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$99,740,893	TBD	Unfunded
27 th Ave SW	St. Lucie County Line	Oslo Rd	2.01	Widen 2 to 4 Lanes	\$42,740,798	TBD	Unfunded
SW 58 th Ave	St. Lucie County Line	Oslo Rd	2.59	New 2 Lanes	\$43,701,861	TBD	Unfunded
SR 60	Vero Beach Ave	Indian River Blvd	2.97	TSM&O	\$3,275,500	TBD	Unfunded
Indian River Blvd	US 1	Merrill P. Barber Bridge / Beachland Blvd	3.1	TSM&O	\$4,133,800	TBD	Unfunded
US 1	79 th St	86 th St	1.01	TSM&O	\$1,395,400	TBD	Unfunded
85 th St	58 th Ave	Wabasso Island	1.56	TSM&O	\$1,146,000	TBD	Unfunded
17 th St	US 1	A1A	1.98	TSM&O	\$1,567,400	TBD	Unfunded

1. Reflective of unfunded costs remaining beyond the 5-year Transportation Improvement Program timeframe (FY 2025/2026-2029/2030)

2. Estimated Indian River County portion (9.94 miles) of total project estimate \$2.375B




Figure 4-2. 2030 Existing + Committed Roadway Network




Figure 4-3. 2050 Cost Feasible Projects




Figure 4-4. Partially and Unfunded 2050 Unfunded Roadway Needs

Table 4-13. Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint (Present-Day Value (PDV))


Revenue	2030	2031-2035	Expenditures	Rollover	2036-2040	Expenditures	Rollover	2041-2050	Expenditures	Rollover
SIS Projects (2 projects)	\$-	\$643,411			\$-			\$4,639,175		
SL (STBG for areas with population from 50,000 to 200,000)	\$2,365,455	\$10,162,791	\$(9,863,500)	\$479,291	\$8,403,846	\$(6,524,002)	\$2,276,181	\$13,515,464	\$(36,437,703)	\$(21,091,909)
TALL (for areas with population from 50,000 to 200,000)	\$350,909	\$1,503,876			\$1,243,590			\$2,000,000		
TALT (any area)	\$216,756	\$931,783			\$770,513			\$1,239,691		
State Highway System (non-SIS) – Non TMA MPOs	\$236,364	\$2,643,411	\$(9,506,375)	\$(6,862,964)	\$2,282,051	\$-	\$(3,393,092)	\$3,747,423		\$1,018,957
State Highway System (non-SIS) – Non TMA MPOs Product Support	\$52,000	\$581,550		\$581,550	\$502,051	\$(5,190,506)	\$(4,207,558)	\$824,433		\$(2,558,964)
Other Roads (non-SIS/non-SHS)	\$952,727	\$2,403,101		\$2,403,101	\$2,064,103	\$-	\$4,051,282	\$3,381,443	\$(6,175,833)	\$463,342
Other Roads (non-SIS, non-SHS) Product Support	\$210,000	\$528,682		\$528,682	\$453,846	\$(3,918,646)	\$(3,027,620)	\$743,814		\$(1,690,767)
STBG (SA – Any Area)	\$896,599	\$28,000,000	\$(25,019,600)	\$2,980,400	\$28,000,000	\$(32,125,412)	\$(1,660,851)	\$56,000,000	\$(44,706,216)	\$9,958,255
Total	\$6,018,991	\$50,801,705			\$46,662,308			\$90,921,340		
Total for Capacity	\$1,451,091	\$44,319,535	\$(44,209,475)	\$110,060	\$41,705,897	\$(47,758,567)	\$(5,961,658)	\$78,212,577	\$(87,319,752)	\$(13,901,086)
County Gas Tax	\$815,000	\$4,075,000			\$4,075,000			\$8,150,000		
Constitutional Gas Tax	\$1,870,000	\$9,350,000			\$9,350,000			\$18,700,000		
Local Option Gas Tax	\$3,588,000	\$17,940,000			\$17,940,000			\$35,880,000		
9 th Cent Gas Tax	\$195,000	\$975,000			\$975,000			\$1,950,000		
Infrastructure Sales Tax (1%)	\$11,055,455	\$51,463,566	\$(68,000,000)	\$(16,536,434)	\$48,778,846	\$(38,758,292)	\$(3,653,805)	\$94,566,495	\$(79,731,058)	\$11,897,325
Road Impact Fees	\$4,584,000	\$25,710,000	\$(23,739,869)	\$1,970,131	\$30,010,000	\$(42,877,418)	\$(11,238,272)	\$79,760,000	\$(66,957,034)	\$3,766,005
Total	\$22,107,455	\$109,513,566			\$111,128,846			\$239,006,495		
Total for Capital	\$15,639,455	\$77,173,566	\$(91,739,869)	\$(14,566,303)	\$78,788,846	\$(81,635,711)	\$(14,892,077)	\$174,326,495	\$(146,688,093)	\$15,663,330

4.5 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2025 ANNUAL UPDATE

The Indian River County Transit Development Plan (TDP) 2025 Annual Update provides a comprehensive review of the county's public transit system, including recent achievements, current operations, and future priorities. The GoLine fixed-route system, operated by the Senior Resource Association, now consists of fourteen routes serving both urban and rural areas, with expanded weekday and Saturday service hours implemented ahead of schedule. Paratransit services, branded as Community Coach, continue to provide essential door-to-door transportation for eligible residents. In FY 2023/2024, GoLine Ridership reached 1.36 million, a 7.9% increase over the previous year, reflecting strong demand and system growth. Performance measures indicate that all routes meet or exceed effectiveness and efficiency standards.

The TDP outlines a staged ten-year implementation program, identifying priority projects such as the construction of a North County Hub, initiation of Sunday service, and ongoing vehicle replacements. The plan is supported by a financially feasible ten-year capital and operating plan, leveraging federal, state, and local funding sources. Key goals include enhancing service quality, maintaining system accessibility and safety, and fostering regional coordination. While the system continues to perform well, challenges such as rising operating costs and the need for sustained funding remain. The TDP's ongoing updates ensure that transit planning remains responsive to community needs and aligned with the broader objectives of the LRTP.



4.6 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN

The 2024 Indian River County Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan provides a strategic framework for developing a safe, accessible, and connected bicycle and pedestrian network throughout the county. Building on previous planning efforts, the updated plan establishes a vision for active transportation that prioritizes safety and comfort for all users. The plan evaluates existing conditions, identifies gaps in the current network, and incorporates extensive public and stakeholder input to ensure that community needs and preferences are reflected in project recommendations.

The plan includes a comprehensive inventory of existing facilities, analyzes crash and safety data, and applies contemporary metrics such as Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) to assess the comfort and connectivity of walking and bicycling environments. It identifies a Vision Network of desired bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and prioritizes projects based on criteria including safety, connectivity, equity, and access to schools, civic destinations, and transit. The plan also provides planning-level cost estimates and outlines implementation strategies, including stand-alone projects, integration with roadway resurfacing, and alignment with the LRTP's cost feasible projects.

Policy recommendations focus on updating design standards, adopting best practices for facility design, and embedding safety and accessibility in decision-making. The plan encourages coordination with local agencies, ongoing public engagement, and regular monitoring of progress using measurable performance indicators. Ultimately, the plan supports the LRTP's goals by advancing a multimodal transportation system that enhances mobility, improves safety, and promotes a healthier future for Indian River County.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY

Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan | 2024



4.7 INTERCITY TRAVEL

GREYHOUND

Greyhound Lines is a privately-operated bus operator that provides intercity bus service connecting Indian River County to major cities across Florida and the broader United States. While Greyhound does not operate local fixed-route service within the county, it offers regional and national connectivity through its stop in Vero Beach. The Vero Beach stop is located at the Sunoco gas station on 20th Street, near I-95 Exit 170. This service compliments the county's local transit system, GoLine, by offering residents and visitors access to long-distance travel options. There are no plans for Greyhound terminals in the county, but future planning efforts may consider opportunities to enhance intercity bus travel.

BRIGHTLINE

Brightline is a privately-operated high-speed passenger rail service connecting Miami to Orlando. While the corridor passes through Indian River County, the company has excluded Vero Beach and other county locations from its current station selection process. Instead, Brightline is evaluating proposals for a Treasure Coast station in either Martin or St. Lucie County. Indian River County officials and municipalities—including Vero Beach, Sebastian, and Fellsmere—have expressed strong support for a station in Fort Pierce due to its central location and potential to boost tourism and regional connectivity. At this time, Brightline has no plans to add a station in Indian River County.

4.8 TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Travel and tourism are central to the economic vitality and cultural identity of Indian River County. The 2050 LRTP supports this sector by improving access to key destinations such as beaches, historic downtowns, parks, and recreational corridors. By coordinating transportation investments with tourism priorities, the plan enhances mobility for visitors, strengthens regional connectivity, and supports local businesses. A safe, efficient, and attractive transportation network not only improves the visitor experience but also reinforces the county's reputation as a welcoming and vibrant destination.



Credit: visitindianrivercounty.com

4.9 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT

Indian River County MPO developed a Congestion Management Process to “address congestion management through a process that provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multi-modal transportation system.”

Maintenance of a Congestion Management Process is a requirement for all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) or TPOs under Florida Law. Additionally, a robust congestion management process aids the MPO in identifying local and regional transportation needs and potential improvements due to the following:

- Increased emphasis on transportation safety
- Physically or legally constrained roadway corridors
- Limited funding resources

The MPO’s congestion process is based on five steps as follows:

- Step 1: Identify Segment Score and Rank
- Step 2: Eliminate Segments Controlled by and to be improved by FDOT
- Step 3: Identify Priority Corridors
- Step 4: Conduct Strategy Evaluation
- Step 5: Prioritize CMP Strategies

The congestion management process is key in the development of the 2050 LRTP and continues to increase in importance to long range transportation planning in general, as populations and transportation systems grow. It is a helpful tool and supportive of identifying congestion and selecting projects for prioritization implementation.

Identified improvements resulting from the Congestion Management Process can include a full range of activities, including demand management and transit/multimodal improvements that may reduce usage of personal vehicles as well as intersection improvement and roadway expansion projects.

4.10 REGIONAL COORDINATION

Ongoing regional transportation planning will be critical as Indian River County anticipates continued growth through 2050. The MPO maintains strong partnerships in the region and throughout the state through organizations including the Treasure Coast Transportation Council (TCTC), Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC), and the Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council (MPOAC). The specific duties of the TCTC include creation of a Regional Long Range Transportation Plan; a process for prioritization of regional projects; a regional public involvement process; and measures of effectiveness to assess regional performance. The MPO will ensure that the appropriate regional projects contained in this plan are reflected in future regional transportation plans.

4.11 TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES (TSM&O)

FDOT created and manages the Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) program to promote a safe, efficient, statewide transportation system that supports economic growth, preserves environmental resources, and enhances community quality of life. The program focuses on five key areas: Management/Deployments, Statewide Arterial Management, Connected Vehicle, ITS Communications, and ITS Software and Architecture, to maintain high standards of safety, efficiency, and connectedness across Florida’s transportation network.

FDOT District Four prepared the 2025 TSM&O Master Plan in collaboration with the five counties in the District, their traffic engineering staff, public transportation divisions, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations. The plan utilizes a performance-driven strategy to optimize the region’s transportation network using technology and operational improvements, rather than expanding physical infrastructure. TSM&O aims to enhance mobility, safety, reliability, and resilience for all users—drivers, freight, transit, and pedestrians—while maximizing return on investment.

The plan is guided the following five goals:

- Enhance mobility for people and goods
- Improve travel time reliability
- Enhance safety for all travelers
- Ensure network resilience
- Prepare for emerging technologies

The Master Plan focuses on areas with the greatest operational need, using seven performance indicators: traffic volumes, crash density, signal density, bottlenecks, transit routes, truck volumes, and roadway vulnerability. A composite scoring system identified high-priority segments, resulting in a strategic network of 1,200 miles eligible for TSM&O investments. Looking beyond 2025, the plan anticipates transformative technologies such as big data analytics, artificial intelligence, urban air mobility, and next generation ITS. These initiatives aim to further advance efficiency, safety, and multimodal mobility in District Four.



4.12 TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

The proposed multimodal improvements included in this plan (see **Table 4-5**) are expected to enhance safety for all roadway users. Additionally, the MPO's CMP will continue to identify intersections and roadway segments with safety concerns and program improvements. In the development of this plan, the MPO considered federal and state safety documents, including the FDOT State Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). To ensure consistency with the SHSP, the Indian River County MPO will support the Key Safety Emphasis Areas listed below:

- Lane Departures
- Impaired Driving
- Pedestrians and Bicyclists
- Intersections
- Occupant Protection
- Motorcyclists
- Aging Road Users
- Commercial Motor Vehicles
- Speeding and Aggressive Driving
- Teen Drivers
- Distracted Driving
- Work Zones
- Traffic Records and Information System

4.13 ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

Transportation projects can significantly impact many aspects of the environment including wildlife and their habitats, wetlands, and groundwater resources. In situations where impacts cannot be completely avoided, mitigation or conservation efforts are required. Environmental mitigation is the process of addressing damage to the environment caused by transportation projects or programs. The process of mitigation is best accomplished through enhancement, restoration, creation and/or preservation projects that serve to offset unavoidable environmental impacts. This plan addresses these potential activities as required by federal regulation [23 C.F.R. 450.322]. In order to understand the environmental mitigation opportunities and issues within the metropolitan planning area, the MPO conducted direct outreach to appropriate federal, state, and local land management, resource, environmental, and historic preservation agencies to obtain comments and consultation on the following:

- Potential environmental impacts from the draft plan of projects
- Environmental factors to consider as part of the plan
- Considerations from applicable conservation plans
- Potential environmental mitigation activities, and areas to carry out these activities, including those with the greatest potential to restore and maintain environmental functions

When addressing mitigation, there is a general rule to avoid all impacts, minimize impacts, and mitigate impacts when impacts are unavoidable. This rule can be applied at the planning level, when MPOs are identifying areas of potential environmental concern due to the development of a transportation project. A typical approach to mitigation that MPOs can follow is to:

- Avoid impacts altogether
- Minimize a proposed activity/project size or its involvement
- Rectify or eliminate the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operation during the life of the action
- Compensate for environmental impacts by providing appropriate or alternate environmental resources of equivalent or greater value, on or off-site

Sections 373.47137 and 373.4139, F.S. require that impacts to habitat be mitigated through a variety of mitigation options, which include mitigation banks and mitigation through the Water Management District(s) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Potential environmental mitigation opportunities that could be considered when addressing environmental impacts from future projects proposed by MPOs may include, but are not limited to, the items presented in

Table 4-14.

Table 4-14. Potential Environmental Mitigation Opportunities

Resource/Impacts	Potential Mitigation Strategy
Wetlands and Water Resources	• Restore degraded wetlands • Create new wetland habitats • Enhance or preserve existing wetlands • Improve storm water management • Purchase credits from a mitigation bank
Forested and other natural areas	• Use selective cutting and clearing • Replace or restore forested areas • Preserve existing vegetation
Habitats	• Construct underpasses, such as culverts • Other design measures to minimize potential habitat fragmentation
Streams	• Stream restoration • Vegetative buffer zones • Strict erosion and sedimentation control measures
Threatened or Endangered Species	• Preservation • Enhancement or restoration of degraded habitat • Creation of new habitats • Establish buffer areas around existing habitats

CHAPTER 5

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT



5.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The 2050 LRTP involved a public involvement process that solicited input from the public and other stakeholders through workshops, MPO meetings, interviews, and surveys. To be eligible to receive federal transportation funds, Indian River County MPO must comply with federal and state standards regulating public involvement processes in transportation planning. To promote full and fair participation in the LRTP update process by all affected citizens, the MPO provided public notice and allowed for public comment both at key points and throughout the planning process.

The 2050 LRTP update was guided by a comprehensive public participation strategy that began early and continued throughout the planning process. Outreach methods included workshops, stakeholder interviews, surveys, MPO meetings, press releases, and newsletters – each designed to maximize community input and visibility. To ensure equitable access and meaningful participation, outreach efforts adhered to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Special attention was given to engaging minority, low-income, transit-dependent, and limited English proficiency populations.

5.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

A series of workshops was conducted to obtain public input to incorporate into the plan during the development of the Needs Assessment and the Cost Feasible Plan (CFP). Throughout the plan development process, interim results were presented to the MPO's Governing Board, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Information was provided in advance of the MPO meetings. The typical format of the meetings included a presentation followed by an opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions. The MPO meetings were publicly advertised, thus sharing opportunities for the public to provide input. A summary of public involvement events, surveys, and information dissemination methods is provided on the following page.

The MPO hosted a wide array of public engagement activities as shown in **Table 5-1**. There were a total of 146 attendees across all workshops.

Table 5-1. Public Engagement Activities Hosted by Indian River County MPO

Date	Activity	Location
April 8, 2025	Public Workshop 1	North IRC Library
April 8, 2025	Public Workshop 2	Fellsmere City Hall
April 9, 2025	Public Workshop 3	IG Center
April 17, 2025	Public Workshop 4	Gifford Youth Achievement Center (GYAC)
April 17, 2025	Public Workshop 5	Vero Beach Community Center
August 21, 2025	Public Workshop 6	Gifford Youth Achievement Center (GYAC)
August 21, 2025	Public Workshop 7	Indian River County Admin Building
August 21, 2025	Public Workshop 8	North Indian River County Library

At the public workshops, participants highlighted concerns such as traffic congestion, speeding, distracted driving, and inadequate lighting and pedestrian infrastructure, especially along CR 512. Public transit suggestions included better marketing, extended service hours, increased frequency, improved signage, mobile app development, and expanded rural coverage. Bicycle and pedestrian access was flagged as unsafe, with calls for protective barriers, new bike lanes and sidewalks, and attention to student routes.

Additional transportation priorities included multimodal integration, equitable transit service for lower-income areas, emergency evacuation planning, seasonal tourism support, and youth-focused programs like “Safe Routes to School.” Capacity needs were ranked by urgency: Tier 1 corridors (e.g., US 1, CR 510, CR 512) require immediate attention; Tier 2 (e.g., SR 60, 12th St) are medium priority; and Tier 3 (e.g., Oslo Rd, Roseland Rd) are lower priority.

5.2 AGENCY OUTREACH AND COORDINATION

The development of the LRTP included coordination with local agencies, adjacent MPOs (Space Coast TPO and St. Lucie TPO), and FDOT. Also, in order to understand the environmental mitigation opportunities and issues within the planning area, the MPO also conducted direct outreach to appropriate federal, state and local land management, resource, environmental, and historic preservation agencies. Consultative comments from responding agencies are included in **Appendix E**. It should be noted there are no designated Tribal lands within the boundaries of the MPO’s planning area. This direct outreach included the following:

- Indian River County
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- St. Johns River Water Management District
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
- Florida Department of Historical Resources
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service



Credit: Sarah Tolve/USFWS

CHAPTER 6

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION



6.0 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Performance targets are a foundational element of the LRTP’s planning framework, helping to evaluate progress toward long-term transportation goals. As outlined in Chapter 2 and the federally required System Performance Report (**Appendix F**), the MPO has adopted statewide performance targets established by FDOT and incorporated transit asset management (TAM) targets in coordination with local transit agencies. These targets guide investment decisions and project prioritization across the transportation network.

While Chapter 2 presents the policy and regulatory basis for performance-based planning, this chapter serves as a “report card” for the LRTP. It evaluates how well the plan performs against established measures and forecasts future outcomes. The tables that follow provide a snapshot of current system performance and anticipated trends, supporting transparency and continuous improvement in transportation planning for Indian River County.

6.1 FHWA GOAL PERFORMANCE

Performance Measures established through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) address each of the national planning goal areas. MPOs are required to conduct performance-based planning by setting data-driven performance targets for the performance measures and programmed transportation investments that are expected to contribute to achieving those targets. **Table 6-1** through **Table 6-3** present the adopted targets and thresholds as identified in Chapter 2 and includes a forecast for 2050 relative to each Performance Measure.

Table 6-1. Performance Measure 1 (PM1) – Safety

Safety Performance Measure	FDOT Statewide Safety Targets	Indian River County MPO Safety Targets	IRC 2050 Forecast
Number of Fatalities	0	0	Improved; Target not met
Number of Serious Injuries	0	0	Improved; Target not met
Rate of Fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	0	0	Improved; Target not met
Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	0	0	Improved; Target not met
Total Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	0	0	Improved; Target not met

Table 6-2 Performance Measure 2 (PM2) – Pavement and Bridge

Performance Measure	2023 Statewide Target	2025 Statewide Target	IRC 2050 Forecast
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good condition	50.00%	50.00%	Target met
Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in poor condition	10.00%	5.00%	Target met
Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition	60.00%	60.00%	Target met
Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition	5.00%	5.00%	Target met
Percent of non-Interstate pavements in good condition	40.00%	40.00%	Target met
Percent of non-Interstate pavements in poor condition	5.00%	5.00%	Target met

Table 6-3. Performance Measure 3 (PM3) – System Performance and Freight

Performance Measure	Target	IRC 2050 Forecast
Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable — Level of Travel Time Reliability (Interstate LOTTR)	≥ 70%	Maintained or Improved
Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable (Non-Interstate NHS LOTTR)	≥ 50%	Maintained or Improved
Freight travel time reliability	2.00	Maintained or Improved

6.2 IRC 2050 GOAL PERFORMANCE

To assess progress toward each LRTP goal, the MPO has established performance indicators and measures aligned with the plan’s objectives and policies. These indicators are evaluated at key milestones rather than annually. **Table 6-4** through **Table 6-9** present the forecasted performance for each goal through 2050, based on the adopted targets and thresholds from Chapter 2.

Table 6-4. Goal 1 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 1.01 – Maintain the adopted level of service standard for all functionally classified roads through the year 2050.	Policy 1.01.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan, consistent with the Interim Year Roadway Improvement Sets.	PI 1.01.1.1 – Percent of lane miles meeting the adopted level of service standard.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 1.02 – Maintain a 12-hour hurricane evacuation clearance time on roads designated as hurricane evacuation routes through the year 2050.	Policy 1.02.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan for roadways designated as hurricane evacuation routes.	PI 1.02.1.1 – Hurricane evacuation clearance time measured through actual event.	Maintained or Improved
		PI 1.02.1.2 – Lane miles of roadway improvements on hurricane evacuation routes.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 1.03 – Enhance the grid roadway network by constructing an average of two centerline miles of new roadway corridors each year from 2025 to 2050.	Policy 1.03.1 – Implement new corridor roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan.	PI 1.03.1.1 – Average annual centerline miles of new roadway corridors constructed during the period from 2025 to 2050.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 1.04 – Enhance the FDOT’s Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) by constructing one FEC railway flyover by 2050.	Policy 1.04.1 – Implement improvements to the SIS at the FEC Railroad by 2050.	PI 1.04.1 – New flyover at the FEC Railroad.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 1.05 – Optimize functionality and efficiency of existing infrastructure and ROW through 2050.	Policy 1.05.1 – Incorporate Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and/or Connected Vehicle architecture into all new roadway projects.	PI 1.05.1.1 – Number of new roadways that incorporate ITS and Connected Vehicle architecture.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 1.06 – Ensure that 50% of Person-Miles (Non-Interstate) and 75% of Person-Miles (Interstate) on the National Highway System are Reliable.	Policy 1.06.1 – Implement roadway improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan, consistent with the Interim Roadway Improvement Sets.	PM 1.06.1.1 – Percent of Person Trips that are Reliable (50% of Person-Miles (Non-Interstate) and 75% of Person-Miles (Interstate))	Maintained or Improved

Table 6-5. Goal 2 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 2.01 – Maintain Transit Quality and LOS “A” for reliability	Policy 2.01.1 – Make Capital and Operational improvements consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan.	PI 2.01.1.1 – Percentage of buses arriving within 5 minutes of schedule.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 2.02 – Maintain Transit Quality and LOS “B” for Service Coverage.	Policy 2.02.1 – Improve service coverage consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan.	PI 2.02.1.1 – System compliance with adopted level of service standard.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 2.03 – Expand weekday hours of service to 15 hours a day on at least one bus route every two years during the period from 2025 to 2050 so that all weekday bus routes operate at least 15 hours per day by 2050.	Policy 2.03.1 – Expand weekday hours of operation on fixed-route bus network consistent with the adopted Transit Development Plan.	PI 2.03.1.1 – Average number of weekday bus routes with 15 hours of service added during the period from 2025 to 2050.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 2.04 – Maintain Bike/Ped LOS “D” on 80% percent of roadways in Indian River County through 2050.	Policy 2.04.1 – Implement sidewalk improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.	PI 2.04.1.1 – Percentage of roadways meeting adopted level of service standard.	Maintained or Improved
	Policy 2.04.2 – Implement bicycle facility improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/ Pedestrian Plan.		
Objective 2.05 – Add an average of two miles of bicycle facilities on functionally classified roadways or trails each year during the period from 2025 to 2050.	Policy 2.05.1 – Implement bicycle facility improvements consistent with the adopted Bicycle/ Pedestrian Plan	PI 2.05.1.1 – Average annual number of new bicycle facilities added during the period from 2025 to 2050.	Maintained or Improved
	Policy 2.05.2 – Adapt abandoned railroad corridors, roadway alignments and military trails for bicycle facilities, wherever possible.		
Objective 2.06 – Enhance freight mobility by ensuring that the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index on the Interstate Highways is less than 2.00	Policy 2.06.1 – Implement the freight mobility improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan	PI 2.06.1.1 – TTTR on the Interstate Highway System (Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) index on the Interstate Highways is less than 2.00)	Maintained or Improved
Objective 2.07 – Increase the efficiency and convenience of connecting multiple modes by adding an average of one shelter or transfer facility per year through 2050.	Policy 2.07.1 – Add bus shelters and improve hubs consistent with the Transit Development Plan.	PI 2.07.1.1 – Number of new shelters/improved transit hubs	Maintained or Improved

Table 6-6. Goal 3 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 3.01 – Limit average increase in CO, HC, and NO emissions to less than 15 percent from the previous five-year period for each five-year period from 2025 to 2050.	Policy 3.01.1 – Implement the transportation improvements identified in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan.	PI 3.01.1.1 – Percent change in CO, HC, and NO emissions (in kilograms) for each five-year period from the base year for the period from 2025 to 2050.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 3.02 – Ensure that all collector roadways are less than six lanes through the year 2050.	Policy 3.02.1 – Implement the transportation improvements in the 2050 Cost Feasible Plan.	PI 3.02.1.1 – Centerline miles of collector roadways with six or more lanes.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 3.03 – Increase resiliency of transportation infrastructure.	Policy 3.03.1 – Incorporate higher elevations, increased drainage capacity, and more resilient construction materials as appropriate into new projects.	PI 3.03.1.1 – Percentage of new projects incorporating enhanced features.	Maintained or Improved

Table 6-7. Goal 4 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 4.01 – By 2050, reduce the number and rate of crash Fatalities to 0.	Policy 4.01.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan including Congestion Management Process plan.	PI 4.01.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of Fatalities.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 4.02 – Reduce the number and rate of Serious Injuries to 0 by 2050.	Policy 4.02.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan including Congestion Management Process plan.	PM 4.02.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of Serious Injuries.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 4.03 – Reduce the number and rate of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries to 0 by 2050.	Policy 4.03.1 – Implement intersection and other improvements related to safety as identified in the Cost Feasible Plan and Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.	PM 4.03.1.1 – Annual percent change in the number and rate of non-motorized crashes.	Maintained or Improved

Table 6-8. Goal 5 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 5.01 – Ensure that over 60% of the pavement area on the National Highway System (NHS) are rated “Good” by FDOT while less than 5 % are rated “Poor” by FDOT.	Policy 5.01.1 – Evaluate the structural integrity of pavement on the major road network and implement rehabilitation projects as appropriate in coordination with FDOT.	PM 5.01.1.1 – FDOT Pavement Condition Rating	Maintained or Improved
Objective 5.02 – Ensure that over 50% of the bridge deck area on the National Highway System (NHS) are rated “Good” by FDOT while less than 10% are rated “Poor” by FDOT.	Policy 5.02.01 – Evaluate the structural integrity of bridges on the major road network and implement rehabilitation projects as appropriate in coordination with FDOT.	PM 5.02.1.1 – FDOT Bridge Condition Rating	Maintained or Improved
Objective 5.03 – Provide adequate funding to maintain and operate the non-state highway system and multimodal infrastructure.	Policy 5.03.1 – Program on an annual basis appropriate funding for maintenance and operations.	PI 5.03.1.1 – Funding included for maintenance and operations.	Maintained or Improved

Table 6-9. Goal 6 Objectives, Policies, and Performance Measures & Indicators

Objectives	Policies	Performance Measures (PM) and Indicators (PI)	IRC 2050 Forecast
Objective 6.01 – Identify projects that can be funded for implementation within a 5-10 year time band.	Policy 6.01.1 – Prioritize and define a clear set of actionable projects that are eligible for funding within the 5-10 year timeframe, based on feasibility, impact, and alignment with long-term goals.	PM 6.02.1.1 – Number of projects identified for funding by the Plan interim year of 2040.	Maintained or Improved
Objective 6.02 – The plan will identify planning studies to prepare future projects for funding and implementation.	Policy 6.02.1 – Allocate resources for the identification and development of planning studies aimed at preparing future transportation projects for funding, ensuring that they meet regulatory and community needs.	PI 6.03.1.1 – Number of studies identified for funding.	Maintained or Improved

6.3 TRAVEL DEMAND

As previously discussed, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model (TCRPM) was utilized to identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the planning area. The model was also used to evaluate the performance of the plan against identified performance targets and indicators, as well as the forecasted performance of the roadway network. The travel demand model provides an indication of how effective the Cost Feasible Plan network is in managing congestion and travel delay. An overall analysis of volume/capacity (V/C) ratios for the roadway network was conducted to demonstrate the level of congestion expected in 2050. Maps depicting the 2050 roadway network are included on the following pages, including the number of annual average daily traffic (Figure 6-1) and V/C ratios (Figure 6-2).






Figure 6-1. Annual Average Daily Traffic (2050 Network)




Figure 6-2. Volume to Capacity (2050 Network)

CHAPTER 7

IMPLEMENTATION



7.0 IMPLEMENTATION

The IRC 2050 LRTP serves as a strategic guide for implementing transportation improvements over the next five years and beyond. Successful implementation will depend on continued collaboration among key partners, including Indian River County, local municipalities, FDOT District Four, transit providers, neighboring jurisdictions, other MPOs/TPOs, and the broader community. The MPO will work closely with these partners to secure funding and advance projects that address the county's evolving transportation needs.

As a central component of the MPO's planning and programming framework, the LRTP's Cost Feasible Plan informs the development of the annual Priority Projects Report (PPR). The PPR identifies projects for advancement into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which in turn feeds into FDOT's Five-Year Work Program. This process ensures that long-range planning goals are translated into actionable investments that support a safe, efficient, and multimodal transportation system.

7.1 PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

This LRTP is not a static document. LRTP changes can occur due to shifts in availability of funding or updated project priorities, among other reasons. FDOT provides MPOs guidance to implement amendments to the LRTP.

The MPO may need to revise the LRTP outside of the standard 5-year update cycle. The Code of Federal Regulations defines two types of revisions—*administrative modifications* and *amendments*.

An *administrative modification* is a minor revision to the LRTP or TIP. It generally includes minor changes to project/phase costs, funding sources, or project/phase initiation dates. Public review and comments are not required, and fiscal constraint demonstration is not necessary either.

An *amendment* is a major revision to the LRTP. Amendments include the addition or removal of projects from the plan, major changes to project costs, changes to major dates, or significant revisions to design concepts and scopes for existing projects. Amendments require re-demonstrating fiscal constraints as well as public review and comment in accordance with the LRTP amendment and Public Participation Process (PPP). Changes to projects that are considered illustrative do not require an amendment. An amendment requires revenue and cost estimates supporting the plan to use an inflation rate(s) to reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information.

The LRTP can be revised at any time. It is important to note that the MPO does not have to extend the planning horizon of the LRTP for administrative modifications or for amendments. Florida Statute requires that the Indian River County MPO Board adopt amendments to the LRTP by a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present. The amended long-range plan is to be distributed in accordance with the FDOT MPO Handbook requirements.

7.2 THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

The Indian River County MPO envisions a transportation system that strengthens local mobility and enhances regional connectivity. The 2050 LRTP addresses these needs by prioritizing high-value, community-focused improvements that promote safety, economic development, and multimodal access. A defining feature of this plan is its commitment to investing in transportation solutions that reflect and support the character of Indian River County.

The 2050 LRTP will guide MPO activities for the next five years, with the next update anticipated by December 2030. During this period, the MPO will work collaboratively with its partners to implement the plan's recommendations and advance projects that align with the community's long-term goals.



APPENDIX A

2050 LRTP CHECKLIST





LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) REVIEW CHECKLIST

MPO: [Indian River County](#)

LRTP Submittal Date:

Review #:

Date of Review: [October 20, 2025](#)Reviewed By: [Matthew Hansford](#)

The following LRTP Review Checklist is provided to assist in the review of the MPO's LRTP. This Review Checklist is to be completed by the MPO Liaison.

Section A – Federal Requirements

[23 CFR Part 450 – Planning Assistance and Standards](#)

A-1 ([23 CFR 450.324\(a\)](#))

- Does the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption? Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 1-1

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-2 ([23 CFR 450.324\(a\)](#))

- Does the LRTP address the planning factors described in [23 CFR 450.306\(b\)23](#)? Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance. Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-7 – 2-8, 4-14, 2-11 – 2-16

[Click here to enter comments](#)

- Risk and Resiliency: Does the LRTP improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation?

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-3 – 2-4, 2-7 – 2-9, 2-13 – 2-14, 2-16, 6-2, 6-4 – 6-5

[Click here to enter comments](#)

- Travel and Tourism: Does the LRTP enhance travel and tourism? Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-8 – 2-9, 4-17

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-3 ([23 CFR 450.324\(b\)](#))

1. Does the LRTP include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-3 – 2-5, 4-9, 4-16, 6-4 – 6-5

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-4 ([23 CFR 450.324\(c\)](#))

2. Was the requirement to update the LRTP at least every five years met? Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) and [2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

To be completed after resolution adoption

A-5 ([23 CFR 450.324\(d\)](#))

3. Did the MPO coordinate the development of the LRTP with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP)? See [2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Not Applicable | If yes, page number: xx

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-6 ([23 CFR 450.324\(e\)](#))

4. Was the LRTP updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity? Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 3-1 – 3-3, 6-7

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

A-7 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(1\)](#))

5. Does the LRTP include the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance. Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 3-1 – 3-3

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-8 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(2\)](#))

6. Does the LRTP include existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-5 – 4-10

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-9 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(3\)](#))

7. Does the LRTP include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with [23 CFR 450.306\(d\)](#)? Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-2 – 2-6, 2-11 – 2-16

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-10 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(4\)\(i\)](#))

8. Does the LRTP include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in [23 CFR 450.306\(d\)](#), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data? Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-11 – 2-16, Appendix F

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-11 ([23 CFR 450.306\(d\)\(4\)](#))

9. Did the MPO integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under [49 USC Chapter 53](#) by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:
- o (i) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in [23 USC 119\(e\)](#) and the Transit Asset Management Plan, as discussed in [49 USC 5326](#);
 - o (ii) Applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP, as specified in [23 USC 148](#);
 - o (iii) The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, as specified in [49 USC 5329\(d\)49](#);
 - o (iv) Other safety and security planning and review processes, plans, and programs, as appropriate;
 - o (v) The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program performance plan in [23 USC 149\(l\)](#), as applicable;
 - o (vi) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the [State Freight Plan \(MAP-21 section 1118\)](#);
 - o (vii) The congestion management process, as defined in [23 CFR 450.322](#), if applicable; and
 - o (viii) Other State transportation plans and transportation processes required as part of a performance-based program.

Please see the “New Requirements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) and [2012 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-6 – 2-16, Appendix F

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-12 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(5\)](#))

10. Does the LRTP include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-3, 2-5, 4-5, 4-10, 6-4

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-13 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(6\)](#))

11. Does the LRTP include consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-5, 2-11, 6-5

Indian River County is in a not designated as a nonattainment area

A-14 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(7\)](#))

12. Does the LRTP include assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters?

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-2, 2-4 – 2-5, 2-7 – 2-9, 2-12, 6-3, 6-5

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-15 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(8\)](#))

13. Does the LRTP include transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in [23 USC 101\(a\)](#), and associated transit improvements, as described in [49 USC 5302\(a\)49](#)?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-17

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-16 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(9\)](#))

14. Does the LRTP describe all proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates? Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-9 – 4-10, 4-14

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-17 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(10\)](#))

15. Does the LRTP include a discussion of the types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the LRTP? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-4, 5-2

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-18 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)](#))

16. Does the LRTP include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted LRTP can be implemented? Please see the “Fiscal Constraint” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-9 – 4-10, 4-14

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-19 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)\(i\)](#))

17. Does the LRTP include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-2 – 4-3, 4-14

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-20 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)\(ii\)](#))

18. Did the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support LRTP implementation, as required under [23 CFR 450.314\(a\)](#)? Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-2 – 4-3

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-21 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)\(iii\)](#))

19. Does the financial plan include recommendations on additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the LRTP, and, in the case of new funding sources, identify strategies for ensuring their availability?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-1

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-22 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)\(iv\)](#))

20. Does the LRTP's revenue and cost estimates use inflation rates that reflect year of expenditure dollars, based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s)?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-3, Appendix D

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-23 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(11\)\(vi\)](#))

21. Does the financial plan address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

Not Applicable | If yes, page number: xx

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-24 ([23 CFR 450.324\(f\)\(12\)](#))

22. Does the LRTP include pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with [23 USC 217\(g\)](#)?

Yes | If yes, page number: 4-6 – 4-8

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-25 ([23 CFR 450.324\(h\)](#))

23. Does the LRTP integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, or an Interim Agency Safety Plan? Please see the “Technical Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-11, 2-16

[FDOT Strategic Highway Safety Plan and Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan mentioned](#)

A-26 ([23 CFR 450.324\(g\)\(1\)](#))

24. Does the LRTP identify the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the LRTP?

Yes | If yes, page number: 3-1 – 3-3

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-27 ([23 CFR 450.324\(j\)](#))

25. Did the MPO provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the LRTP using the MPO’s adopted Public Participation Plan (PPP) developed under [23 CFR 450.316\(a\)](#)?

Yes | If yes, page number: 5-1 – 5-2

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-28 ([23 CFR 450.324\(k\)](#), [23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(1\)\(iv\)](#))

26. Did the MPO publish or otherwise make readily available the LRTP for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web? Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance. Please see the “Administrative Topics” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 5-1 – 5-2

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-29 ([23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(1\)\(j\)](#))

27. Did the MPO provide adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed LRTP? Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 5-1 – 5-2

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-30 ([23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(1\)\(vii\)](#))

28. In developing the LRTP, did the MPO seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems such as low-income and minority households? Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance. Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 5-1

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-31 ([23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(1\)\(vi\)](#), [23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(2\)](#))

29. Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the LRTP? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft LRTP, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final LRTP? Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 5-1 – 5-2

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

A-32 ([23 CFR 450.316\(a\)\(1\)\(viii\)](#))

30. Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final LRTP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts? Please see the “Stakeholder and Coordination Input” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Not Applicable | If yes, page number: xx

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-33 ([23 CFR 450.316\(b\)](#))

31. Did the MPO consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPO planning area that are affected by transportation, or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities in the development of the LRTP? Please see the “Proactive Improvements” section of the [2018 FHWA LRTP Expectations Letter](#) for guidance.

Yes | If yes, page number: 2-11, 4-15 – 4-17

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-34 ([23 CFR 450.316\(c\)](#))

32. If the MPO planning area includes Indian Tribal lands, did the MPO appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the LRTP?

Not Applicable | If yes, page number: xx

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-35 ([23 CFR 450.316\(d\)](#))

33. If the MPO planning area includes Federal public lands, did the MPO appropriately involve Federal land management agencies in the development of the LRTP?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [5-2](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-36 ([23 CFR 450.316\(e\)](#))

34. In U.S. Census designated urban areas of more than 50,000 people that are served by more than one MPO, is there written agreement among the MPOs, the State, and public transportation operator(s) describing how the metropolitan transportation planning processes will be coordinated to assure the development of consistent plans across the planning area boundaries, particularly in cases in which a proposed transportation investment extends across those boundaries?

[Not Applicable](#) | If yes, page number: [xx](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

A-37

35. Did the MPO consider projects and strategies that will promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local housing patterns (in addition to planned growth and economic development patterns) in the development of the LRTP?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [3-4](#)

[No mention of housing patterns](#)

Section B – State Requirements

[Florida Statutes: Title XXVI – Public Transportation, Chapter 339, Section 175](#)

B-1 ([s.339.175\(1\), \(5\), and \(7\), FS](#))

36. Are the prevailing principles in [s. 334.046\(1\), FS](#) – preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida's economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the LRTP?

Yes | If yes, page number: [2-3 – 2-5, 2-7 – 2-10, 2-12 – 2-13, 3-1, 6-4](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-2 ([s.339.175\(1\) and \(7\)\(a\), FS](#))

37. Does the LRTP give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities?

Yes | If yes, page number: [2-2, 4-8, 6-3](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-3 ([s.339.175\(5\) and \(7\), FS](#))

38. Is the LRTP consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved comprehensive plans for local governments in the MPO's metropolitan planning area?

Yes | If yes, page number: [3-4](#)

No mention of local government comprehensive plans. Future land use maps discussed in population and employment projection section.

B-4 ([s.339.175\(1\) and \(7\) FS](#))

39. Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the development of the LRTP?

Yes | If yes, page number: [2-4, 6-5](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-5 ([s.339.175\(7\)\(a\), FS](#))

40. Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered in the development of the LRTP?

Yes | If yes, page number: [2-9 – 2-10](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-6 ([s.339.175\(7\)\(c\), FS](#))

41. Does the LRTP assess capital investment and other measures necessary to 1) ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system, including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities; and 2) make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods?

Yes | If yes, page number: [2-3, 2-5, 4-5 – 4-6, 4-8, 6-4, 6-6, Appendix B](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-7 ([s.339.175\(7\)\(d\), FS](#))

42. Does the LRTP indicate, as appropriate, proposed transportation enhancement activities, including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, scenic easements, landscaping, historic preservation, mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff, and control of outdoor advertising?

Yes | If yes, page number: [4-6 – 4-8, 5-2 Appendix B](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

B-8 ([s.339.175\(13\) FS](#))

43. Was the LRTP approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present?

Yes | If yes, page number: [p. i; 7-1](#)

[“\[Resolution Text Here\]”; statute requires recorded vote for amendments; adoption vote to be recorded at the meeting](#)

Section C – Proactive Recommendations

C-1 ([23 CFR 450.306\(b\)\(9\)](#))

44. Does the LRTP attempt to improve the resilience and reliability of the transportation system or mitigate the impacts of stormwater on surface transportation?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [2-4, 2-8 – 2-9, 6-5](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

C-2

45. Does the LRTP proactively identify climate adaptation strategies including—but not limited to—assessing specific areas of vulnerability, identifying strategies to reduce emissions by promoting alternative modes of transportation, or devising specific climate adaptation policies to reduce vulnerability?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [2-4, 2-7 – 2-10, 5-2](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

C-3

46. Does the LRTP consider strategies to promote inter-regional connectivity to accommodate both current and future mobility needs?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [4-1, 4-17, 7-2](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

C-4

47. Does the MPO consider the short- and long-term effects of population growth and or shifts on the transportation network in the development of the LRTP?

[Yes](#) | If yes, page number: [3-1 – 3-3](#)

[Click here to enter comments](#)

APPENDIX B

FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OVERVIEW



Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Roadway Capacity Projects

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	PDE Timeframe	PDE Cost	PDE Source	PE/DES Timeframe	PE/DES Cost	PE/DES Source	ROW Timeframe	ROW Cost	ROW Source	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST Source	RRU Timeframe	RRU Cost	RRU Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
2308793	82 nd Ave	26 th St	69 th St	Y	FDOT	5.0	New 2 Lane	\$5,490,314							2026	\$100,000	ACSM									
															2026-2030	\$3,780,017	SA									
															2026-2029	\$1,215,059	SM									
															2026-2028	\$1,428,926	SN									
4513681	Aviation Blvd	43 rd Ave	SR 5/US 1	N	FDOT	2.105	Widen to 4 Lane and Add Improvements	\$-	2028	\$550,000	CM															
									2028-2029	\$3,055,000	SA															
4416921	CR 510	58 th Ave	E SR 5/US 1	Y	FDOT	0.6	Widen to 4 Lane	\$5,948,860							2029	\$1,801,748	SL									
															2029	\$565,400	SN									
4056067	CR 510	CR 512	87 th St	N	FDOT	0.978	Widen to 4 Lane	\$43,811,064										2026	\$302,385	ACPR						
																		2026	\$79,260	SA						
																		2026	\$148,320	SL						
																		2026	\$640,239	SL						
4056063	CR 510	W of 82 nd Ave	58 th Ave	Y	FDOT	3.26	Widen to 4 Lane	\$43,811,064							2026	\$1,710,192	ACCM									
															2027	\$590,581	CM									
															2026	\$291,600	LF									
															2026	\$1,053,719	SA									
															2026-2028	\$4,444,674	SL									
															2026	\$530,362	SN									
4056068	CR 510	87 th St	W of 82 nd Ave	N	FDOT	0.871	Widen to 4 Lane	\$43,811,064										2030	\$2,513,011	CN	2029-2030	\$2,810,450	LF			
																		2030	\$16,303,808	SA						
																		2030	\$2,000,000	SL						
																		2030	\$389,302	SM						
																		2030	\$701,400	SN						
4130485	I-95	Oslo Road		Y	FDOT	1.01	Landscaping (Interchange)	\$-				2028	\$19,958	DIH				2030	\$1,384,227	DDR						
												2028	\$249,480	DS				2030	\$58,304	DIH						
4315211	Oslo Road	SW 82 nd Ave	58 th Ave	Y	FDOT	2.683	Widen to 4 Lane	\$63,023,987							2027	\$316,063	SA									
4416931	US 1	Aviation Blvd		N	FDOT	0.01	Intersection Improvements	\$5,269,971				2026	\$1,653,360	DDR	2026-2030	\$5,742,965	DDR									
												2026	\$300,000	SL	2027-2028	\$108,000	DIH									

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trail Projects

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
4529951	43 rd Ave	45 th St	49 th St	N	FDOT	0.503	Sidewalk Construction	\$5,000	2027	\$42,000	LF			
									2027	\$361,305	TALL			
									2027-2028	\$1,165,877	TALT			
4489951	Trans FL RR	Broadway St	Grant Ave	N	FDOT	0.9	Bike Path/Trail	\$1,855,609	2026	\$87,952	LF			
									2026	\$165,945	TALL			
									2026	\$97,583	TALT			

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Aviation Projects

FM Number	Airport	SIS	Agency	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	CAP Timeframe	CAP Cost	CAP Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
4533791	Sebastian	N	N/A	Construction Access Road and Uti. West	\$-	2027-2028	\$1,600,000	DPTO			
						2027-2028	\$400,000	LF			
4550111	Sebastian	N	N/A	Construction Golf Apron Phase 1	\$-	2027	\$75,000	DPTO			
						2027	\$1,350,000	FAA			
						2027	\$75,000	LF			
4533651	Sebastian	N	N/A	Construction Terminal Apron Expansion	\$-	2026	\$960,000	DPTO			
						2026	\$240,000	LF			
4495941	Sebastian	N	N/A	Construction Aircraft Wash Rack	\$-	2028	\$100,000	DPTO			
						2028	\$25,000	LF			
4481131	Sebastian	N	N/A	Construction Taxiway Golf	\$987,600	2026	\$790,080	DPTO			
						2026	\$197,520	LF			
4548181	Sebastian	N	N/A	Engineering Design and Golf Apron Phase 1	\$-	2026	\$12,500	DPTO			
						2026	\$225,000	FAA			
						2026	\$12,500	LF			
4549981	Sebastian	N	N/A	Update Airport Master Plan	\$-	2028	\$25,000	DPTO			
						2028	\$450,000	FAA			
						2028	\$25,000	LF			
4515611	Sebastian	N	N/A	Design Access Road & Utility	\$-	2026	\$200,000	DPTO			
						2026	\$50,000	LF			
4515541	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (Design)	\$-	2026	\$10,000	DPTO			
						2026	\$180,000	FAA			
						2026	\$10,000	LF			
4533661	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Airfield Electrical Upgrades	\$-	2026	\$1,440,000	DPTO			
						2026	\$360,000	LF			
4550101	Vero Beach	N	N/A	AWOS Relocation	\$-	2027	\$280,000	DPTO			
						2027	\$70,000	LF			
4515381	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Rehabilitate Airport Drain System	\$-	2028	\$100,000	DPTO			
						2028	\$1,800,000	FAA			
						2028	\$100,000	LF			
4533831	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (Construction)	\$-	2027	\$110,000	DPTO			
						2027	\$1,980,000	FAA			
						2027	\$110,000	LF			
4515531	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Replace Hangar Roof	\$-	2026	\$800,000	DPTO			
						2026	\$200,000	LF			
4548971	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Extend/Mark/Light Taxiway E	\$-	2029	\$1,300,000	DPTO			
						2029	\$3,400,000	FAA			
						2029	\$1,300,000	LF			
4549021	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Extend/Mark/Light Taxiway E	\$-	2028	\$1,120,000	DPTO			
						2028	\$280,000	LF			
4549011	Vero Beach	N	N/A	Extend Runway 4/22 Phase 1 Env	\$-	2028	\$20,000	DPTO			
						2028	\$360,000	FAA			
						2028	\$20,000	LF			

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 O&M and Safety Projects

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	PDE Timeframe	PDE Cost	PDE Source	PE/DES Timeframe	PE/DES Cost	PE/DES Source	ROW Timeframe	ROW Cost	ROW Source	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST source	RRU Timeframe	RRU Cost	RRU Source	INC Timeframe	INC Cost	INC Source	MNT Timeframe	MNT Cost	MNT Source	OPS Timeframe	OPS Cost	OPS Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs				
4442703	43 rd Ave	1 st ST SW	6 th St	N	IRC	0.756	Resurfacing	\$-										2028 - 2029	\$3,203,550	GRSC																			
																		2028	\$1,067,850	LF																			
4442702	43 rd Ave	6 th St	12 th St	N	IRC	0.764	Resurfacing	\$-										2026	\$1,415,525	GRSC																			
																		2026	\$1,318,900	LF																			
																		2026	\$487,805	SCED																			
																		2026	\$496,670	SCW R																			
4497001	43 rd Ave	5 th St SW	1 st St SW	N	IRC	0.491	Resurfacing	\$-										2030	\$784,000	GRSC																			
																		2030	\$773,250	LF																			
																		2030	\$512,821	SCED																			
																		2030	\$518,974	SCOP																			
																		2030	\$503,955	SCW R																			
4533271	45 th St	58 th Ave	43 rd Ave	N	FDO T	0.924	Bike Ln/Sidewalk Retrofit	\$-	2026	\$300,000	SA	2027	\$400,000	SA																									
4493321	CR 512	I-95	W of 106 th Ave	N	FDO T	0.381	Widen/Resurfac e (Interchange)	\$611,734										2027	\$2,567,464	SA																			
4512932				N	FDO T		IRC Mowing	\$-																		2026 - 2028	\$975,000	D											
2336662				N	FDO T		IRC State Hwy System Bridges	\$6,552,054																		2026 - 2028	\$120,000	D											
2336661				N	FDO T		IRC State Hwy System Roadway	\$6,552,054																		2026 - 2029	\$880,000	D											
2342422				Y	FDO T		Interstate Highway Bridges	\$671,800																		2026 - 2028	\$75,000	D											
2344241				Y	FDO T		Interstate Highways Maintenance	\$671,800																		2026 - 2029	\$60,000	D											
4484431	SR 60	SR 60 to US 1	IR Blvd & 11 th Ave	N	FDO T	3.11	Resurfacing	\$1,141,516										2029	\$2,517,962	ACNR	2028	\$200,000	DS																
																		2029	\$4,560,215	DDR																			
																		2029	\$84,967	DIH																			
																		2029	\$150,642	LF																			
4484441	SR 60	E of Ft Drum Wildlife Entrance	W of CR 512	Y	FDO T	7.14	Resurfacing	\$934,084										2030	\$4,886,743	ACNR																			
																		2030	\$2,131,084	DDR																			
																		2030	\$101,027	DIH																			
																		2030	\$9,370,481	DS																			
4456181	SR A1A	Sebastian Inlet Bridge		N	FDO T	1.058	Bridge Replacement	\$14,079,646							2026	\$3,581,600	ACBR	2026	\$74,160	ACBR				2030	\$1,000,000	DDR													
																		2026	\$105,127,508	ACBR																			
																		2026	\$17,813,196	GFBR																			
																		2026	\$2,053,430	LF																			
				N			Resurfacing	\$1,901,689										2027	\$12,983,008	DDR																			

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	PDE Timeframe	PDE Cost	PDE Source	PE/DES Timeframe	PE/DES Cost	PE/DES Source	ROW Timeframe	ROW Cost	ROW Source	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST Source	RRU Timeframe	RRU Cost	RRU Source	INC Timeframe	INC Cost	INC Source	MNT Timeframe	MNT Cost	MNT Source	OPS Timeframe	OPS Cost	OPS Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs			
4498181	SR A1A	IRC/St. Lucie County Line	Jasmine Ln		FDOT	5.459												2027	\$88,152	DIH																		
4456182	SR A1A	Sand Dollar Ln	S of Sebastian Inlet Bridge	N	FDOT	6.55	Resurfacing	\$14,079,646										2026	\$3,016,539	ACNR																		
4515841				N	IRC		Traffic Signal Maintenance	\$-																	2028 - 2030	\$2,146,345	D											
4278044				N	IRC		Traffic Signal Maintenance	\$1,934,590																					2026 - 2027	\$430,549	DDR							
																																2026 - 2027	\$465,006	DITS				
4498121	US 1	N of 87 th St	S of Sebastian Blvd	N	FDOT	4.222	Resurfacing	\$1,392,606										2027	\$6,942,827	DDR																		

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Transit and TD Projects

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Funds	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	OPS Timeframe	OPS Cost	OPS Source	CAP Timeframe	CAP Cost	CAP Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
4071906				N	IRC		FDOT Block Grant & FTA 5307	Operating/Administrative Assistance	\$1,500,888	2026-2029	\$3,207,230	DDR						
										2030	\$851,840	DPTO						
										2026-2030	\$4,059,070	LF						
										2026-2030	\$12,500,000	FTA						
4071902				N	IRC		FTA 5307	Purchase Vehicle/Equipment	\$1,500,888				2026-2030	\$20,000,000	FTA			
4457281				N	IRC		FTA 5339	Capital for Fixed Route	\$1,823,325				2026-2030	\$1,200,000	FTA			
4358461				N	IRC		FDOT Transit Corridor Grant	Operating for Fixed Route	\$1,161,299	2026	\$19,327	DDR						
										2026	\$130,673	DPTO						
4071824				N	IRC		FTA 5311	Operating/Administrative Assistance	\$199,330	2026-2030	\$579,426	DU						
										2026-2030	\$579,426	LF						

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Planning Projects

FM Number	On Street	From Street	To Street	SIS	Agency	Distance	Improvement	Prior Year Costs	Plan Timeframe	Plan Cost	Plan Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
4393275				Y	IRC MPO		IR FY25-26 UPWP	\$969,467	2026	\$603,825	PL			
4393276				N	IRC MPO		IR FY27-28 UPWP	\$969,467	2027-2028	\$1,207,650	PL			
4393277				N	IRC MPO		IR FY29-30 UPWP	\$969,467	2029-2030	\$1,207,650	PL			

Draft TIP FY 2025/2026 – 2029/2030 Capital Improvement Projects

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement	Fully Funded?	PE/DES Timeframe	PE/DES Cost	PE/DES Source	ROW Timeframe	ROW Cost	ROW Source	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
1st Street SW	27th Ave		Left Turn Lane/Traffic Signal	Y	2025	\$50,000					2026	\$1,541,920				
8th St	66th Ave	74th Ave	Reconstruction	Y	2025	\$450,000		2026-2027	\$2,500,000		2027-2028	\$6,000,000				
8th St	74th Ave	82nd Ave	Reconstruction	Y	2025	\$450,000		2026-2027	\$2,500,000		2027-2028	\$6,000,000				
16th St	58th Ave		Intersection Improvement	N	2029	\$100,000										
17th Street SW	27th Ave	43rd Ave		Y	2027	\$300,000					2027-2028	\$3,200,000				
20th Ave	8th St	12th St	Sidewalk East Side	Y	2025	\$400,000					2026	\$2,000,000				
26th St	43rd Ave		Intersection Improvement	N				2025-2027	\$1,500,000		2028-2029	\$4,500,000				
26th St	43rd Ave	58th Ave	4/5 Lanes (1 mile)	N				2025-2029	\$2,500,000		2029	\$4,000,000				
26th St	58th Ave	66th Ave	4/5 Lanes (1 mile)	N				2025-2029	\$2,500,000							
27th Ave	Oslo Road		NB Right & Long Left		2026	\$500,000					2027-2028	\$4,000,000				
37th St	IR Blvd		Intersection Improvement	N	2026	\$300,000					2026-2027	\$4,200,000				
Aviation Blvd	US 1	37th & 41st St	Extension		2025	\$900,000		2026-2027	\$5,000,000							
41st St	32nd Ave	US 1	Sidewalk North Side		2026	\$50,000					2029	\$500,000				
41st St	US 1		Intersection Improvement/Old Dixie	Y	2026	\$50,000		2025-2026	\$900,000		2027-2028	\$1,750,000				
43rd Ave	5th St SW	1st St SW	Bridge Replacement/Pedestrian Crosswalk	Y	2027	\$100,000					2027-2028	\$5,625,000				
43rd Ave	5th St SW	1st St SW	Pedestrian & Bike Access Improvement	N	2029	\$300,000										
43rd Ave	1st St SW	6th St	Pedestrian & Bike Access Improvement	Y	2025	\$300,000					2028-2029	\$4,271,400				
43rd Ave	6th St	12th St	Pedestrian & Bike Access Improvement	N	2025	\$300,000					2026	\$2,400,000				
43rd Ave	45th St	49th St	Sidewalks Both Sides		2025	\$150,000					2027	\$1,569,182				
45th St	US 1		Left Turn Lane	Y	2025	\$50,000					2026-2027	\$2,114,290				
49th St & 28th Ct	FS 12 & 47th St	Old Dixie & 49th St	Sidewalks North & Both Sides	N	2027	\$200,000										
49th St	US 1		Intersection Improvement	Y	2025	\$40,000		2025-2027	\$900,000		2028-2029	\$1,750,000				
53rd St	58th Ave	66th Ave	Widening 900 ft 4 Lane	N							2026-2027	\$4,000,000				
53rd St	58th Ave W	66th Ave	Widening 1,545 ft Upgrade to 4 Lane	N				2025-2029	\$2,500,000		2028-2029	\$2,000,000				
53rd St	58th Ave W	66th Ave	Widening 2,745 ft 4 Lane	N				2027-2028	\$1,000,000		2027-2028	\$2,000,000				
58th Ave	33rd St		Left Turn Lanes	Y	2027	\$200,000		2025-2027	\$650,000		2028	\$1,000,000				
58th Ave	37th St		Left Turn Lanes	Y	2026	\$100,000		2025	\$250,000		2027	\$1,000,000				
58th Ave	77th St		Intersection Improvement	N	2025	\$125,000					2026	\$1,000,000				
66th Ave	49th St	69th St	4 Lanes (2.5 miles)	Y							2025	\$6,000,000				
66th Ave	69th St	85th St	4 Lanes (2.0 miles)	Y							2025-2026	\$13,435,804				
82nd Ave			Bridge Replacement - Temporary Culvert	N							2025	\$350,000				

On Street	From Street	To Street	Improvement	Fully Funded?	PE/DES Timeframe	PE/DES Cost	PE/DES Source	ROW Timeframe	ROW Cost	ROW Source	CST Timeframe	CST Cost	CST Source	Other Costs	Total TIP Cost	Future Year Costs
CR 510	CR 512	US 1	4 Lanes	Y	2025	\$1,000,000										
CR 512	Willow St	I-95	4 Lanes	N	2027	\$1,000,000										
Highland Drive			Sidewalk	Y	2025	\$125,000					2026	\$750,000				
IR Blvd	17th St Bridge	US 1	Pedestrian & Bike Access Improvement	Y							2025-2027	\$7,700,000				
			Miscellaneous ROW Acquisition	N				2025-2029	\$1,250,000							
64th Ave	64th Ave	Wabasso Park	Sidewalk Extension	Y				2025	\$50,000		2026	\$400,000				
2nd St	Old Dixie Hwy	20th Ave	Sidewalks (1.25 miles)	Y	2025	\$100,000		2026	\$100,000		2027	\$500,000				
			Sidewalks & Designated Bike Lanes	Y	2025	\$50,000					2025-2029	\$1,125,000				

APPENDIX C

COST FEASIBLE PROJECTS IN PRESENT-DAY VALUE (PDV)



2050 LRTP Roadway Cost Feasible Plan (Present Day Value, 2025 Dollars)

Indian River County MPO

2050 Capacity Needs

On Street	From Street	To Street	Mi.	Improv Type	PE Cost (PDV)	PE Time	PE Source	DES Cost (PDV)	DES Time	DES Source	ROW Cost (PDV)	ROW Time	ROW Source	CST Cost (PDV)	CST Time	CST Source		
CR 510	W OF 82ND AVE	58TH AVE	3.02	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 14,796,164	2031 – 2035	Fed/State		
CR 510	58TH AVE	US 1	0.60	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 9,683,500	2031 – 2035	Fed/State	\$ 93,019,600	2031 – 2035	Mix		
53RD ST	66TH AVE	58 AVE	1.03	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 10,183,897	2036 – 2040	Local		
US 1	53RD ST	CR 510	4.32	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 32,125,412	2036 – 2040	Fed/State	\$ 40,156,765	2041 – 2050	Mix		
AVIATION BLVD EXT	US 1	35 LN	0.89	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 8,086,797	2041 – 2050	Local		
82 AVE	26TH ST	69TH ST	5.02	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 6,524,002	2036 – 2040	Mix	\$ 32,833,580	2041 – 2050	Mix		
82 AVE	69TH ST	CR 510	2.02	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 8,310,845	2041 – 2050	Mix	\$ 11,872,636	2041 – 2050	Mix		
82 AVE	CR 510	CONCHA DR	0.97	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 441,131	2036 – 2040		\$ 882,262	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 6,175,833	2041 – 2050	Mix	\$ 8,822,618	2041 – 2050	Mix		
AVIATION BLVD	43RD AVE	US 1	1.95	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			\$ 2,239,869	2031 – 2035	Local	\$ 15,679,085	2036 – 2040	Local	\$ 22,398,692	2041 – 2050	Local		
CR 512	WILLOW ST	I-95	2.45	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 1,406,343	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 2,812,686	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 19,688,801	2036 – 2040	Fed/State	\$ 28,126,858	2041 – 2050	Fed/State		
26TH ST	66TH AVE	58TH AVE	1.02	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 1,500,000	2041 – 2050	Local	\$ 11,694,065	2041 – 2050	Local		
26TH ST	58TH AVE	43RD AVE	1.00	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 1,500,000	2041 – 2050	Local	\$ 11,428,901	2041 – 2050	Local		
INDIAN RIVER BOULEVARD	US1/4TH STREET	37TH STREET	3.71	STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENTS	Estimate in CST phase inclusive of potential prior phases.									\$ 10,000,000	2041 – 2050	Local		
CR 512	I-95	CR 510	2.56	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	\$ 1,188,910	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 2,377,821	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 16,644,744	TBD		\$ 23,778,206	TBD			
43RD AVE	ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE	18 ST	5.28	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 3,029,683	2041 – 2050	State	\$ 6,059,366	2041 – 2050	State	\$ 42,415,562	TBD		\$ 60,593,660	TBD			
FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSCEOLA COUNTY LINE	9.94	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	Estimated total of \$575,517,589 for all phases within Indian River County													
53RD ST	82 AVE	66TH AVE	1.99	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 906,884	TBD		\$ 1,813,769	TBD		\$ 12,696,381	TBD		\$ 18,137,687	TBD			
12TH STREET	74 AVE	66 AVE	1.00	IMPROVED 2 LANES	\$ 509,195	TBD		\$ 1,018,390	TBD		\$ 7,128,728	TBD		\$ 10,183,897	TBD			
5TH ST SW	20TH AVE	OLD DIXIE HWY	1.42	IMPROVED 2 LANES	\$ 727,971	TBD		\$ 1,455,941	TBD		\$ 10,191,587	TBD		\$ 14,559,410	TBD			
66TH AVENUE	CR 510	BARBER STREET	0.80	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 459,938	TBD		\$ 919,876	TBD		\$ 6,439,133	TBD		\$ 9,198,762	TBD			
ROSELAND RD	CR 512	US 1	4.70	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 2,695,700	TBD		\$ 5,391,400	TBD		\$ 37,739,797	TBD		\$ 53,913,996	TBD			
27 AVE SW	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSLO RD	2.01	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 1,155,157	TBD		\$ 2,310,313	TBD		\$ 16,172,194	TBD		\$ 23,103,134	TBD			
SW 58 AVE	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSLO RD	2.59	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 1,181,131	TBD		\$ 2,362,263	TBD		\$ 16,535,839	TBD		\$ 23,622,628	TBD			

1. Reflective of unfunded costs remaining beyond the 5-year Transportation Improvement Program timeframe (FY 2025/26-2029/30)

2. Estimated Indian River County portion (9.94 miles) of total project estimate \$2.375B

APPENDIX D

COST FEASIBLE PROJECTS IN YEAR OF
EXPENDITURE (YOE) COST



2050 LRTP Roadway Cost Feasible Plan (Year of Expenditure)

Indian River County MPO

2050 Capacity Needs

On Street	From Street	To Street	Mi.	Improv Type	PE Cost (YOE)	PE Time	PE Source	DES Cost (YOE)	DES Time	DES Source	ROW Cost (YOE)	ROW Time	ROW Source	CST Cost (YOE)	CST Time	CST Source		
CR 510	W OF 82ND AVE	58TH AVE	3.02	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 31,006,375	2031 – 2035	Fed/State		
CR 510	58TH AVE	US 1	0.60	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 12,491,715	2031 – 2035	Fed/State	\$ 119,995,284	2031 – 2035	Mix		
53RD ST	66TH AVE	58 AVE	1.03	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 20,876,988	2036 – 2040	Local		
US 1	53RD ST	CR 510	4.32	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 50,115,643	2036 – 2040	Fed/State	\$ 77,904,125	2041 – 2050	Mix		
AVIATION BLVD EXT	US 1	35 LN	0.89	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 15,688,387	2041 – 2050	Local		
82 AVE	26TH ST	69TH ST	5.02	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 10,177,443	2036 – 2040	Mix	\$ 63,697,145	2041 – 2050	Mix		
82 AVE	69TH ST	CR 510	2.02	NEW 2 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 16,123,040	2041 – 2050	Mix	\$ 23,032,914	2041 – 2050	Mix		
82 AVE	CR 510	CONCHA DR	0.97	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 688,164	2036 – 2040		\$ 1,376,328	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 11,981,116	2041 – 2050	Mix	\$ 17,115,879	2041 – 2050	Mix		
AVIATION BLVD	43RD AVE	US 1	1.95	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			\$ 2,889,431	2031 – 2035	Local	\$ 24,459,372	2036 – 2040	Local	\$ 43,453,463	2041 – 2050	Local		
CR 512	WILLOW ST	I-95	2.45	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 2,193,895	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 4,387,790	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 30,714,529	2036 – 2040	Fed/State	\$ 54,566,105	2041 – 2050	Fed/State		
26TH ST	66TH AVE	58TH AVE	1.02	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 2,910,000	2041 – 2050	Local	\$ 22,686,486	2041 – 2050	Local		
26TH ST	58TH AVE	43RD AVE	1.00	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	Complete/Committed			Complete/Committed			\$ 2,910,000	2041 – 2050	Local	\$ 22,172,069	2041 – 2050	Local		
INDIAN RIVER BOULEVARD	US1/4TH STREET	37TH STREET	3.71	STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENTS	Estimate in CST phase inclusive of potential prior phases.									\$ 19,400,000	2041 – 2050	Local		
CR 512	I-95	CR 510	2.56	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	\$ 1,854,700	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 3,709,400	2036 – 2040	State	\$ 34,121,726	TBD		\$ 48,745,322	TBD			
43RD AVE	ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE	18 ST	5.28	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 5,877,585	2041 – 2050	State	\$ 11,755,170	2041 – 2050	State	\$ 86,951,903	TBD		\$ 124,217,004	TBD			
FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSCEOLA COUNTY LINE	9.94	WIDEN 4 TO 6 LANES	Estimated total of \$575,517,589 for all phases within Indian River County													
53RD ST	82 AVE	66TH AVE	1.99	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 1,414,740	TBD		\$ 2,829,479	TBD		\$ 24,630,979	TBD		\$ 35,187,113	TBD			
12TH STREET	74 AVE	66 AVE	1.00	IMPROVED 2 LANES	\$ 1,043,849	TBD		\$ 2,087,699	TBD		\$ 14,613,892	TBD		\$ 20,876,988	TBD			
5TH ST SW	20TH AVE	OLD DIXIE HWY	1.42	IMPROVED 2 LANES	\$ 1,492,340	TBD		\$ 2,984,679	TBD		\$ 20,892,754	TBD		\$ 29,846,791	TBD			
66TH AVENUE	CR 510	BARBER STREET	0.80	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 942,873	TBD		\$ 1,885,746	TBD		\$ 13,200,224	TBD		\$ 18,857,462	TBD			
ROSELAND RD	CR 512	US 1	4.70	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 5,526,185	TBD		\$ 11,052,369	TBD		\$ 77,366,584	TBD		\$ 110,523,692	TBD			
27 AVE SW	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSLO RD	2.01	WIDEN 2 TO 4 LANES	\$ 2,368,071	TBD		\$ 4,736,143	TBD		\$ 33,152,998	TBD		\$ 47,361,425	TBD			
SW 58 AVE	ST LUCIE COUNTY LINE	OSLO RD	2.59	NEW 2 LANES	\$ 2,421,319	TBD		\$ 4,842,639	TBD		\$ 33,898,471	TBD		\$ 48,426,387	TBD			

1. Reflective of unfunded costs remaining beyond the 5-year Transportation Improvement Program timeframe (FY 2025/26-2029/30)
2. Estimated Indian River County portion (9.94 miles) of total project estimate \$2.375B

APPENDIX E

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH RESPONSES



TO BE UPDATED

APPENDIX F

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT



TO BE UPDATED

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

M E M O R A N D U M

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

THROUGH: Ryan Sweeney
Acting Planning & Development Services Director

FROM: Brian Freeman, AICP
MPO Staff Director

DATE: December 2, 2025

SUBJECT: **Consideration of the 2025 Update to the Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of December 10, 2025.

DESCRIPTION, CONDITIONS & ANALYSIS

Engaging the public is an essential component in the preparation of MPO plans and programs. To guide the MPO's public outreach efforts, the MPO adopted its first Public Involvement Plan (later renamed the MPO Public Participation Plan) in 1995. Since then, regular updates to the plan have occurred, incorporating changes in technology, federal and state requirements, and local policies as appropriate. The 2025 Update to the Public Participation Plan (PPP) outlines the various strategies that the MPO will use to facilitate public participation at MPO and committee meetings, during the development of MPO projects and activities, and via MPO communications.

At its December 2nd meeting, the CAC voted to recommend approval of the 2025 PPP Update. The TAC is scheduled to consider the 2025 PPP Update at its December 5th meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the MPO review the attached information, make any necessary changes, and approve the 2025 Update to the Public Participation Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Public Participation Plan – 2025 Update



INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
MPO
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Public Participation Plan

Updated Fall 2025

Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons with questions or concerns about nondiscrimination, or who require special accommodations under the American with Disabilities Act or language translation services (free of charge) should contact Brian Freeman at (772) 226-1990 or bfreeman@indianriver.gov.

Additional information is available at <http://www.indianriver.gov/mpo>

In accordance with 23 CFR 450.316(x)(3) this plan will be advertised for a 45-day public comment period before adoption by the Indian River County MPO starting October 24, 2025.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN – 2025 UPDATE

Table of Contents

A. INTRODUCTION & VISION	3
B. STRATEGIES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....	5
1. The MPO and Its Committees	6
2. MPO Projects and Activities	10
3. MPO Communications	16
C. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED	18
D. PLAN EVALUATION	19
APPENDICES.....	21
1. Federal and State Regulations Concerning MPO Public Participation	
2. Incorporation of FDOT Public Involvement Handbook References into the MPO Public Participation Plan	

A. Introduction & Vision

To ensure that transportation systems meet the needs of those that use them, it is vital that the public participates in transportation planning. In developing its plans and programs, the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) provides numerous opportunities for public input. The MPO's Public Participation Plan serves as a guide to further guarantee the active participation of citizens and those affected by MPO decisions.

Federal and state regulations require that all MPOs develop a public participation process through which public participation in transportation decision-making is actively solicited. Some of the specific regulations that apply to MPO public participation are listed below.

- **23 CFR 450, Section 316 (b)(1)** contains requirements such as providing the public with timely information about transportation issues, plans, and programs; providing adequate public notice and time for public review of transportation activities; and granting explicit consideration and response to public input received.
- **Title VI** of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, mandates non-discrimination by race, color or national origin in connection with programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.
- **Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice** (1994) requires measures to avoid disproportionately high adverse environmental effects of federal programs through full and fair participation of low-income and minority communities.
- **Chapter 286, Florida Statutes** (a.k.a. Florida Sunshine Law) requires public access to governmental meetings at the state and local level and requires meetings of boards and commissions to be open to the public, adequately noticed, and recorded via minutes.
- **FDOT Public Involvement Handbook** identifies required public hearings for projects and also best practices for public outreach.

In addition, the Public Participation Plan has been developed in consideration of FDOT's **Community Impact Assessment** process, a five-step methodology advocated by FDOT to identify community needs, analyze impacts and identify solutions.

Roles and responsibilities for the MPO board members, MPO staff, and member jurisdictions are listed in a formal agreement adopted by all member jurisdictions on July 13, 2004. The agreement is titled INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR CREATION OF THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, 23 CFR 450.316 is referenced in the agreement. It is the intent of the Indian River County MPO to comply with and, wherever possible, exceed minimum federal and state standards for public participation. To this end, the MPO's Public Participation Plan provides a process that is applicable to all MPO functions and activities.

Vision

A vision statement is a brief description of what the community hopes to achieve through planning. The MPO will maintain and distribute information and provide public participation opportunities as necessary in order to achieve the following:

A well-informed public that feels it has opportunities to contribute meaningful input to decisions concerning the area's transportation system.

Guiding Principles

The MPO's guiding principles for public engagement mirror FDOT's published best practices. This includes continuous engagement throughout project cycles, defining and including all stakeholders in decision making processes, utilizing appropriate techniques to maximize outreach, and documenting public engagement to ensure transparency. These guiding principles are operationalized in Section B -Strategies for Public Participation.



Above: LRTP visioning workshop hosted at Indian River County's Intergenerational Center

B. Strategies for Public Participation

The MPO's strategies for public participation appear in the following sections and follow a brief description of the section heading. Those strategies also identified by the Federal Highway Administration and Florida Department of Transportation as methods used in best practice organizations are denoted with this symbol (🔊).

The MPO values diversity and welcomes input from all interested parties, regardless of cultural identity, background or income level. Moreover, the MPO believes that the best programs and services result from careful consideration of the needs of all of its communities and when those communities are involved in the transportation decision-making process. Thus, the MPO does not tolerate discrimination in any of its programs, services or activities. Pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other federal and state authorities, the MPO will not exclude from participation in, deny the benefits of, or subject to discrimination anyone on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, religion or family status.

The MPO is committed to facilitating the accessibility and usability of the County website to make the online and mobile experience easy and sufficient for everyone, including those with disabilities. If you use assistive technology (such as a screen reader) and you need assistance, or would like to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact Indian River County's Information Services Department via email at accessibility@indianriver.gov. We will make reasonable effort to accommodate all needs and/or requests.

The sub headers below segment MPO activities into three principal categories: MPO meetings and its Committees, MPO Projects and Activities, and MPO Communications. These categories were chosen as each is identified to have separate strategies which elicit the most robust continuous engagement.



Above: Breakout session at an LRTP visioning workshop

1) The MPO and Its Committees

The Indian River County MPO is the primary agency responsible for transportation planning in the urbanized area of Indian River County. Consisting of 12 voting members representing the local governments within the county, the MPO is a legislative authority with the power to develop and adopt plans, and to set priorities for the programming of improvements to the transportation system.

The MPO governing board is currently comprised of 12 voting members: (5) County Commissioners, (2) City of Vero Beach, (2) City of Sebastian, (1) Town of Indian River Shores, (1) City of Fellsmere. (1) School Board - Total of 2 ex-officio non-voting members: (1) Town of Orchid; (1) Florida Department of Transportation. The composition of the MPO governing Board is reapportioned every decade in wake of the decennial census.

To help make decisions, the MPO uses recommendations from advisory committees. These committees offer input from citizens, bicycle/pedestrian interests, and local technical experts.

Technical Advisory Committee

The MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is composed of technically qualified representatives of agencies responsible for the transportation system in the Vero Beach Urbanized Area. The TAC has a total of 16 voting members. Committee duties include the coordination of transportation planning and programming activities, review of all transportation technical studies and reports, and review of work programs and transportation improvement programs. The principal responsibility of the TAC is to provide technical recommendations to the MPO on transportation matters.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is comprised of 16 voting Members: (1) IRC Public Works Department; (1) IRC Planning & Development Services Development Department; (1) IRC Traffic Engineering Department; (1) IRC Office of Management and Budget; (1) Vero Beach Engineering Department; (1) Vero Beach Planning Department; (1) Vero Beach Municipal Airport; (1) Sebastian Engineering Department; (1) Sebastian Planning Department; (1) Sebastian Municipal Airport; (1) Town of Indian River Shores; (1) City of Fellsmere; (1) Town of Orchid; (1) IRC Sheriff's Department; (1) IRC School Board; (1) Senior Resource Association (GoLine). TAC members serve a 1-year term.

Citizens Advisory Committee

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) consists of 14 members appointed by the MPO governing board. The committee is responsible for providing the MPO with citizen input regarding transportation-related matters. The composition of CAC membership corresponds to the MPO governing Board membership with the addition of two at-large members representing the transportation disadvantaged and minority communities. CAC members are appointed by their respective jurisdiction (county, municipality, or school district), with the exception of the two at-

large members who are appointed by the MPO governing board. CAC members serve a 1-year term.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BAC) is comprised of bicycling and pedestrian advocates and enthusiasts. While the BPAC's primary task is the update of the county's bicycle/pedestrian plan, the BPAC also provides the MPO with input on transportation projects and MPO planning activities.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) is comprised of six voting members: (1) County Representative, (1) City of Vero Beach Representative, (1) City of Sebastian Representative, (1) Town of Indian River Shores Representative, (1) Town of Orchid Representative and (1) City of Fellsmere Representative. BPAC members serve a 1-year term.



Above: Elementary school students participating in MPO Bike Rodeos

Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board

The Transportation Disadvantaged Local Coordinating Board (TDLCB) is composed of representatives from the local community and social service agencies. The TDLCB identifies Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) local service needs, develops a Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan, and monitors the performance of the TD program in Indian River County. TDLCB members representing the local community are appointed by the MPO governing board, while social service agency members are designated by the respective agencies. TDLCB members serve a 1-year term.

Conduct of Public Meetings

Wherever possible, the MPO and all public meetings will be conducted consistent with the principles contained in Chapter 6 of the FDOT Public Involvement Handbook. Those principles include selecting an appropriate venue, time, and format for the meeting; providing notification to the public and intended audience; using innovative communication and data gathering techniques; communicating effectively; and recording the meeting.

Meetings of the MPO, TAC, CAC, BPAC, and TDLCB are typically held in the First Floor Conference Room of County Administration Building B located at 1800 27th Street in Vero Beach, Florida. Each year, a meeting schedule is posted on the MPO website prior to the beginning of the year. Agendas are posted on the MPO website and distributed via email to committee members, local governments, media, and interested parties at least seven days prior to meetings. All meetings include an opportunity for all persons to address the board (or committee).

Emergency Meetings

Meetings of MPO boards and committees are occasionally scheduled on shorter-than-usual notice to take action on matters critical to the health, safety, and welfare of the community. According to the MPO Bylaws and TDLCB Bylaws, special meetings may be called by the Chair of each respective board or committee. For such meetings, agendas are posted on the MPO website and distributed via email to board members, local governments, media, and interested parties as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

Strategies for public participation in this area

MPO and advisory committee meetings are public forums affording citizens an adequate opportunity to participate in the planning process. To enhance these opportunities, the MPO will implement the following strategies:

- The MPO will appoint members to the Citizens Advisory Committee who adequately reflect the geographic, cultural, and social composition of the MPO area, and will involve those that have been traditionally under-represented in planning such as the senior and low-income communities.
- The MPO will invite the public to all MPO and advisory committee meetings, and will encourage public discussion and input prior to making decisions at those meetings, with a special emphasis on feedback from the traditionally under-represented.
- To encourage the open exchange of opinions, the MPO will seek, but not require, a consensus on issues.
- The MPO will establish a standing agenda item that will invite public comment and participation at all public meetings.
- All MPO and advisory committee meetings will be conducted in ADA-compliant facilities accessible by public transportation.

- Information will be collected and feedback will be solicited at public meetings via detailed sign-in sheets, comment cards, and informational displays.
- The respective chairpersons of the MPO, CAC, TAC, and BPAC will meet periodically with MPO staff to discuss upcoming issues.
- The MPO will prepare and distribute at all MPO meetings a committee status report listing the activities of the committees, the outcomes of any meetings, and minutes of meetings. The MPO will prepare and distribute at all committee meetings an MPO status report listing the actions of the MPO with regard to committee recommendations.
- MPO staff reports written for MPO and committee review will be concise and easy to understand.
- MPO staff and consultants will employ the use of electronic presentations, computer imaging, visualization techniques, and other media at public meetings.
- At the beginning of the calendar year, MPO staff will provide the local media with an annual calendar of scheduled MPO and advisory committee meetings. These calendars are provided to the *Press-Journal*, *Vero News*, *Vero Beach 32963*, and *Sebastian Daily*, and other local general circulation newspapers.
- One week prior to each MPO meeting, MPO staff will provide the local media with a complete agenda package. These agendas are provided to the *Press-Journal*, *Vero News*, *Vero Beach 32963*, and *Sebastian Daily*, and other local general circulation newspapers.
- MPO and advisory committee meeting announcements will be sent via e-mail to a database of interested persons and stakeholders.
- MPO and advisory committee meeting announcements, minutes, and agendas will be posted to the MPO website (www.indianriver.gov/mpo).
- MPO and advisory committee meeting announcements will be published in the MPO electronic newsletter (*The MPO Overview*).
- In cases of unscheduled meetings due to declared emergencies, procedures are outlined in the Continuity of Operations (COOP) Plan. This indicates that the MPO staff will provide an additional week over and above the normal notification and distribution period to account for disruptions in communications and coordinate with the Emergency Management Coordinator and the Planning and Development Services Director regarding meeting times and available facilities.
- Staff will make extensive use of simulations and other visualization techniques to help engage the public.
- The MPO will maintain its A+ rating for transparency by posting all meeting records, documents, and audio/video recordings.

2. MPO Projects and Activities

The MPO develops a number of recurring work products in fulfillment of its statutory obligations. Major MPO projects (which include the Long Range Transportation Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and Transit Development Plan Major Update) involve collecting and analyzing background data, procuring consultant services, and performing extensive public outreach efforts. On an annual basis, the MPO also completes a number of activities in preparation of various MPO work products like the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). These activities greatly benefit from public participation but may afford fewer public participation opportunities than major projects due to their relatively short timeframes. These activities form the basis of the Consultative Process by which all stakeholders are provided an opportunity for input in project selection and implementation.

Long Range Transportation Plan (and other major MPO projects)

The Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is developed by the MPO approximately every five years pursuant to state and federal regulations. The plan provides cost-feasible solutions for the mobility of all residents of the MPO area across a 20-year horizon.

Adoption of the LRTP and all amendments will be as specified in the MPO Handbook and will include at a minimum 30 days of advertising via web and newspaper, a public hearing and a roll-call vote.

Because of the comprehensive nature of the LRTP, the MPO can engage in a wide variety of specialized public participation activities in addition to the general strategies for public participation applicable to all MPO projects.

For example, in accordance with FDOT's Community Impact Assessment (CIA) methodology, major MPO projects will incorporate a review of community profiles early on to ensure plan alternatives address community concerns. Community Impact Assessments are comprehensive inventories of communities, their values and characteristics.

For the Long Range Transportation Plan and other major MPO projects, the MPO requires the consultant working on the project to create a Public Participation Component as one of the first tasks in the scope of work. The Public Participation Component establishes procedures for public participation specific to the project and ensures that adequate public participation will be performed throughout the project. Public participation activities in the Public Participation Component may include, but are not limited to, strategies described in Section (c), *MPO Communications*. Innovative techniques will be encouraged in order to directly notify the public of upcoming projects, distribute interim and final reports, and solicit feedback on projects.

Final reports for major projects will include a section documenting the participation of the public in developing the project. This section will list the proposed opportunities for public input,

describe any substantive comments received, and report how substantive comments were handled and considered in the final report.



Above: Scenes from the 2024 Bike-Ped Master Plan Update public workshops

Transportation Improvement Program

The **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** is a five-year list of improvement projects that will be undertaken within the MPO area. The projects in the TIP are the direct result of Long Range Plan efforts and the extensive analysis and public outreach that was done therein. The MPO's role with respect to the TIP is focused on the timing of implementing various LRTP alternatives.

Throughout the TIP development process, the MPO will seek public input. This input will begin with the development of a List of Priority Projects (usually in May/June) that the MPO wants the FDOT to fund in its upcoming Work Program. At public meetings, the MPO advisory committees will review the priority list and make recommendations to the MPO board. The MPO board will then review the list, make any necessary changes based on additional public input, and approve the list for submittal to FDOT. Currently, FDOT District 4 policy requires submission of the LOPP by August 1 each year. Because of the significance of Prioritization in the process, the MPO will take additional measures to obtain input, such as social media outreach and *The MPO Overview* electronic newsletter. Since many ideas generated by the public during the course of the year are appropriate for inclusion on a priority list, project candidate identification is treated as an ongoing (vs once a year) process.

Further public input in TIP development will occur when FDOT presents its **Draft Tentative Work Program** (usually in October or December depending on the state legislative calendar) for review and endorsement by the MPO. The public and the MPO will review the Work Program to ensure that the projects listed conform to the needs of the community.

Finally, the MPO and its advisory committees will hold another series of public meetings to consider adoption of the TIP. Copies of the draft TIP will be made available on the website and at a number of public outlets prior to the meetings. The public and the MPO will review the TIP for consistency with the Tentative Work Program and community priorities (May/June). Final TIP adoption and publication is done in a manner consistent with FDOT annual obligations reporting and FTA program of projects reporting. Submission of the adopted TIP is due to FDOT by July 15 each year.

Amendments to the adopted TIP are often necessary due to changes in project schedules, availability of funding, or other reasons. An opportunity for public comment will also be provided for such TIP amendments. Notice of the discussion of such amendments will be given to the media prior to committee meetings.

Unified Planning Work Program

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the MPO's annual summary of upcoming planning activities and budget. Every two years, the MPO must submit a new UPWP for approval by the Florida Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. The UPWP is presented for review at public meetings of the MPO advisory committees and the MPO. Prior to these meetings, copies of the draft UPWP are made available for public review and comment.

In reviewing the proposed draft UPWP, the public and the advisory committees will provide comments to MPO staff about whether or not the UPWP reflects appropriate work activities for the MPO to undertake in light of local needs and state and federal regulations.

All amendments and modifications will be advertised to the public and adopted at a public meeting as specified in FDOT requirements.

Congestion Management Process

The MPO's Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a process designed to consider alternatives to traditional approaches to solving traffic congestion problems. The MPO uses locally developed performance measures and current transportation data to identify the most congested links on the County highway system. These links are then evaluated on an individual basis to determine if lower-cost treatments of the congested segment could be employed to eliminate or forestall the need for a more costly highway improvement.

The MPO will obtain public input into prioritizing of CMP corridors and strategies for addressing congestion. In fact, many of the more effective CMP strategies implemented were identified by system users. Public participation will be adequately addressed through the MPO's public meetings and communications strategies. Annual CMP updates also present an opportunity to inform the public of current transportation conditions in Indian River County.

Public participation activities associated with CMP development will be coordinated with other MPO public participation programs to enhance public awareness and efficiently distribute information.



Above: Multi-modal stakeholders mark up a map at a workshop

Transit Development Plan (TDP) Updates (and other non-motorized activities)

By state law, major updates of the TDP must be developed every five years in order for the County to remain eligible for state grant funding. During interim years, TDP annual updates are prepared and serve as evaluation tools to monitor progress toward major update implementation. The MPO uses consultant experts to develop TDP major updates, while TDP annual updates are

prepared by MPO staff. For TDP major updates, the MPO requires the consultant team to prepare a public participation component which includes public presentations, on-board passenger surveys (over 1,100 conducted for the 2023 TDP major update), an online survey, and other approaches.

Public participation is also accommodated at public committee meetings with distribution of meeting agendas and/or work products to be completed through the MPO's communication strategies. Given the high sensitivity of the transportation disadvantaged public which relies on public transportation, the MPO makes a special emphasis to reach these hard-to-reach segments of the public, such as presenting as part of a community meeting agenda or event.

FDOT Projects

Chapter 2 of the **FDOT Public Involvement Handbook** states that "FDOT promotes public involvement through all phases of transportation project development." Several manuals and handbooks are available that provide guidance on developing public involvement programs and activities that comply with both state and federal legislation.

The **PD&E Manual** establishes the Department's procedures for complying with state and federal laws for public involvement. The Districts are responsible for conducting public involvement activities for plans (such as the District Work Program) and projects following the procedures and processes established in the PD&E Manual. In addition to District plans and projects, each district planning office has staff that serves as liaisons with their local MPOs.



Above: I-95 & Oslo Road Groundbreaking Ceremony

The **MPO Program Management Handbook** provides guidance to MPOs on their role; how MPO areas are designated, formed, and modified; and on federal and state transportation planning requirements. The MPO cooperates fully with all requirements of the FDOT Public Involvement Process and assists FDOT in securing venues and promoting its public meetings, provides

information and contacts, and supports FDOT as needed.

Strategies for public participation in this area

- Staff will present proposed scopes of work at public committee meetings.
- The MPO will use public committee meetings to allow the public to review and comment on interim and final work products.
- MPO staff and consultants may employ the use of electronic presentations, computer simulation, and other media at public meetings.
- The MPO will establish special consensus-building workshops, charrettes, discussion groups, or other public meetings during the course of project development. These meetings may be held at various locations throughout the county as appropriate.
- The MPO will include a public participation section documenting the solicitation and incorporation of public comments as a component of final project reports.
- To provide information in a concise and understandable format, the MPO will produce an Executive Summary of major improvements for major projects.
- MPO staff will inform the media of upcoming projects so that interested citizens and officials may have the opportunity to become involved as early as possible.
- The MPO will make available draft scopes of work and draft work products for public review at MPO offices.
- MPO staff will seek out innovative methods to inform the public of project activities and allow the public to review and comment on project reports. This may include postings to the MPO website, publication in the proposed MPO newsletter, and the preparation of periodic special edition newsletters, reports or flyers pertaining to the project.
- In developing major projects, the MPO will abide by FDOT's Community Impact Assessment methodology and its stated principles of informing, educating and including the public in the decision making process.
- MPO staff will consider all public feedback obtained during the course of its major projects when undertaking related recurring activities.



Above: Trans-Florida Central Railroad Trail Dedication Ceremony

3. MPO Communications

The MPO develops and maintains transportation plans and information that are of interest to and requested by the general public. At the same time, the MPO relies on comments from the public to make sure its plans and activities reflect the values of the community. To fulfill its vision for a well-informed public, the MPO will use a variety of techniques to distribute MPO information and publicize MPO activities. Wherever possible, the MPO will use interactive techniques to obtain valuable feedback from the community in the process of distributing information. Federal land managers will also be notified to provide feedback concerning Federal public lands.

Communications strategies cited in this section resulted from evaluating previous plan strategies, identifying best practices of other MPOs, applying new technology, or considering strategies obtained from the public in the development of this plan.

Strategies for public participation in this area

- The Indian River County MPO will produce an MPO newsletter on at least a quarterly basis. The newsletter will provide information on MPO projects, plans, and other activities and provide links to useful online resources.
- MPO staff will seek innovative ways to distribute information to the public, including the expanded use of the Indian River County website, social media, and links to local traffic information sites.
- MPO staff will seek innovative techniques for soliciting public comment and response to MPO activities.
- Staff will explore technologies making MPO and County websites compliant with software standards for impaired users.
- Where feasible, the MPO will coordinate its public participation activities with those of the Public Information Office of the Florida Department of Transportation. These coordination activities may include advertising, mailing notices, and holding public hearings. For construction projects, the MPO will coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation to ensure that the public is adequately involved in the review of Project Development and Environmental (PD&E) Studies.
- The MPO will prepare a "State of the System Report" to be distributed in a special newsletter edition.
- Through the media, the MPO will distribute information and notify the public that information is available from the MPO. The MPO will contribute regularly to a periodic traffic update section of the local newspaper. MPO staff will request that the media publish announcements for MPO meetings and MPO committee meetings.
- The MPO will explore additional media outlets, such as regional television networks and public radio stations, to announce major projects and activities via Public Service Announcements (PSA's).

- The MPO will distribute information at local libraries and other public outlets, such as schools and community centers. The MPO will seek out distribution locations in close proximity to those traditionally underserved in the planning process.
- The MPO will keep environmental and federal agencies and organizations informed of upcoming studies and construction projects.
- Staff will respond to requests for information as promptly as possible.
- The MPO will create a presentation display to be posted in public locations and deployed at major community events. The display will include information on major proposed plans, staff contact information, and upcoming opportunities for public participation.
- The MPO will sponsor or participate in one or more annual transportation seminars in conjunction with state and regional agencies.



Above: A sample of the MPOOverview the MPO's email-based newsletter

C. Consideration of Public Comments Received

Processing Public Comments

The primary objective of any public participation activity is to inform the public and solicit their comments as they relate to transportation improvements. The most common way for the public to relay their ideas and input is through submitting verbal or written comments. The information gleaned from them, if correctly synthesized and catalogued, will serve as an excellent record for future project phases. The amount and types of comments received will help in evaluating the success of the individual public participation activities. A protocol is needed to handle these comments. The following are the MPO procedures for handling public comments:

1. Collection and Documentation:
 - All comments received will be logged and entered into the Public Participation file for the appropriate project or activity. Comments of a highly generalized nature or involving multiple projects will be maintained in the MPO Public Participation file.
2. Acknowledgement and Response
 - If a response is requested, the MPO will indicate that the comment will be considered during an upcoming project or activity cycle.
3. Analysis, Distribution and Incorporation
 - As comments are received, they will be acknowledged through a polite and simple email or letter, as appropriate.
 - The MPO will evaluate the comments received as the appropriate project is initiated.
 - Staff will summarize comments received and incorporate these into consultant presentations or committee reports to the MPO as appropriate.
 - The MPO will evaluate draft and final work products with respect to consideration of public comments received.
 - Unless otherwise requested, the MPO will respond with respect to the final disposition of the issue.
 - Staff will perform a preliminary evaluation of the comment. If the comment does not require future MPO action, it will be responded to by staff or routed to the appropriate implementing agency.

D. Plan Evaluation

Procedure

Each year, an evaluation will be performed to determine to what extent objectives for public participation have been met by the MPO. The annual evaluation will be data-driven to the extent possible and will include data collection, data analysis, and a determination of whether or not plan objectives have been met.

The MPO and its Committees	
Recommended period of evaluation:	Semi-Annual
Quantitative measures:	Number of non-staff and non-committee members at MPO and Advisory Committee meetings.
MPO Projects and Activities	
Recommended period of evaluation:	At major project or activity milestones; and at project or activity completion.
Quantitative measures:	Number of participants from traditionally underserved communities, including transportation disadvantaged or minority communities, at MPO project or activity workshops.
	Number of comments received from all sources relating to an MPO project or activity.
MPO Communications	
Recommended period of evaluation:	Semi-Annual
Quantitative Measures:	Percentage of the county's overall population that recognizes the MPO, its projects or activities.
	Percentage of the county's overall population that has been made aware of or participated in a public participation activity.
	Percentage of the county's transportation disadvantaged population that recognizes the MPO, its projects or activities.

Public Participation Plan Review and Update

Where it is determined that the MPO's public outreach efforts have not resulted in meeting its objectives, the MPO will review its strategies individually using the data collected for each

strategy. The MPO will assess the relative contribution of each strategy toward meeting the objective. New strategies may be necessary in order to meet the objective. To obtain new strategies, the MPO will continuously review best practices, suggestions from the public, the FDOT Public Involvement Handbook, and the latest technology.

On an annual basis, the MPO will also review its Public Participation Objectives. Where objectives were not met, the MPO will determine whether its objectives were appropriate and contributed to the vision for public participation. Objectives may also be added as a result of updated federal or state guidance or a change in local priorities.

Socio-Cultural Effects Evaluation

According to Chapter 4 of the **FDOT Public Involvement Handbook**, the Sociocultural Effects (SCE) Evaluation is the Department's process for identifying and addressing potential effects of transportation projects on people, communities, and community resources. The MPO is the Statewide Leader in Socio-Cultural Effects data development and evaluation, having published the first-ever MPO Socio-Cultural Effects report in 2003. This tool, now known as the Community Characteristics Report, identifies various geographies and communities within the County and assesses their socioeconomic and demographic profiles. Included in this is an assessment of Transportation Disadvantaged populations and key community contacts. Data in the Community Characteristics Report is compiled from the U.S. Decennial Census and the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). MPO staff updates the Community Characteristics Report after each decennial census and also at the midpoint between censuses. The most recent Community Characteristics Report was prepared using Census and ACS data for the year 2020.

Revisions

An **administrative modification** is a minor revision to the LRTP (or TIP) that includes minor changes to project/project phase costs, minor changes to funding sources of previously included projects, and minor changes to project/project phase initiation dates. An administrative modification is a revision that does not require public review and comment, a redemonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

An **amendment** means a revision to a long-range statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP, that involves a major change to a project included in a LRTP, TIP, or STIP, including the addition or deletion of a project or a major change in project cost, project/project phase initiation dates, or a major change in design concept or design scope (e.g. changing project termini or the number of through traffic lanes or changing the number of stations in the case of fixed guideway transit projects). Changes to projects that are included only for illustrative purposes do not require an amendment. An amendment is a revision that requires public review and comment and a redemonstration of fiscal constraint.

APPENDIX 1

FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATIONS CONCERNING MPO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

23 CFR

450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation.

(a) The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The MPO shall develop the participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;

(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;

(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public

comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;

(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under subpart B of this part; and

(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

(2) When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan and TIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process in this section or the interagency consultation process required under the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A), a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP.

(3) A minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO. Copies of the approved participation plan shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes and shall be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable.

(b) In developing metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities. In addition, the MPO shall develop the metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area, and the process shall provide for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by:

(1) Recipients of assistance under title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53;

(2) Governmental agencies and non-profit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services; and

(3) Recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 201-204.

(c) When the MPA includes Indian Tribal lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(d) When the MPA includes Federal public lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(e) MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies, as defined in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section, which may be included in the agreement(s) developed under § 450.314.

Executive Order 12898

Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

February 11, 1994

Section 1-1. Implementation

1-101. Agency Responsibilities

To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands.

Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964

Sec. 2000d. Prohibition against exclusion from participation in, denial of benefits of, and discrimination under federally assisted programs on ground of race, color, or national origin

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

(Pub. L. 88-352, title VI, Sec. 601, July 2, 1964, 78 Stat. 252.)

286.011 F.S.

Public meetings and records; public inspection; criminal and civil penalties.--

(1) All meetings of any board or commission of any state agency or authority or of any agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision, except as otherwise

provided in the Constitution, at which official acts are to be taken are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all times, and no resolution, rule, or formal action shall be considered binding except as taken or made at such meeting. The board or commission must provide reasonable notice of all such meetings.

(2) The minutes of a meeting of any such board or commission of any such state agency or authority shall be promptly recorded, and such records shall be open to public inspection. The circuit courts of this state shall have jurisdiction to issue injunctions to enforce the purposes of this section upon application by any citizen of this state.

(3)(a) Any public officer who violates any provision of this section is guilty of a noncriminal infraction, punishable by fine not exceeding \$500.

(b) Any person who is a member of a board or commission or of any state agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision who knowingly violates the provisions of this section by attending a meeting not held in accordance with the provisions hereof is guilty of a misdemeanor of the second degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082 or s. 775.083.

(c) Conduct which occurs outside the state which would constitute a knowing violation of this section is a misdemeanor of the second degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082 or s.

775.083. (4) Whenever an action has been filed against any board or commission of any state agency or authority or any agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision to enforce the provisions of this section or to invalidate the actions of any such board, commission, agency, or authority, which action was taken in violation of this section, and the court determines that the defendant or defendants to such action acted in violation of this section, the court shall assess a reasonable attorney's fee against such agency, and may assess a reasonable attorney's fee against the individual filing such an action if the court finds it was filed in bad faith or was frivolous. Any fees so assessed may be assessed against the individual member or members of such board or commission; provided, that in any case where the board or commission seeks the advice of its attorney and such advice is followed, no such fees shall be assessed against the individual member or members of the board or commission. However, this subsection shall not apply to a state attorney or his or her duly authorized assistants or any officer charged with enforcing the provisions of this section.

(5) Whenever any board or commission of any state agency or authority or any agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision appeals any court order which has found said board, commission, agency, or authority to have violated this section, and such order is affirmed, the court shall assess a reasonable attorney's fee for the appeal against such board, commission, agency, or authority. Any fees so assessed may be assessed against the individual member or members of such board or commission; provided, that in any case where the board or commission seeks the advice of its attorney and such advice is followed, no such fees shall be assessed against the individual member or members of the board or commission.

(6) All persons subject to subsection (1) are prohibited from holding meetings at any facility or location which discriminates on the basis of sex, age, race, creed, color, origin, or economic status or which operates in such a manner as to unreasonably restrict public access to such a facility.

(7) Whenever any member of any board or commission of any state agency or authority or any

agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision is charged with a violation of this section and is subsequently acquitted, the board or commission is authorized to reimburse said member for any portion of his or her reasonable attorney's fees.

(8) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1), any board or commission of any state agency or authority or any agency or authority of any county, municipal corporation, or political subdivision, and the chief administrative or executive officer of the governmental entity, may meet in private with the entity's attorney to discuss pending litigation to which the entity is presently a party before a court or administrative agency, provided that the following conditions are met:

(a) The entity's attorney shall advise the entity at a public meeting that he or she desires advice concerning the litigation.

(b) The subject matter of the meeting shall be confined to settlement negotiations or strategy sessions related to litigation expenditures.

(c) The entire session shall be recorded by a certified court reporter. The reporter shall record the times of commencement and termination of the session, all discussion and proceedings, the names of all persons present at any time, and the names of all persons speaking. No portion of the session shall be off the record. The court reporter's notes shall be fully transcribed and filed with the entity's clerk within a reasonable time after the meeting.

(d) The entity shall give reasonable public notice of the time and date of the attorney-client session and the names of persons who will be attending the session. The session shall commence at an open meeting at which the persons chairing the meeting shall announce the commencement and estimated length of the attorney-client session and the names of the persons attending. At the conclusion of the attorney-client session, the meeting shall be reopened, and the person chairing the meeting shall announce the termination of the session.

(e) The transcript shall be made part of the public record upon conclusion of the litigation.

23 CFR § 450.104 Definitions.

Unless otherwise specified, the definitions in [23 U.S.C. 101\(a\)](#) and 49 U.S.C. 5302 are applicable to this part.

Administrative modification means a minor [revision](#) to a long-range statewide or [metropolitan transportation plan](#), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), or [Statewide Transportation Improvement Program](#) (STIP) that includes minor changes to project/project phase costs, minor changes to funding sources of previously included projects, and minor changes to project/project phase initiation dates. An [administrative modification](#) is a [revision](#) that does not require public review and comment, a redemonstration of fiscal constraint, or a [conformity](#) determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

Amendment means a [revision](#) to a long-range statewide or [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, or STIP that involves a major change to a project included in a [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, or STIP, including the addition or deletion of a project or a major change in project cost, project/project phase initiation dates, or a major change in [design concept](#) or [design scope](#) (e.g., changing project termini or the number of through traffic lanes or changing the number of stations in the case of fixed guideway transit projects). Changes to projects that are included only for illustrative purposes do not require an [amendment](#). An [amendment](#) is a [revision](#) that requires public review and comment and a redemonstration of fiscal constraint.

If an [amendment](#) involves “non-exempt” projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas, a [conformity](#) determination is required.

Asset management means a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving physical assets, with a focus on both engineering and economic analysis based upon quality information, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired [state](#) of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.

Attainment area means any geographic area in which levels of a given criteria air pollutant (e.g., ozone, carbon monoxide, PM10, PM2.5, and nitrogen dioxide) meet the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for that pollutant. An area may be an [attainment area](#) for one pollutant and a [nonattainment area](#) for others. A “maintenance area” (see definition in this section) is not considered an [attainment area](#) for transportation planning purposes.

Available funds means funds derived from an existing source dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes. For Federal funds, authorized and/or appropriated funds and the extrapolation of formula and discretionary funds at historic rates of increase are considered “available.” A similar approach may be used for [State](#) and local funds that are dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes.

Committed funds means funds that have been dedicated or obligated for transportation purposes. For [State](#) funds that are not dedicated to transportation purposes, only those funds over which the [Governor](#) has control may be considered “committed.” Approval of a TIP by the [Governor](#) is considered a commitment of those funds over which the [Governor](#) has control. For local or private sources of funds not dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes (including donations of property), a commitment in writing (e.g., letter of intent) by the responsible official or body having control of the funds may be considered a commitment. For projects involving [49 U.S.C. 5309](#) funding, execution of a Full Funding Grant Agreement (or equivalent) or an Expedited Grant Agreement (or equivalent) with the DOT shall be considered a multiyear commitment of Federal funds.

Conformity means a [Clean Air Act \(42 U.S.C. 7506\(c\)\)](#) requirement that ensures that Federal funding and approval are given to transportation plans, programs and projects that are consistent with the air quality goals established by a [State](#) Implementation Plan (SIP). [Conformity](#) to the purpose of the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any nonattainment or [maintenance area](#). The transportation [conformity](#) regulations ([40 CFR part 93](#), subpart A) sets forth policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating and assuring [conformity](#) of transportation activities.

Conformity lapse means, pursuant to section 176(c) of the [Clean Air Act \(42 U.S.C. 7506\(c\)\)](#), as amended, that the [conformity](#) determination for a [metropolitan transportation plan](#) or TIP has expired and thus there is no currently conforming [metropolitan transportation plan](#) or TIP.

Congestion Management Process means a systematic approach required in transportation management areas (TMAs) that provides for effective management and operation, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented metropolitan-wide strategy, of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C., and title 49 U.S.C., through the

use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies.

Consideration means that one or more parties takes into account the opinions, action, and relevant information from other parties in making a decision or determining a course of action.

Consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with an established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken. This definition does not apply to the “consultation” performed by the [States](#) and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in comparing the [long-range statewide transportation plan](#) and the [metropolitan transportation plan](#), respectively, to [State](#) and tribal conservation plans or maps or inventories of natural or historic [resources](#) (see [section 450.216\(i\)](#) and [sections 450.324\(g\)\(1\) and \(g\)\(2\)](#)).

Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning and programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objective.

Coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan means a locally developed, coordinated transportation plan that identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, provides strategies for meeting those local needs, and prioritizes transportation services for funding and implementation.

Coordination means the cooperative development of plans, programs, and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing and adjustment of such plans, programs, and schedules to achieve general consistency, as appropriate.

Design concept means the type of facility identified for a transportation improvement project (e.g., freeway, expressway, arterial highway, grade-separated highway, toll road, reserved right-of-way rail transit, mixed-traffic rail transit, or busway).

Design scope means the aspects that will affect the proposed facility's impact on the region, usually as they relate to vehicle or person carrying capacity and control (e.g., number of lanes or tracks to be constructed or added, length of project, signalization, safety features, access control including approximate number and location of interchanges, or preferential treatment for high-occupancy vehicles).

Designated recipient means an entity designated, in accordance with the planning process under [49 U.S.C. 5303](#) and [5304](#), by the [Governor](#) of a [State](#), responsible local officials, and publicly owned operators of public transportation, to receive and apportion amounts under [49 U.S.C. 5336](#) that are attributable to urbanized areas of 200,000 or more in population, or a [State](#) or regional authority if the authority is responsible under the laws of a [State](#) for a capital project and for financing and directly providing public transportation.

Environmental mitigation activities means strategies, policies, programs, and actions that, over time, will serve to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce or eliminate impacts to environmental [resources](#) associated with the implementation of a [long-range statewide transportation plan](#) or [metropolitan transportation plan](#).

Expedited Grant Agreement (EGA) means a contract that defines the scope of a Small Starts project, the Federal financial contribution, and other terms and conditions, in accordance with [49 U.S.C. 5309\(h\)\(7\)](#).

Federal land management agency means units of the Federal Government currently responsible for the administration of public lands (e.g., U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the National Park Service).

Federally funded non-emergency transportation services means transportation services

provided to the general public, including those with special transport needs, by public transit, private non-profit service providers, and private third-party contractors to public agencies.

Financial plan means documentation required to be included with a [metropolitan transportation plan](#) and TIP (and optional for the [long-range statewide transportation plan](#) and STIP) that demonstrates the consistency between reasonably available and projected sources of Federal, [State](#), local, and private revenues and the costs of implementing proposed transportation system improvements.

Financially constrained or Fiscal constraint means that the [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, and STIP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each program year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and [maintenance areas](#) can be included in the first 2 years of the TIP and STIP only if funds are “available” or “committed.”

Freight shippers means any entity that routinely transport cargo from one location to another by providers of freight transportation services or by their own operations, involving one or more travel modes.

Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) means an instrument that defines the scope of a project, the Federal financial contribution, and other terms and conditions for funding New Starts projects as required by [49 U.S.C. 5309\(k\)\(2\)](#).

Governor means the [Governor](#) of any of the 50 [States](#) or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) means a [State](#) safety program with the purpose to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all [public roads](#) through the implementation of the provisions of [23 U.S.C. 130, 148, and 150](#) including the development of a [Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) (SHSP), Railway-Highway Crossings Program, and program of highway safety improvement projects.

Illustrative project means an additional transportation project that may be included in a [financial plan](#) for a [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, or STIP if reasonable additional [resources](#) were to become available.

Indian Tribal government means a duly formed governing body for an Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian Tribe pursuant to the [Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, Public Law 103-454](#).

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) means electronics, photonics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.

Interim metropolitan transportation plan means a transportation plan composed of projects eligible to proceed under a [conformity lapse](#) and otherwise meeting all other applicable provisions of this part, including approval by the [MPO](#).

Interim Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) means a TIP composed of projects eligible to proceed under a [conformity lapse](#) and otherwise meeting all other applicable provisions of this part, including approval by the [MPO](#) and the [Governor](#).

Long-range statewide transportation plan means the official, statewide, multimodal, transportation plan covering a period of no less than 20 years developed through the statewide transportation planning process.

Maintenance area means any geographic region of the United [States](#) that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) previously designated as a [nonattainment area](#) for one or more pollutants pursuant to the [Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990](#), and subsequently redesignated as an [attainment area](#) subject to the requirement to develop a maintenance plan under section 175A of the [Clean Air Act](#), as amended ([42 U.S.C. 7505a](#)).

Management system means a systematic process, designed to assist decision makers in selecting cost effective strategies/actions to improve the efficiency or safety of, and protect the investment in the nation's infrastructure. A [management system](#) can include: Identification of performance measures; data collection and analysis; determination of needs; evaluation and selection of appropriate strategies/actions to address the needs; and evaluation of the effectiveness of the implemented strategies/actions.

Metropolitan planning agreement means a written agreement between the [MPO](#), the State(s), and the providers of public transportation serving the metropolitan planning area that describes how they will work cooperatively to meet their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Metropolitan planning area (MPA) means the geographic area determined by agreement between the [MPO](#) for the area and the [Governor](#), in which the metropolitan transportation planning process is carried out.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) means the policy board of an organization created and designated to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Metropolitan transportation plan means the official multimodal transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon that the [MPO](#) develops, adopts, and [updates](#) through the metropolitan transportation planning process.

National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) means those standards established pursuant to section 109 of the [Clean Air Act](#) ([42 U.S.C. 7409](#)).

Nonattainment area means any geographic region of the United [States](#) that EPA designates as a [nonattainment area](#) under section 107 of the [Clean Air Act](#) ([42 U.S.C. 7407](#)) for any pollutants for which an NAAQS exists.

Nonmetropolitan area means a geographic area outside a designated metropolitan planning area.

Nonmetropolitan local officials means elected and appointed officials of general purpose local government in a [nonmetropolitan area](#) with responsibility for transportation.

Obligated projects means strategies and projects funded under title 23 U.S.C. and title [49 U.S.C. Chapter 53](#) for which the [State](#) or [designated recipient](#) authorized and committed the supporting Federal funds in preceding or current program years, and authorized by the FHWA or awarded as a grant by the FTA.

Operational and management strategies means actions and strategies aimed at improving the performance of existing and planned transportation facilities to relieve congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.

Performance measure refers to "Measure" as defined in [23 CFR 490.101](#).

Performance metric refers to "Metric" as defined in [23 CFR 490.101](#).

Performance target refers to “Target” as defined in [23 CFR 490.101](#).

Project selection means the procedures followed by MPOs, States, and [public transportation operators](#) to advance projects from the first 4 years of an approved TIP and/or STIP to implementation, in accordance with agreed upon procedures.

Provider of freight transportation services means any entity that transports or otherwise facilitates the movement of cargo from one location to another for others or for itself.

Public transportation agency safety plan means a comprehensive plan established by a [State](#) or recipient of funds under Title 49, Chapter 53 and in accordance with [49 U.S.C. 5329\(d\)](#).

Public transportation operator means the public entity or government-approved authority that participates in the continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process in accordance with [23 U.S.C. 134](#) and [135](#) and 49 U.S.C. 5303 and 5304, and is a recipient of Federal funds under title [49 U.S.C. Chapter 53](#) for transportation by a conveyance that provides regular and continuing general or special transportation to the public, but does not include sightseeing, school bus, charter, certain types of shuttle service, intercity bus transportation, or intercity passenger rail transportation provided by Amtrak.

Regional ITS architecture means a regional framework for ensuring institutional agreement and technical integration for the implementation of ITS projects or groups of projects.

Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than projects that may be grouped in the TIP and/or STIP or exempt projects as defined in EPA's transportation [conformity](#) regulations ([40 CFR part 93](#), subpart A)) that is on a facility that serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside the region; major activity centers in the region; major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, or employment centers; or transportation terminals) and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel.

Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) means a policy board of [nonmetropolitan local officials](#) or their designees created to carry out the regional transportation planning process.

Revision means a change to a long-range statewide or [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, or STIP that occurs between scheduled periodic updates. A major [revision](#) is an “amendment” while a minor [revision](#) is an “administrative modification.”

Scenario planning means a planning process that evaluates the effects of alternative policies, plans and/or programs on the future of a community or region. This activity should provide information to decision makers as they develop the transportation plan.

State means any one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico.

State Implementation Plan (SIP) means, as defined in section 302(q) of the [Clean Air Act](#) (CAA) ([42 U.S.C. 7602\(q\)](#)), the portion (or portions) of the implementation plan, or most recent [revision](#) thereof, which has been approved under section 110 of the CAA ([42 U.S.C. 7410](#)), or promulgated under section 110(c) of the CAA ([42 U.S.C. 7410\(c\)](#)), or promulgated or approved pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 301(d) of the CAA ([42 U.S.C. 7601\(d\)](#)) and which implements the relevant requirements of the CAA.

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) means a statewide prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of 4 years that is consistent with

the [long-range statewide transportation plan](#), metropolitan transportation plans, and TIPs, and required for projects to be eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title [49 U.S.C. Chapter 53](#).

Strategic Highway Safety Plan means a comprehensive, multiyear, data-driven plan, developed by a [State](#) DOT in accordance with the [23 U.S.C. 148](#).

Transit Asset Management Plan means a plan that includes an inventory of capital assets, a condition assessment of inventoried assets, a decision support tool, and a prioritization of investments.

Transit Asset Management System means a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public transportation capital assets effectively, throughout the life cycles of those assets.

Transportation Control Measure (TCM) means any measure that is specifically identified and committed to in the applicable SIP, including a substitute or additional TCM that is incorporated into the applicable SIP through the process established in CAA section 176(c)(8), that is either one of the types listed in section 108 of the CAA ([42 U.S.C. 7408](#)) or any other measure for the purpose of reducing emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use or changing traffic flow or congestion conditions. Notwithstanding the above, vehicle technology-based, fuel-based, and maintenance-based measures that control the emissions from vehicles under fixed traffic conditions are not TCMs.

Transportation improvement program (TIP) means a prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of 4 years that is developed and formally adopted by an [MPO](#) as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process, consistent with the [metropolitan transportation plan](#), and required for projects to be eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title [49 U.S.C. chapter 53](#).

Transportation Management Area (TMA) means an urbanized area with a population over 200,000, as defined by the Bureau of the Census and designated by the Secretary of Transportation, or any additional area where TMA designation is requested by the [Governor](#) and the [MPO](#) and designated by the Secretary of Transportation.

Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) means a statement of work identifying the planning priorities and activities to be carried out within a metropolitan planning area. At a minimum, a UPWP includes a description of the planning work and resulting products, who will perform the work, time frames for completing the work, the cost of the work, and the source(s) of funds.

Update means making current a [long-range statewide transportation plan](#), [metropolitan transportation plan](#), TIP, or STIP through a comprehensive review. [Updates](#) require public review and comment, a 20-year horizon for [metropolitan transportation plans](#) and long-range statewide transportation plans, a 4-year program period for TIPs and STIPs, demonstration of fiscal constraint (except for long-range statewide transportation plans), and a [conformity](#) determination (for [metropolitan transportation plans](#) and TIPs in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

Urbanized area (UZA) means a geographic area with a population of 50,000 or more, as designated by the Bureau of the Census.

Users of public transportation means any person, or groups representing such persons, who use transportation open to the general public, other than taxis and other privately funded and operated vehicles.

Visualization techniques means methods used by [States](#) and [MPOs](#) in the development of transportation plans and programs with the public, elected and appointed officials, and other stakeholders in a clear and easily accessible format such as GIS- or web-based surveys, inventories, maps, pictures, and/or displays identifying features such as roadway rights of way, transit, intermodal, and non-motorized transportation facilities, historic and cultural [resources](#), natural [resources](#), and environmentally sensitive areas, to promote improved understanding of existing or proposed transportation plans and programs.

APPENDIX 2.

Incorporation of FDOT Public Involvement Handbook references into the MPO Public Participation Plan

FDOT Public Involvement Handbook Objectives	MPO Public Participation Plan Page Number
Early and continuous public participation	8-9, 10-11,15
Inclusionary practices in activities and notification	8, 10-11, 15
Consideration of the needs of the traditionally underserved and transportation disadvantaged	7, 8-9, 13-15, 16-17
Collaboration with other agencies, local governments, private sector transportation entities, and non-MPO officials	8-9, 15, 16-17
Convenient meeting times and locations	8-9, 15
Reasonable access to information	8-9, 10-15, 16-17
Timely notice of public participation activities, including appropriate review and comment periods	9, 10, 15, 16-17
Acknowledgement and consideration of public comments	15, 18

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

M E M O R A N D U M

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

THROUGH: Ryan Sweeney
Acting Planning and Development Services Director

Brian Freeman, AICP
MPO Staff Director

FROM: Mark Vietze
Senior Planner

DATE: December 2, 2025

SUBJECT: **Crash Data Presentation**

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of December 10, 2025.

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

A required task of the MPO is to annually review and adopt targets for five safety performance measures. In doing so each year, the MPO has supported FDOT's "Vision Zero" goal of eliminating all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries.

As part of the MPO's continued focus on creating a safer community, staff recently compiled crash data for Indian River County covering the most recent available five-year period (January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2024). The crash data was obtained from the State of Florida's Signal Four Analytics database. As recommended by the MPO's recently adopted *Safe Streets for All Action Plan*, staff has also begun an initial assessment of the crash data in preparation for the MPO's adoption of safety targets early next year.

At the December 10th MPO meeting, staff will provide a presentation on the preliminary crash data for the years 2020 through 2024.

RECOMMENDATION

This is an informational item; no action is required.

INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FLORIDA

M E M O R A N D U M

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

THROUGH: Ryan Sweeney
Acting Planning & Development Services Director

FROM: Brian Freeman, AICP
MPO Staff Director

DATE: December 2, 2025

SUBJECT: **Extension of General Planning Consultant Contracts**

It is requested that the information presented herein be given formal consideration by the Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) at its meeting of December 10, 2025.

DESCRIPTION, CONDITIONS, AND ANALYSIS

The MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) contains a number of transportation planning tasks expected to be undertaken during the fiscal year. Many of the UPWP tasks require the expertise of transportation consulting firms.

Since 2003, the MPO has obtained General Planning Consultants (GPCs) to perform a number of major and minor planning tasks. In recent years, GPCs have prepared the MPO's 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), an update to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan, the Safe Streets for All Action Plan, and the Railroad Overpass Feasibility Study.

In December of 2022, the Indian River County MPO authorized staff to hire four General Planning Consultants (Kimley-Horn, Marlin, Benesch, and Inspire) to undertake various UPWP planning tasks that require consultant services. The current GPC contracts are set to expire in December of this year. According to the original GPC contracts, "... subject to the MPO's sole discretion, this Agreement may be extended by the MPO Staff Director or designee for an additional one (1) year beyond the initial three (3) year period of the Agreement, if specifically delegated this authority by the MPO."

Next year, MPO staff will coordinate with the County's Purchasing Division on soliciting the services of consultant firms for a new three-year contract. MPO staff anticipates presenting those firms for approval by the MPO in late 2026.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the MPO authorize the MPO Staff Director to renew the contracts with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Marlin Engineering, Alfred Benesch and Company, and Inspire Placemaking Collective for an additional year.

ATTACHMENT

1. General Planning Consultant Scope of Services (approved in 2022)
2. Renewal of Agreement for General Planning Consultant Services with Kimley Horn and Associates, Inc.
3. Renewal of Agreement for General Planning Consultant Services with Marlin Engineering, Inc.
4. Renewal of Agreement for General Planning Consultant Services with Alfred Benesch and Company
5. Renewal of Agreement for General Planning Consultant Services with Inspire Placemaking Collective, Inc.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Consultant(s) selected may be required to perform the following types of activities under the terms of this agreement.

1. **Short & Long Range Transportation Planning/Corridor Analyses and Sub-area Analyses**

The GPC may be required to develop Long and Short Range Transportation Plans, Analyses, and Studies. Subtasks required of these analyses may include:

- a. Data collection, GIS database development, and existing conditions analysis
- b. Deficiency identification and strategy development
- c. Future condition forecasts
- d. Impact assessment of proposed improvements on neighborhoods and adjacent land uses (consistent with FDOT's Efficient Transportation Decision Making methodology, or ETDM)
- e. Long Range Transportation Plan development
- f. Planning for consistency with MAP-21/FAST Act provisions including Performance Measures
- g. Land Use and Transportation coordination studies, including vacant land, population, and development projections and production and attraction balance studies.
- h. Regional Long Range Planning studies

2. **Non-Motorized Transportation Planning**– The consultant(s) will be required to perform non-motorized transportation project planning and studies:

- a. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Greenways Plans and Studies
- b. Automated Bicycle and Pedestrian AADT Collection studies
- c. Pedestrian Safety Action Plans
- d. Multi-Modal Quality and Level of Service (MMQLOS) Analysis
- e. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Inventory and Database Management

3. **Transit Planning** - The consultant(s) must have specialized expertise in the fields of transit planning and must be able to perform the following tasks, if requested by the MPO:

- a. Major and Minor TDP Updates
- b. Transit Quality of Service Report Development
- c. Transit Route and Segment Evaluation
- d. Transit network development and mode-choice modeling
- e. Ridership and Operator Surveys
- f. Origin-Destination mapping
- g. Transportation Disadvantaged Analysis
- h. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans

4. **Transportation Planning Model Calibration and Sub-Area Modeling** The consultant(s) shall be able to perform a number of tasks in support of the MPO's Travel Demand Forecast Modeling efforts. The consultant(s) must be able to perform these activities in the FDOT-adopted Travel Demand Forecasting Model standard platform. Activities to be undertaken may include:
 - a. Initial network and model development and validation activities
 - b. Network changes, background data, and zonal boundary changes
 - c. Model calibration and adjustment
 - d. Socio-economic data development
 - e. Scenario modeling for major new developments, proposed land use changes, or changes to proposed transportation projects
 - f. Small-area and sub-area model development and calibration
 - g. Air-quality modeling and analysis
5. **Traffic Engineering and Operational Studies** – Appropriate activities to be performed by consultant(s) on an as-requested basis may include:
 - a. Signal Timing study development
 - b. Traffic Count, Vehicle Classification, or Delay study development
 - c. System Condition Inventory development
 - d. Incorporating Autonomous, Connected, Electric, and Shared (ACES) Vehicle studies into the planning process
 - e. Level of Service determination
 - f. Crash Data System Development and Analysis
 - g. Access Management Classification and Re-classification Study development
 - h. Design, Permitting, and Environmental Studies
 - i. Safety and Security studies
6. **Public Participation Activities** – These activities are undertaken to ensure that the MPO's public involvement process meets all federal and state regulations and provides opportunities for a well-informed public to contribute input into the transportation planning and decision-making processes. The following sub-tasks may require skills that would be otherwise unavailable to the MPO or inefficient to procure on a permanent basis:
 - a. Website development and maintenance
 - b. Newsletter, fact sheet, direct mail, PSA, brochure, and advertisement design and layout
 - c. MPO Database development and maintenance
 - d. Public workshop or small group meeting preparation and staffing
 - e. Public Opinion Poll and Survey design
 - f. MPO Public Involvement effort evaluation
 - g. Visualization and Graphics, including Computer Simulation development
 - h. Other activities contained in the MPO Public Participation Plan

7. **Comprehensive Plan and Analysis Reviews** - Consultant(s) services are appropriate to review comprehensive plan amendments and perform analysis for comprehensive plan updates. Specific Comprehensive Plan review and analysis activities may include:
 - a. Review of local comprehensive plans and plan amendments for consistency with MPO plans
 - b. Review of local comprehensive plans and plan amendments for consistency with updated federal and/or state guidance and legislation
 - c. Analysis of local comprehensive plan amendment proposals for impacts to the transportation system in Indian River County
 - d. Development of charts, graphs, technical studies, and other work products that support local comprehensive plan development activities
8. **Review of Other Planning Studies** - General Planning Consultant(s) may be engaged to review specialized transportation studies submitted by local governments, the Florida Department of Transportation, private developers, and other agencies. Transportation Study Review activities may include:
 - a. Review of study methodology
 - b. Review of modeling assumptions
 - c. Review of study data assumptions and analysis, including trip generation rates, pass-by and internal capture rates, system capacity assumptions, traffic assignments, and other components of the analysis
9. **Congestion Management Process (CMP) Updates** – General Planning Consultant(s) may be required to analyze congested corridors and identify improvements for inclusion in the MPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as part of the MPO’s annual Congestion Management Process. The CMP requires expertise in transportation planning and operations and may involve the following sub-tasks:
 - a. Network Development, Review and Modification
 - b. System Trends and Conditions Analysis
 - c. Strategy Identification and Evaluation
 - d. Corridor Screening Criteria Development
 - e. CMP Project Identification
 - f. Annual State of the System Report Development
10. **Special Project Planning Studies** – The consultant(s) may be required to perform various studies, analysis, and tasks that supports another MPO work product. These projects may be either one-time or continuing tasks that are of special interest to residents within the urbanized area, and may include:
 - a. Mobility Zone plan development
 - b. Traffic Systems and Management Operational (TSMO) data collection and studies Other mobility studies, as identified by the MPO
 - c. Other Project Studies, as identified by the MPO
 - d. Economic market analysis
 - e. Freight and Goods Movement Studies

- f. Intermodal Systems Evaluation and Planning, Major Modal Hub access and planning (i.e. Airport, Transit and Hubs)
- g. Design, Permitting, and Environmental Studies (not PL fund eligible)
- h. Continuity of Operations and Contingency Plans
- i. Traffic Impact Fee Analysis
- j. Land Use and Transportation coordination studies, including vacant land, population, and development projections and production and attraction balance studies
- k. High-Speed, Regional, Commuter, and Freight Rail Planning studies and Rail Impact studies
- l. Post-Census or New Highway Authorization Bill MPO Administrative, Performance Monitoring, and Compliance Studies

**RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR GENERAL
PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES**

between

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

and

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

THIS RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT, entered into this 10th day of December, 2025, by and between INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, hereinafter referred to as the “MPO”, and KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC., hereinafter referred to as the “CONSULTANT”.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the MPO and CONSULTANT entered into an Agreement for General Planning Consulting Services (Agreement) dated December 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, that Agreement is scheduled to expire on December 14, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the parties had agreed that the Agreement may be extended for one additional year at the discretion of the MPO; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to continue to utilize the services provided by CONSULTANT for an additional one-year period;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties herein, in consideration of their mutual covenants, agree as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated by reference herein.
2. The Agreement dated December 14, 2022, is hereby renewed for an additional one year, and now shall expire on December 14, 2026. All of the other terms and conditions contained therein shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed these presents this 10th day of December, 2025.

ATTEST: _____

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

BY: _____

BY: _____
Bob McPartlan, Chair

ATTEST:

**KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES,
INC.**

BY: _____

BY: _____

NAME: _____

NAME: _____

ITS: (title) _____

Approved as to Form and
Legal Sufficiency

Susan J. Prado
Deputy County Attorney

**RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR GENERAL
PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES**

between

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

and

MARLIN ENGINEERING, INC.

THIS RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT, entered into this 10th day of December, 2025, by and between INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, hereinafter referred to as the “MPO”, and MARLIN ENGINEERING, INC., hereinafter referred to as the “CONSULTANT”.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the MPO and CONSULTANT entered into an Agreement for General Planning Consulting Services (Agreement) dated December 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, that Agreement is scheduled to expire on December 14, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the parties had agreed that the Agreement may be extended for one additional year at the discretion of the MPO; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to continue to utilize the services provided by CONSULTANT for an additional one-year period;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties herein, in consideration of their mutual covenants, agree as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated by reference herein.
2. The Agreement dated December 14, 2022, is hereby renewed for an additional one year, and now shall expire on December 14, 2026. All of the other terms and conditions contained therein shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed these presents this 10th day of December, 2025.

ATTEST: _____

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

BY: _____

BY: _____
Bob McPartlan, Chair

ATTEST:

MARLIN ENGINEERING, INC.

BY: _____

BY: _____

NAME: _____

NAME: _____

ITS: (title) _____

Approved as to Form and
Legal Sufficiency

Susan J. Prado
Deputy County Attorney

**RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR GENERAL
PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES**

between

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

and

ALFRED BENESCH AND COMPANY

THIS RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT, entered into this 10th day of December, 2025, by and between INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, hereinafter referred to as the “MPO”, and ALFRED BENESCH AND COMPANY, hereinafter referred to as the “CONSULTANT”.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the MPO and CONSULTANT entered into an Agreement for General Planning Consulting Services (Agreement) dated December 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, that Agreement is scheduled to expire on December 14, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the parties had agreed that the Agreement may be extended for one additional year at the discretion of the MPO; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to continue to utilize the services provided by CONSULTANT for an additional one-year period;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties herein, in consideration of their mutual covenants, agree as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated by reference herein.
2. The Agreement dated December 14, 2022, is hereby renewed for an additional one year, and now shall expire on December 14, 2026. All of the other terms and conditions contained therein shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed these presents this 10th day of December, 2025.

ATTEST: _____

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

BY: _____

BY: _____
Bob McPartlan, Chair

ATTEST:

ALFRED BENESCH AND COMPANY

BY: _____

BY: _____

NAME: _____

NAME: _____

ITS: (title) _____

Approved as to Form and
Legal Sufficiency

Susan J. Prado
Deputy County Attorney

**RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR GENERAL
PLANNING CONSULTING SERVICES**

between

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

and

INSPIRE PLACEMAKING COLLECTIVE, INC.

THIS RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT, entered into this 10th day of December, 2025, by and between INDIAN RIVER COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, hereinafter referred to as the “MPO”, and INSPIRE PLACEMAKING COLLECTIVE, INC., hereinafter referred to as the “CONSULTANT”.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, the MPO and CONSULTANT entered into an Agreement for General Planning Consulting Services (Agreement) dated December 14, 2022; and

WHEREAS, that Agreement is scheduled to expire on December 14, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the parties had agreed that the Agreement may be extended for one additional year at the discretion of the MPO; and

WHEREAS, the MPO desires to continue to utilize the services provided by CONSULTANT for an additional one-year period;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties herein, in consideration of their mutual covenants, agree as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated by reference herein.
2. The Agreement dated December 14, 2022, is hereby renewed for an additional one year, and now shall expire on December 14, 2026. All of the other terms and conditions contained therein shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have executed these presents this 10th day of December, 2025.

ATTEST: _____

**INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
METROPOLITAN PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

BY: _____

BY: _____
Bob McPartlan, Chair

ATTEST:

**INSPIRE PLACEMAKING
COLLECTIVE, INC.**

BY: _____

BY: _____

NAME: _____

NAME: _____

ITS: (title) _____

Approved as to Form and
Legal Sufficiency

Susan J. Prado
Deputy County Attorney