## MARTIN P $O$ Metropolitan Planning Organization

FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING Martin County Administrative Center
$4^{\text {th }}$ Floor Workshop Room 2401 SE Monterey Road, Stuart, FL 34996
www.martinmpo.com
(772) 221-1498

Friday, June 7, 2024 @ 1:00 PM
AGENDA
ITEM
ACTION

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVE AGENDA

APPROVE
4. MEETING SUMMARY

- FTAC Meeting - December 1, 2023

INFORMATION
5. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC (PLEASE LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO THREE MINUTES; COMPLETE CARD TO COMMENT)
6. AGENDA ITEMS
A. FLORIDA'S TURNPIKE AND I-95 DIRECT CONNECT INTERCHANGE PD\&E STUDY PRESENTATION(pg. 6) INFORMATION
B. COVE ROAD WIDENING PD\&E PRESENTATION (pg. 22) INFORMATION
C. FINAL DRAFT FY25-FY29 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) - FREIGHT RELATED PROJECTS (pg. 48)

APPROVE
D. FY26-FY30 LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES (LOPP)(pg. 246) APPROVE
E. FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FDOT) DISTRICT FOUR FREIGHT UPDATE (pg. 249) INFORMATION

## 7. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

8. NOTES
9. NEXT MEETING

FTAC - December 6, 2024

## 10.ADJOURN

The Martin MPO solicits public participation 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 language translation services (free of charge) should contact Ricardo Vazquez, Principal Planner (Title VI/Non-discrimination Contact) at (772) 223-7983 or rvazquez@martin.fl.us in advance of the meeting. Hearing-impaired individuals are requested to telephone the Florida Relay System at \#711.

# MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING 

Martin County Administrative Building
$4^{\text {th }}$ Floor Workshop Room
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996
www.martinmpo.com
(772) 221-1498

Friday, December 1, 2023 @ 1:00 PM
MEETING SUMMARY

ROLL CALL
FTAC Members in Attendance:
Jim Gorton
Samantha Lovelady
Peter Kunen
Jessica Cortor Seymour for Thomas Lanahan
Justin Stroh
Robert Ledoux
Members Excused:
Joan Goodrich, Chair
Ryan Walpole, Vice Chair
Jeff Sabin
Brita Nowak
Desiree Wood

## Members Absent:

Andrew McBean
Donna Carman
Butch Olsen
Mark Crosley
Officer Dickson
Yvette Ager Goodiel
Jared Dusharm
Aubrey Brown

## Staff in Attendance:

Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator
Ricardo Vazquez, Senior Planner
Lucine Martens, Planner
Anthony O'Neill-Butler, Administrative Assistant

## Others in Attendance:

George Dzama, Deputy Public Works Director
James Brown Jr., FDOT-Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE)
Nicholas Danu, FDOT-Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE)
Robert Lopes, FDOT District Four
Carlos Carter, FDOT District Four
Tanya Kristoff, Lochner

## MEETING SUMMARY

There was not a quorum present at the meeting.
Tanya Kristoff with Lochner Engineering presented the SW Monterey Road at FEC Railroad Grade Separation Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Study Presentation to the Committee. The study includes a total of nine different alternatives. A brief discussion took place regarding the nine different alternatives and the upcoming Public Meeting which will take place in May 2024.

James Brown Jr. with Florida's Turnpike Enterprise introduced Nicholas Danu, also with Florida's Turnpike Enterprise, who presented Florida's Turnpike and I-95 Direct Connect Interchange PD\&E Study Presentation. Mr. Danu noted that the study is very preliminary and that a formal presentation is underway for the February cycle of meetings. FDOT is currently looking at concepts that should be ready to be made in January and once completed, will go to the public in mid-May 2024. Mr. Danu also noted that the Turnpike is using their own money instead of using Federal funds. Beth Beltran, MPO Administrator, asked if the MPO could be notified when the public meetings take place. Jessica Seymour asked how this would affect traffic, even though that is not the objective of this project. Mr. Danu advised that they are trying to get ahead of the growth in this area and it is anticipated right now that this project will help to alleviate some congestion.

Justin Stroh, FDOT District Four Freight Coordinator, introduced himself to the Committee as the new Freight Coordinator and asked them to inform him of any needs or additional freight activity within the District Four area. Mr. Stroh also sought a letter of support from the Martin MPO to submit SR-710 to the National Highway Freight Network. Ms. Beltran advised him that the letter of support would be going before the MPO Policy Board on December 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2023$.

## COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Samantha Lovelady expressed her hopes that we could get more members to attend the next meeting.

Robert Daniels asked if there was the capability for a virtual component. Beth Beltran and Ricardo Vazquez advised that, for quorum purposes, that is not permitted.

Jessica Seymour shared that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council had a recent meeting regarding recyclable materials and the opportunities that could bring for rail across the counties, especially considering Miami-Dade County's loss of their recycling facilities.

Jim Gorton mentioned a new Green Facility which will introduce trucks with biosolids down the SR-710 corridor and to prepare for an influx of freight traffic in that area.

Beth Beltran told the Committee about the MPO's Transit Development Plan (TDP) and asked all members to take the survey.

## NEXT MEETING

- FTAC Meeting - June 7, 2024, at 1:00 PM


## ADJOURNMENT 2:53 PM

The Martin MPO solicits public participation 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 language translation services (free of charge) should contact Ricardo Vazquez, Principal Planner (Title VI/Non-discrimination Contact) at (772) 223-7983 or in advance of the meeting. Hearing-impaired individuals are requested to telephone the Florida Relay System at \#711.

# MARTIN M $\mathbf{P}$ Metropolitan Planning Organization 

MARTIN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

| MEETING DATE: | DUE DATE: | UPWP\#: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| June 7, 2024 | May 31, 2024 | 6 |  |
| WORDING: |  |  |  |
| TURNPIKE AND I-95 DIRECT CONNECTION PD\&E STUDY PRESENTATION |  |  |  |
| REQUESTED BY: | PREPARED BY: <br> MPO | DOCUMENT(S) REQUIRING <br> Reardo Vazquez / <br> Beth Beltran |  |
| ACTION: N/A |  |  |  |

## BACKGROUND

Florida's Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) is developing a Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) Study for the Turnpike and I-95 Direct Connection Interchange Project. The purpose of this study is to develop and evaluate alternatives to a potential interchange that will directly connect l-95 and the Florida Turnpike. This study will look at improvements to traffic operations, travel time reliability, safety, and enhanced emergency response and evacuation.

## ISSUES

At the June 7, 2024, FTAC meeting, FTE staff will present the Turnpike and I-95 Direct Connection Interchange PD\&E Study.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Provide comments

## ATTACHMENTS

Turnpike and I-95 Direct Connection Interchange PD\&E Study PowerPoint Presentation

## Martin MPO FTAC Meeting

 June 7, 2024Turnpike (SR 91) and I-95 (SR 9) Direct Connection Interchange PD\&E Study in Martin County

Financial Project ID \#: 446975-1
Presenter: Jazlyn Heywood, P.E.

## PRESENTATION OUTLINE

1. Purpose and Need
2. Project Alternatives
3. Schedule


## LOCATION AND PURPOSE \& NEED



## PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED IMPROVE SYSTEM LINKAGE

- No existing direct connections between Florida's Turnpike and I-95
- Local roadway network used to switch between facilities at Martin Highway or Indiantown Road
- System-to-system connection needed to improve linkage I-95


## PROJECT PURPOSE \& NEED - ENHANCE SAFETY

(4)


## Enhance emergency response and evacuation

- Both Turnpike and I-95 are critical in facilitating traffic movement during emergency response and evacuation periods



## ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS



- Tiered alternatives analysis
 process


## ALTERNATIVE 1



- Provides the same four direct connections between Turnpike and I-95 as Alternative 1

Potential
Right-of-Way
Impacts

- Estimated cost: \$156M


## ALTERNATIVES 1 \& 2 - EMERGENCY ACCESS ROADS



## ALTERNATIVES 1\&2-2050 TRAFFIC BENEFITS

## New Direct Connection Interchange

- 26,400 vehicles per day


## West Indiantown Road Interchange

- Crossover traffic removed: 15,600 AADT
- 37\% decrease at Turnpike interchange
- 16\% decrease at I-95 interchange


## Southwest Martin Highway Interchange

- Cross over traffic removed: 3,200 AADT
- $8 \%$ decrease at Turnpike interchange



## ALTERNATIVES 1 \&2-2050 TRAFFIC BENEFITS

## LOCAL ROAD BENEFITS

## Martin Highway (SR 714)

- Local road traffic removed: 3,200 AADT
- $5 \%$ decrease in traffic

High Meadows Avenue

- Local road traffic removed: 2,600 AADT
- 9\% decrease in traffic



## PROJECT SCHEDULE



Schedule is subject to change

## PROJECT WEBSITE \& CONTACT INFORMATION

## Project Website:

www.TPK-I-95-Interchange-Study.com

## Project Manager Contact Information:

Jazlyn Heywood, P.E.<br>Florida's Turnpike Enterprise<br>P.O. Box 613069<br>Ocoee, FL 34761-3069<br>Jazlyn.Heywood@dot.state.fl.us<br>407.264.3298

## THANK YOU!



## BACKGROUND

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a Project Development \& Environment (PD\&E) Study for the widening of Cove Road (FM\# 441700-1). The study limits are from Kanner Highway to US-1. The purpose of widening Cove Road from two lanes to four lanes is to add capacity for all modes of travel and to improve the local transportation network. The PD\&E Study will evaluate existing conditions, impacts to traffic, evaluate environmental concerns, and develop design alternatives for consideration.

## ISSUES

At the June 7, 2024, FTAC Meeting, FDOT staff and their consultant will present the Cove Road Widening PD\&E Project.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Provide comments

## APPROVAL

MPO

## ATTACHMENTS

Cove Road Widening PD\&E Project PowerPoint Presentation


Florida Department of Transportation

COVE ROAD
From State Road (SR) 76/Kanner Highway to SR 5/US-1
Martin County, Florida

## PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND

 ENVIRONMENT (PD\&E) STUDYFinancial Project Identification Number: 441700-1
Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) Number: 14479


## Transportation Development Process




- From Kanner Highway to US-1
- Project extends approximately 3.2 miles


## Project Location



## Project Background

- Existing Roadway Characteristics
- 2-lane undivided roadway
- Major arterial
- Unincorporated M artin County
- Intermittent sidewalks
- Posted speed varies from 35-45 miles per hour
- Project Kick-off M eeting held:
- Virtual - M arch 29, 2023
- In-Person - M arch 30, 2023


## The primary purpose of widening Cove Road from two lanes to four lanes is to add capacity for all modes of travel and improve the local transportation network.



## Concepts and Alternatives Under Consideration

- Five alternatives are currently being evaluated for this project
- An initial review considered additional alternatives, but it was determined that they did not meet the project's purpose and need and were eliminated from further consideration.
- The No-Build Alternative
- No improvements to the roadway other than routine maintenance
- The project was divided into two evaluation segments
- Segment 1 is from SR 76/Kanner Highway to west of Avalon Drive
- Segment 2 is from west of Avalon Drive to SR 5/US 1


## Existing Condition from SR 76 to W of Avalon Dr



* From SR 76 (Kanner Hwy.) to Atlantic Ridge Drive


## Alternative 1A Typical Section




## Alternative 1B Typical Section




## Existing Condition from Avalon Dr to US 1



## Alternative 2A Typical Section



COVE ROAD
From State Road (SR) 76/Kanner Highway
to SR 5/US-1
Martin County, Florida


## Alternative 2C




## Alternative 2D




## Environmental Analysis

- Protected species and habitat
- Wetland and floodplains
- Water quality and Stormwater management and permitting
- Air quality
- Right-of-way requirements and relocations
- Contamination
- Archeological and Historical Resources
- Noise
- Land use
- Construction effects
- Farmland
- Aesthetics

|  |  | Segment 1 |  | Segment 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SR 76 (Kanner Highway) to Avalon Drive |  | Avalon Drive to SR 5 (US 1) |  |  |
| Evaluation Criteria | No Build Alternative | Typical Section 1A | Typical Section 18 | Typical Section 2A (Best fit alignment) | Typical Section 2C (Best fit alignment) | Typical Section 2D |
| Right-of-Way Impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of parcels impacted | 0 | 23 | 21 | 30 | 31 | 3 |
| Right of way impact area (acres) | 0 | 1.07 | 1.02 | 1.38 | 0.94 | 0.48 |
| Number of residential relocations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of business relocations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Natural, Environmental \& Physical Impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Threatened and endangered species impacts | None | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Archaeological/historic site impacts | None | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Potential contamination sites (high \& medium risk ranking) | None | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wetland impacts (acres) | None | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Floodplain impacts (acres) | None | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Potential Section 4(f) impacts | None | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Social \& neighborhood impacts | None | Low | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Estimated Costs (Present Day Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design ( $15 \%$ of construction) | No cost | \$6,564,000 | \$6,122,000 | \$1,236,000 | \$1,165,000 | \$1,356,000 |
| Road right-of-way | No cost | \$4,262,000 | \$3,933,000 | \$13,452,000 | \$10,431,000 | \$4,419,000 |
| Pond right-of-way | No cost | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| Wetland mitigation | No cost | \$54,000 | \$54,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Roadway construction | No cost | \$43,758,400 | \$40,810,300 | \$8,239,500 | \$7,764,200 | \$9,036,700 |
| CEI (15\% of construction) | No cost | \$6,564,000 | \$6,122,000 | \$1,236,000 | \$1,165,000 | \$1,356,000 |
| Total cost | No cost | \$61,202,000 | \$57,041,000 | \$24,164,000 | \$20,525,000 | \$16,168,000 |

## Project Schedule

- Alternatives Public M eeting
- Virtual - M ay 21, 2024
- In-Person - M ay 22, 2024
- Indian River State College
- Design funded in fiscal year 2025
- Right-of-way and construction are not currently funded


Public Hearing

Recommended Alternatives and Finalize Documents

LDCA Announcement

## Alternatives Public Workshop feedback

- Alternative 1B and Alternative 2C most preferred
- Add traffic signal/roundabout (Tres Belle, Montego Cove, SE North Gate Dr, Ault Ave)
- Add area at Montego Cove entrance from the west to accommodate cars waiting at gated entrance
- Modify "unsafe" Kanner/Cove/Gaines intersection; improve Gaines Ave traffic heading westbound Cove
- Kanner/Cove intersection - cars not stopping to make right turn on to Cove
- Access management and left turns not allowed everywhere
- Noise and requests for walls
- Traffic back up on Cove Road by Tres Belle
- Students' safety crossing Cove Rd
- Drainage issues from SE North Gate Drive to U.S. 1
- Elevation changes and driveway grades, potential drainage issues
- Add median landscaping, include large trees or hedges
- Include streetlights
- Hosford Park and dog safety
- Wetland impacts between Summerfield and widening



## Contact Information

# Vanita Saini, P.E. <br> Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Project M anager FDOT District Four <br> 3400 West Commercial Boulevard Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309 

Email: vanita.saini@dot.state.fl.us<br>Telephone: (954) 777-4468<br>Toll-Free: (866) 336-8435, Ext. 4468

## Safe Summer Travel M onth


flhsmv.gov/SafeSummerTravel
FLHSMV

COVE ROAD
From State Road (SR) 76/Kanner Highway

## Questions?



FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

| MEETING DATE: June 7, 2024 | DUE DATE: <br> May 31, 2024 | UPWP\#: $5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WORDING: <br> FINAL DRAFT FY25 - FY29 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) |  |  |
| REQUESTED BY: FDOT | PREPARED BY: <br> Ricardo Vazquez / <br> Beth Beltran | DOCUMENT(S) REQUIRING ACTION: Final Draft FY25-FY29 TIP |

## BACKGROUND

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the document that contains all Federal, State and locally funded, and regionally significant transportation projects to be funded in Martin County during the next five fiscal years. This document is updated annually and is based on the FDOT District Four Tentative Work Program that was approved by the MPO Board on October 23, 2023.

The Final Draft FY25 - FY29 TIP is scheduled to be adopted by the MPO Board at the June 17, 2024, meeting. On May 3rd the Draft TIP was made available for public review on the MPO website and in hard copy format at local libraries and in the County Administrative Center lobby to provide 45 days for public review and comment.

## ISSUES

At the June 2024 Advisory Committee meetings, MPO staff will present the Final Draft FY25 - FY29 TIP. The final draft TIP will be presented during a public hearing at the June 17, 2024, MPO Policy Board meeting.

Freight related projects in the TIP include:

- Cove Road widening from Kanner Hwy to US-1
- SR-710 widening from Martin/Okeechobee County Line to east of SW Allapattah Road
- CR-714 at SR-710 realignment
- Turnpike widening and bridge replacement
- I-95 Inspection Barn Upgrades
- Monterey Road at FEC Railroad Crossing Grade Separation
- High Meadow Ave widening from I-95 to Martin Hwy


## RECOMMENDED ACTION

a) Motion to approve the Final Draft FY25 - FY29 TIP as presented.
b) Provide comments on the Final Draft FY25 - FY29 TIP.

## AGENDA ITEM 6C

## FISCAL IMPACT

The Transportation Improvement Program is based upon the Draft Tentative Work Program approved at the October 23, 2023, Policy Board Meeting. It is the vehicle through which State and Federal transportation funds are authorized to be released for Martin County transportation projects.

## ATTACHMENTS

Final Draft FY25 - FY29 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Transportation Improvement Program

# martin(M)PO Metropolitan Planning Organization 

FY25 - FY29

## Transportation Improvement Program

Adopted by the Martin MPO Board on June 17, 2024
ENDORSEMENT

Troy McDonald
MPO Board Chairman

The Transportation Improvement Program of the Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization has been developed consistent with Federal regulations 23 U.S.C. 134(h) and CFR 450 and Florida Statute 339.175(8) in cooperation with the Florida Department of Transportation, and the local member agencies and public transit operators in the Martin MPO Planning Area.

## Martin MPO Board

## Martin County

Commissioner Doug Smith, Vice Chair
Commissioner Stacey Hetherington
Commissioner Sarah Heard
Commissioner Harold Jenkins

## Town of Sewall's Point

Commissioner Kaija Mayfield

## City of Stuart

Commissioner Troy McDonald, Chair
Commissioner Christopher Collins

## Village of Indiantown

Council Member Susan Gibbs Thomas

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION

TITLE
Martin MPO FY25 - FY29
Transportation Improvement Program

## REPORT DATE

June 2024

## ORGANIZATION NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBER

Martin MPO
3481 SE Willoughby Boulevard
Suite 101, Stuart, FL 34994
772-221-1498
www.martinmpo.com

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this report has been funded in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U. S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), under the Metropolitan Planning Program of the U.S. Code (Title 23, Section 104(f)). The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) contains all transportation-related projects to be funded by Title 23 and Title 49 funds. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the USDOT.

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 Americans with Disabilities Act or language translation services (free of charge) should contact Ricardo Vazquez, Principal Planner (Title VI/Non- discrimination Contact) at (772) 223-7983 or rvazquez@martin.fl.us. Hearing-impaired individuals are requested to telephone the Florida Relay System at \#711.

## CERTIFICATION

## FHWA/ FTA CERTIFICATION

Federal Law requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to jointly certify the transportation planning processes of Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) at least every four years (a TMA is an urbanized area, as defined by the US Census, with a population over 200,000). ${ }^{1}$ The most recent quadrennial certification site visit was conducted in March 2021, and the next anticipated quadrennial certification will occur before September 2025.

Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.328(a), the FHWA/FTA must jointly find that each metropolitan TIP is based on a " $3-C$ " (continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative) planning process by the MPO, State Department of Transportation, and transit service provider(s). The Martin MPO participated in a State Certification process that is conducted annually by FDOT District Four. The results from the most recent State Certification is available on the Martin MPO website (www.martinmpo.com) No recommendations or corrective actions were issued by FDOT as part of the most recent State Certification.

[^0]Pursuant to the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(5) and 23 CFR 450.334(a), the Department and the MPO have performed a review of the certification status of the metropolitan transportation planning process for the Martin MPO with respect to the requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 ;
2. Titte VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended ( 42 U.S.C. $2000 \mathrm{~d}-1$ ) and 49 C.F.R. Part 21
3. 49 U.S.C. 5332 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Section $1101(\mathrm{~b})$ of the FAST Act and 49 C.F.R. Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
5. 23 C.F.R. Part 230 regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
6. The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ( 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and the regulations found in 49 C.F.R. Parts 27, 37, and 38;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101) prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of gender; and
9. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ( 29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 C.F.R. Part 27 regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities.

Included in this certification package is a summary of noteworthy achievements by the MPO, attachments associated with these achievements, and (if applicable) a list of any recommendations and/or corrective actions. The contents of this Joint Certification Package have been reviewed by the MPO and accurately reflect the results of the joint certification review meeting held on 2/13/2023.

Based on a joint review and evaluation, the Florida Department of Transportation and the Martin MPO recommend that the Metropolitan Planning Process for the Martin MPO be certified.


Name. Troy McDonald
Title: MPO Chairman (or designee)


Office of Policy Planning

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AADT ...... Annual Average Daily Traffic
AAR ...... Administrative Approval Request
AARP ..... American Association of Retired Persons
AASHTO . American Association of State Highway and
Transportation Officials
ACES ...... Automated/Connected/Electric/Shared-use
ADA ...... Americans with Disabilities Act
AOR ...... Annual Operating Report
ARC ....... Advocates for the Rights of Challenged
BDB ....... Business Development Board
BEBR ..... Bureau of Economic and Business Research
BOCC..... Board of County Commissioners
BPAC ..... Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
BPSAP .... Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
CAC ....... Citizens Advisory Committee
CDC ........ Center for Disease Control
CDP........ Census Designated Place
CEI....... Construction Engineering and Inspection
CFP........Cost Feasible Plan
CFR ....... Code of Federal Regulations
CIP...... Capital Improvement Program
CMP ....... Congestion Management Process
CMS ...... Congestion Management System
CPTHSTP Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation
CR.......... County Road
CRA ....... Community Redevelopment Area
CTC....... Community Transportation Coordinator
CTD........ Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged

| CTPP | Census Transportation Planning Program |
| :---: | :---: |
| CUTR | Center for Urban Transportation Research |
| DBE | Disadvantaged Business Enterprise |
| DOPA | Designated Official Planning Agency |
| E+C. | Existing Plus Committed |
|  | Environmental Justice |
|  | Executive Order |
| EPA. | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ETAT | Environmental Technical Advisory Team |
| ETDM | Efficient Transportation Decision Making |
| FAA. | Federal Aviation Administration |
| FAC. | Florida Administrative Code |
| FAST | Fixing America's Surface Transportation |
| FCTS | Florida Coordinated Transportation System |
| FDOT | Florida Department of Transportation |
| FEC.. | Florida East Coast (Railway) |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FPTA | Florida Public Transportation Association |
|  | Florida Statutes |
| FSUT | Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure |
| FTA. | Federal Transit Administration |
| FTAC | Freight Transportation Advisory Committee |
| FTP | Florida Transportation Plan |
| FY . | Fiscal Year |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GIS-T | Geographical Information System - Transportation Modeling |
| GOS | Goals, Objectives, and Strategies |
| GUI... | Graphic User Interface |

HOA ........ Homeowners Association
HPMS ...... Highway Performance Monitoring System
ICWW...... Intracoastal Waterway
ISTEA...... Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
ITS .......... Intelligent Transportation System
JPA ......... Joint Participation Agreement
LCB-TD... Local Coordinating Board for the Transportation Disadvantaged
LCI .......... Livable Communities Initiative
LEP.........Limited English Proficiency
LGCP ...... Local Government Comprehensive Plan
LOGT ...... Local Option Gas Tax
LOPP ...... List of Project Priorities
LOS......... Level of Service
LRTP....... Long Range Transportation Plan
MAP-21 ... Moving Ahead for Progress in the $21^{\text {st }}$ Century Act
MCPT ...... Martin County Public Transit
MCTV ...... Martin County Television
MMUNP... Multimodal Unfunded Needs Plan
MOE........ Measure of Effectiveness
MPA ........ Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO ........ Metropolitan Planning Organization
MPOAC... MPO Advisory Council
MTP......... Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAAQS ... National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAC ........ Neighborhood Advisory Committee
NEPA ...... National Environmental Policy Act
OA........... Other Arterials
OMD........ Office of Modal Development
PEA......... Planning Emphasis Areas
PIP .......... Public Involvement Plan
POP......... Program of Projects
PPP.........Public Participation Plan
RFP ......... Request for Proposal
RFS ......... Request for Service
RLRTP .... Regional Long Range Transportation Plan
RTTAC .... Regional Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
SAFETEA-LU......Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SEE ......... Sociocultural Effects Evaluation

SEFTC .....Southeast Florida Transportation Council
SFRTA .....South Florida Regional Transportation Authority
SFY ..........State Fiscal Year
SHSP .......Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SIS ...........Strategic Intermodal System
SOV .........Single Occupancy Vehicle
SR............State Road
STIP .........State Transportation Improvement Program
STRA-21 ..Surface Transportation Reauthorization Act of 2021
SUN .........Shared-Use Nonmotorized
TAC..........Technical Advisory Committee
TAP..........Transportation Alternatives Program
TAZ..........Traffic Analysis Zone
TCQSM ....Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual
TCRPC.....Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
TCRPM ....Treasure Coast Regional Planning Model
TCSP .......Transportation and Community and System Preservation (Grant)
TCTAC .....Treasure Coast Technical Advisory Committee
TCTC .......Treasure Coast Transportation Council
TD ............Transportation Disadvantaged
TDM .........Transportation Demand Management
TDP..........Transit Development Plan
TDSP .......Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan
TEA-21.....Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
TIMAS......Transportation Inventory Management and Analysis
TIP ...........Transportation Improvement Program
Title VI .....Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
TMA .........Transportation Management Area
TPA..........Transportation Planning Agency
TPO..........Transportation Planning Organization
TRIP.........Transportation Regional Incentive Program
ULAM.......Urban Land use Allocation Model
UPWP ......Unified Planning Work Program
USC .........United States Code
USDOT ....United States Department of Transportation
UZA..........Urbanized Area

## FEDERAL AND STATE FUND CODES

ACIM ....... Advance Construction Interstate Maintenance
ACNH...... Advance Construction National Highway
ACNP...... Advance Construction Bridge Replacement
ACSA ...... Advance Construction Surface Transportation Program -
Any Area
BA........... Donor Bonus - any area Federal
BL............Donor Bonus - areas <200K population (federal)
BNCA...... Bonds - controlled access road (state)
BNDS ...... Bonds - state roads (state)
BRP......... State Bridge Replacement
BRRP ...... State Bridge Replacement and Repair
BRT......... Federal Bridge Replacement - on Federal system
BRTZ........Federal Bridge Replacement - off Federal system
CIGP ....... County Incentive Grant Program
CM .......... Congestion Mitigation
D ............. Unrestricted state primary funds
DDR ........ District Dedicated Revenue (state)
DFTA....... Federal Pass Through Dollars from FTA
DIH .......... State in-house product support
DIM.......... State intermodal development
DITS....... Statewide Intelligent Transportation System
DOH ........ State primary overhead
DPTO ...... State PTO
DS ........... State primary highways and public transit
DSL..........Local Government Cooperative Assistance Program
DU ........... State primary funds/federal reimbursement
DWS....... Weigh Stations (state)
EB ............ Equity Bonus
FCO......... State-fixed capital outlay
FHPP....... Federal High Priority Projects
FRA......... Federal Railroad Administration
FTAT ....... FHWA Transfer to FTA
GFSA......General Funds - Any Area
GMR........ General Revenue for SIS
GRSC...... General Revenue for SCOP
HPR......... Highway Planning Research (federal)
HSP ......... Highway Safety Program
LF or LFF. Local funds
LFR ......... Local funds - reimbursement from FDOT


## PHASE OF CONSTRUCTION AND COST ALLOCATION CODES
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 MPO OVERVIEW

Established in 1993, the Martin MPO is governed by a Policy Board and serves the residents of Martin County. Planning tasks of the Martin MPO include regional coordination, bicycle and pedestrian planning, mobility management, demographic research, air quality planning, and public involvement processes and updates. As an agency, the Martin MPO also serves its primary function as the coordinator for multi-modal transportation project planning and funding in and through the county with various state agencies responsible for transportation and land use plans as well as adjacent MPOs. On specific regional issues, the Martin MPO partners with the St. Lucie TPO, the Indian River County MPO, and the Palm Beach TPA.

### 1.2 TIP PURPOSE

The purpose of this Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is to provide a comprehensive and prioritized listing of transportation projects for FY25-FY29 that is consistent with the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). It contains all transportation-related projects to be funded by Title 23 and Title 49 funds and regionally significant transportation projects planned for the upcoming five years and is updated annually with funding priority given to the highest-ranked projects from the LRTP Cost Feasible Plan.

The TIP is based on funding data contained within the FDOT Tentative Work Program (also known as the Public Hearing Report), which is developed annually and made public by FDOT prior to the development of the TIP. This report is the result of FDOT working with local agencies to establish priorities for scheduling improvements to the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), including freight and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies, Federal interstate highway system, local roadways and MPO priorities concerning transit, pedestrian and bicycle friendly environments and transportation demand management programs.

### 1.3 ORGANIZATION

Section 1.0 contains a brief overview of the MPO and the purpose of the TIP. It also contains a list of major projects that are considered top priorities. Section 2.0 contains specific items that were considered in the development of this TIP. These items include the Financial Plan, List of Project Priorities, the MPO's overall goals as described within the 2045 LRTP and Performance Measures to meet Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements.

Section 3.0 contains a list of efforts the MPO plans to make in order to obtain public input for the development and approval of the TIP. It will also contain a brief summary of the public comments received and the MPO's response to them. The Appendices contain a list of projects by funding category, the project sheets programmed in Martin County, the Local Capital Improvement Plans and FY22 Federal Obligated Projects. The detailed project sections are based on the FDOT District Four Tentative Work Program as imported on April 8, 2024. Depending on many factors, these lists of projects may potentially change before July 1, 2024. Once the MPO receives a final Work Program from FDOT District Four, this section may be modified.

Because the project portion of the TIP is generated through the Interactive TIP Tool, there can be several variations of the project report. For efficiency and reduction of printed pages, the adopted version shows project details with maps for only the Highway projects. Sections for transit, aviation, Turnpike, and Districtwide list are summarized with project details without location maps. All project details include a summary of costs and revenues by funding source. Because only funded projects and phases are listed in the FDOT District Four Work Program, the costs and revenues are assumed to be equal, demonstrating financial constraint.

### 1.4 FULL PROJECT COSTS

The normal project production sequence is to have a Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) phase, a Design (PE) phase, a Right of Way (ROW) phase and a Construction (CST) phase. Some projects may not have a ROW phase, if land is not needed to complete the project. Costs on the TIP pages for projects both on and off the SIS will have historical costs and five years of the current TIP, which may or may not be the total project cost. If there is no CST phase on the TIP page, then the entry will probably not be reflective of the total project cost. For some projects, such as resurfacing, safety or operational project, there may not be a total cost provided but rather additional details on that program.

The SIS is a network of high-priority transportation facilities that includes the State's largest and most significant commercial service airports, spaceport, deep water seaports, freight rail terminals, passenger rail and intercity bus terminals, rail corridors, waterways, and highways.

For costs beyond the ten-year window, access to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is provided. The LRTP reference on the TIP page provides the information necessary to locate the full project costs and/or additional details regarding the project in the LRTP. If there is no LRTP reference in the TIP, full project costs are provided in the TIP. The link to the Martin LRTP is martinmpo.com/wp-content/uploads/Martin-MPO-2045-Long-Range-Transportation-Plan.pdf

### 1.5 TIP AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS

Once the TIP is adopted, there are times that it must be modified or amended because the MPO does not have direct control of funding resources. This can be accomplished by amendment or administrative modification. TIP Amendments are revisions that involve a major change, including an added or deleted project, a significant change to project cost (an increase of $20 \%$ and greater than $\$ 2$ million), or a major change to a project scope. Amendments require a review period to gather public comments. During this review and comment period, the TIP will be brought before the MPO Advisory Committees for review, and then before the MPO Policy Board for approval. TIP Administrative modifications are revisions that include minor changes to project costs, funding sources, and project initiation dates. Administrative modifications do not require public review, but staff will present them to the Advisory Committees whenever feasible. Administrative modifications require MPO Policy Board approval. The Martin MPO coordinates all TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications with FDOT District Four.

### 1.6 MAJOR PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The major multi-modal projects, prioritized by the Martin MPO Policy Board and included in the FDOT Tentative Work Program for federal and state funding, are described below.

- FM\# 413253-2 - I-95 from Martin/Palm Beach County Line to CR-708/Bridge Road: Add lanes and reconstruct. Phase: PDE
- FM\# 413254-2 - SR-9/I-95 from CR-708/Bridge Road to High Meadows Ave: Add lanes and reconstruct. Phase: PDE
- FM\# 419669-3 - Willoughby Blvd from SR-714/Monterey Road to SR-5/US-1: New two-lane road. Phase: PDE
- FM\# 422681-5 - I-95 from High Meadows to Martin/St. Lucie County Line: Add lanes and reconstruct.

Phase: PDE

- FM\# 441636-2 - SR-714/Monterey @ FEC Railroad Crossing: Grade Separation

Phase: PDE

- FM\# 441699-1 - CR-713/High Meadow Ave from I-95 to CR-714/Martin Hwy: Add lanes and reconstruct.

Phase: PDE and P.E.

- FM\# 441700-1 - Cove Road from SR-76/Kanner Highway to SR-5/US-1: Add lanes and reconstruct. Phase: PD\&E and P.E.
- FM\# 446257-1 - US-1 @ Kanner Highway: Southbound Right Turn Lane onto Kanner Hwy, includes Triple Left Turn lanes onto US-1 Northbound. Phase: P.E., Right of Way, and Construction


### 1.7 IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

The following major projects were implemented from the last two TIP cycles:
FM\# 438348-1: St. Lucie Blvd from Indian Street to SE Ocean Blvd - Resurfacing (7/13/2022)
FM\# 436425-1: Murphy Road Bridge - Bridge Replacement (8/24/2022)
FM\# 440811-1: CR-708/SW Bridge Rd from CR-711 to US-1 - Resurfacing and Bike Lanes (9/29/2022)
FM\# 444345-1: Dixie Highway/Green River Parkway - Sidewalk (12/21/2022)
FM\# 435139-2: CR-707 SE Beach Rd - Resurfacing (3/29/23)
FM\# 438346-2: SE Ocean Blvd from SE Hospital to SE Palm Beach Rd - Sidewalk (9/15/23)

### 2.0 PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

### 2.1 FINANCIAL PLAN

In accordance with Federal Legislation [23 C.F.R. 450.326(k)], the MPO must demonstrate that the TIP is financially constrained. This means that the estimated expenses (or project costs) are consistent with the anticipated revenues for each funding source. Only those projects for which a revenue source has been identified are shown in the TIP to ensure a balance between the costs and revenues.

The TIP must include a financial plan that demonstrates how the approved TIP can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the TIP, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. However, because the MPO does not have direct control of funding resources, Administrative Modifications or Amendments may have to be made to the TIP during the fiscal year.

The Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) is financially constrained for each year. Federally funded projects identified in the TIP can be implemented using current proposed revenue sources based on the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Tentative Work Program and locally dedicated transportation revenues. All projects funded by FDOT with Federal or non-Federal dollars are included in a balanced 36 -month forecast of cash and expenditures and a five-year finance plan supporting the FDOT Work Program. All local government projects (non-Federally funded) that are included in the TIP are part of member local government's capital improvement programs. The following table provides a summary of total project costs by Federal, State and local funding codes by fiscal year. Note that all project costs are shown in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars, meaning the costs reflect the adjusted value of the work at the time the funds will be expended on the project.

Table 1 - Allocation of Project Costs by Funding Sources and Year

| Funding Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal | \$70,769,336 | \$29,879,892 | \$10,330,049 | \$17,440,813 | \$16,068,691 | \$144,488,781 |
| Local | \$2,759,693 | \$1,289,296 | \$2,828,305 | \$1,337,464 | \$1,255,474 | \$9,470,232 |
| R/W and Bridge Bonds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,500,000 | \$0 | \$7,500,000 |
| State 100\% | \$15,179,702 | \$30,748,487 | \$42,500,216 | \$11,232,374 | \$23,442,048 | \$123,102,827 |
| Toll/Turnpike | \$95,937,512 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,590,000 | \$106,527,512 |
| Total | \$184,646,243 | \$61,917,675 | \$55,658,570 | \$37,510,651 | \$51,356,213 | \$391,089,352 |

Summary by Funding Sources and Fiscal Year


## Summary by Funding Sources and Fiscal Year



### 2.2 PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

Per 23 CFR 450.332(c), federally funded projects are selected by the MPO in conjunction with the development of the FDOT Tentative Work Program and through the cooperation of the public transit operator who provides the MPO with estimates of available federal and state funds in order for the MPO to develop its financial plan.

In addition, the 2045 LRTP plays a major role in identifying projects for selection. Contained within the LRTP is an evaluation of existing conditions, an evaluation of projected conditions, the identification of policy and project needs, and a determination of the cost feasibility of implementing these projects.

Both the FDOT Tentative Work Program and the 2045 LRTP provide the basis for establishing project priorities consistent with the planning factors considered in their annual selection, and subsequent development of the TIP under the requirements outlined in Federal legislation.

### 2.3 PROJECT PRIORITY STATEMENT

As required under 339.175 (8) (b) F.S., the annual list of project priorities was developed based on criteria that included the:

- Approved 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP);
- Strategic Intermodal System Plan (SIS);
- Results of the transportation management systems; and
- MPO's public involvement procedures.

Annually MPO staff meet with FDOT staff and local government staff to discuss project priorities. During this process, priorities are identified based on those of the previous year and the priorities listed in the Cost Feasible Plan of the current LRTP. This new list of priorities is discussed with the MPO Advisory Committees and then approved by the MPO Board. These priorities are then submitted to FDOT and used to program projects accordingly.

## Surface Transportation Program (STP) Priorities

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects.

### 2.4 CHANGES TO PROJECT PRIORITIES

In accordance with 23 CFR 450.326(n)(1), MPOs are required to explain any changes in priorities from previous TIPs.
Changes from last year's TIP were made based on funding availability and construction. The Transportation Alternatives Priorities have been updated to reflect recent Transportation Alternatives Program applications, as well as previously funded projects. The Public Transit Priorities table reflects funding estimates.

The FY25 - FY29 LOPP has been updated to include the widening of SR-710 as the MPO's \#1 priority due to the serious injury crashes and fatalities that have occurred along this corridor over the years. The SR-710 widening project limits were also updated, which extended the project to SW Allapattah Road from the Martin/Okeechobee County Line. The CR-708/SE Bridge Road Bridge Replacement project has been moved to Priority \#5 (previously \#17). The FY24-FY28 LOPP Priority \#8 (FEC Crossings at NW Alice Street pedestrian facilities) has been updated in the FY25-FY29 LOPP to include NW Alice St. as the "facility", which includes the realignment of NW Alice St. with NW Wright Blvd.

Two new projects were added to the FY25-FY29 LOPP, which include the CR 609/SW Allapattah Road resurfacing project from 3 miles north of Minute Maid Road to the St. Lucie County Line (priority \#14), and the SW Citrus Blvd. resurfacing project from SW Hemingway Ter to SR-710 (priority \#15).

### 2.5 LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES

The projects in the following tables have been formally reviewed by the MPO Citizen's Advisory Committee, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and Technical Advisory Committee, and were approved by the MPO Policy Board at its meeting on June 19, 2023.

Table 2
FY25 - FY29 - List of Project Priorities

| FY25 <br> Rank | Facility | Segment Limits |  | Project Description | 2045 LRTP Page | Prev. <br> Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |
| 1 | SR-710 | SE of CR-609/ SW Allapattah Rd. | Martin/ Okeechobee County Line | Widen from 2-lanes to 4-lanes | 76 | 2 |
| 2 | SE Cove Rd. | SR-76/ <br> Kanner Hwy. | US-1 | Widen from 2-lanes to 4-lanes including bike lanes and shared use pathway | 69 | 1 |
| 3 | CR-714 | Realignment |  | Flatten curve of CR-714 before intersection at SR-710 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Appx. G, } \\ & \text { pg. } 1 \end{aligned}$ | 3 |
| 4 | SE Monterey Rd. | At FEC Railroad |  | Railroad/roadway grade separation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Appx. H, } \\ \text { pg. } 5 \end{gathered}$ | 4 |
| 5 | CR-708/ SE Bridge Rd. | Bascule Bridge |  | Bridge Replacement | 132 | 17 |
| 6 | SR-76/ <br> Kanner Hwy. | At SW South River Dr. |  | *New southbound right turn lane at South River Dr. \& traffic signal | 80 | 5 |
| 7 | US-1 | At SE Constitution Blvd. |  | Traffic signal | 80 | 6 |
| 8 | Monterey Rd. \& East Ocean Blvd. | Kingswood Ter. | St. Lucie Blvd. | Mid-block pedestrian crosswalks | Appx. H, $\text { pg. } 11$ | 7 |

Table 2 - Continued

| FY25 <br> Rank | Facility | Segment Limits |  | Project Description | $\begin{aligned} & 2045 \text { LRTP } \\ & \text { Page } \end{aligned}$ | Prev. <br> Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |
| 9 | NW Alice St. | FEC Crossing |  | Pedestrian facilities/realign roadway with NW Wright Blvd. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Appx. H, } \\ \text { pg. } 11 \end{gathered}$ | 8 |
| 10 | Willoughby Blvd. Extension | Monterey Rd. | US-1 | New 2-lane road with bike lanes and sidewalks/shared use pathways | 69 | 9 |
| 11 | CR-713/High Meadow Ave. | I-95 | CR-714/ Martin Hwy. | Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with shared-use pathway | 69 | 10 |
| 12 | SE Dixie Hwy. | Cove Rd. | Jefferson St. | Resurfacing/Complete Street improvements/CEI | 84 | 15 |
| 13 | CR-609/ <br> SW Allapattah Rd. | SR-710 | $2,800 \mathrm{ft}$. north of Minute Maid Rd. | Resurfacing/southbound left turn lane/shoulder widening/CEI | 128, 132 | 16 |
| 14 | CR-609/ <br> SW Allapattah Rd. | Approx. 3 miles north of Minute Maid Rd. | St. Lucie County Line | Resurfacing/shoulder widening/safety improvements | 128, 132 |  |
| 15 | SW Citrus Blvd. | SW Hemingway Ter. | SR-710 | Resurfacing/shoulder widening and bike lanes/safety improvements | 128, 132 |  |
| 16 | N Sewall's Point Rd. | East Ocean Blvd. | NE Palmer St. | Mitigate for sea level rise impact | 87 | 18 |
| 17 | MacArthur Blvd. | Sailfish Point | 1,500 ft. north | Mitigate for sea level rise impact | 87 | 19 |

## Table 3

## FY25 - FY29

List of Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Priorities

| Project Description | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SE Avalon Drive Sidewalks | $\$ 398,228$ |  |  |  | Funded |
| SE Washington St. Sidewalks |  | $\$ 420,000$ |  |  | Funded |
| S Dixie Highway Improvements |  |  | $\$ 462,220$ |  | Funded |
| SW Bulldog Way Sidewalks |  |  |  | $\$ 876,310$ | Pending |

Table 4
FY25-FY29
List of Public Transit Priorities

| Facility/ <br> Equipment | Project <br> Location/Description | Estimated <br> Amount | Funding <br> Source | 2045 LRTP <br> or TDP <br> Page \# | Project Status/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bus <br> Replacement <br> / Expansion | Rolling Stock | $\$ 146,920$ | $\S 5339$ | LRTP -pg. 74 | Amount of funds programmed <br> is based on anticipated |
| Operating | Operating <br> Assistance | $\$ 812,370$ | $\S 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 74 | procurements and estimated <br> costs and will change year to <br> year. |
| Security | $1 \%$ Security | $\$ 18,104$ | $\S 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 74 |  |
| Safety | $.75 \%$ Safety | $\$ 13,578$ | $\S 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 74 |  |

### 2.6 MPO 2045 LRTP GOALS

The 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Martin MPO is an analysis of the current and projected conditions in the region that will impact the transportation network. It contains an evaluated list of transportation improvements that will be necessary to maintain an adequate level of mobility and to accommodate anticipated population growth. The goals contained in the LRTP guide the transportation planning process in the MPO Planning Area and help to establish project priorities for the TIP.

- 2045 LRTP Goal 1: An efficient multimodal transportation system that supports economic growth and enhances the quality of life.
- 2045 LRTP Goal 2: A safe multimodal transportation system that meets the needs of all the users.
- 2045 LRTP Goal 3: Preserve natural environment and promote equity and healthy communities.
- 2045 LRTP Goal 4: A transportation system with an ability to harness changes in the future.
- 2045 LRTP Goal 5: A transportation system that reflects the community's needs and desires.


### 2.7 Performance Measures

Transportation Performance Management (TPM) is a strategic approach to connect transportation investment and policy decisions to help achieve performance goals. Performance measures are quantitative expressions used to evaluate progress toward goals. Performance targets are quantifiable levels of performance to be achieved within a time period. Federal transportation law requires state departments of transportation (DOT), MPOs, and public transportation providers to conduct performance-based planning by tracking performance and establishing data-driven targets to assess progress toward achieving goals. Performance-based planning supports the efficient investment of transportation funds by increasing accountability, providing transparency, and linking investment decisions to key outcomes related to seven national goals established by the U.S. Congress:

- Improving Safety
- Maintaining Infrastructure Condition
- Reducing Traffic Congestion
- Improving the Efficiency of the System and Freight Movement
- Protecting the Environment
- Reducing Delays in Project Delivery

Federal law requires FDOT, the MPOs, and public transportation providers to coordinate when selecting performance targets. FDOT and the MPOAC developed the TPM Consensus Planning Document to describe the processes through which these agencies will cooperatively develop and share information related to transportation performance management and target setting.

## Safety

The first of FHWA's performance management rules establishes measures to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The rule requires state DOTs and MPOs to annually establish targets and report performance and progress toward targets to FHWA for the following safety-related performance measures:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT
5. Number of Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

## Statewide Targets

Safety performance measure targets are required to be adopted on an annual basis. In August of each calendar year, FDOT reports targets to FHWA for the following calendar year. On August 31, 2023, FDOT established statewide safety performance targets for calendar year 2024. Table 5 presents FDOT's statewide targets.

Table 5 - Statewide Safety Performance Targets

| Table 5 - Statewide Safety Performance Targets |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Calendar Year 2024 <br> Statewide Target |
| Number of fatalities | 0 |
| Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) | 0 |
| Number of serious injuries | 0 |
| Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) | 0 |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries | 0 |

FDOT adopted a vision of zero traffic-related fatalities in 2012. This, in effect, became FDOT's target for zero traffic fatalities and quantified the policy set by Florida's Legislature more than 35 years ago (Section 334.046(2), Florida Statutes, emphasis added):
"The mission of the Department of Transportation shall be to provide a safe statewide transportation system..."
FDOT and Florida's traffic safety partners are committed to eliminating fatalities and serious injuries. As stated in the Safe System approach promoted by FHWA, the death or serious injury of any person is unacceptable. The Florida Transportation Plan (FTP), the state's long-range transportation plan, identifies eliminating transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries as the state's highest transportation priority. Therefore, FDOT established 0 as the only acceptable target for all five federal safety performance measures.

## MPO Safety Targets

MPOs are required to establish safety targets annually within 180 days of when FDOT established targets. MPOs establish targets by either agreeing to program projects that will support the statewide targets or establish their own quantitative targets for the MPO planning area.

The Martin MPO, along with FDOT and other traffic safety partners, shares a high concern about the unacceptable number of traffic fatalities, both statewide and nationally. As such, on December 11, 2023, the Martin MPO agreed to support FDOT's statewide safety performance targets for calendar year 2024, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the statewide targets. The safety initiatives within this TIP are intended to contribute toward achieving these targets.

## FDOT Safety Planning and Programming

## Florida's Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Florida's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), published in March 2021, identifies strategies to achieve zero traffic deaths and serious injuries. The SHSP was updated in coordination with Florida's 27 MPOs and the MPOAC, as well as other statewide traffic safety partners. The SHSP development process included review of safety-related goals, objectives, and
strategies in MPO plans. The SHSP guides FDOT, MPOs, and other safety partners in addressing safety and defines a framework for implementation activities to be carried out throughout the state.
Florida's transportation safety partners have focused on reducing fatalities and serious injuries through the 4Es of engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency response. To achieve zero, FDOT and other safety partners will expand beyond addressing specific hazards and influencing individual behavior to reshaping transportation systems and communities to create a safer environment for all travel. The updated SHSP calls on Florida to think more broadly and inclusively by addressing four additional topics, which are referred to as the 4Is: information intelligence, innovation, insight into communities, and investments and policies. The SHSP also embraces an integrated "Safe System" approach that involves designing and managing road infrastructure to keep the risk of a mistake low and to ensure that when a mistake leads to a crash, the impact on the human body does not result in a fatality or serious injury. The five Safe System elements together create a holistic approach with layers of protection: safer road users, safer vehicles, safer speeds, safer roads, and post-crash care.

The SHSP also expands the list of emphasis areas for Florida's safety programs to include six evolving emphasis areas, which are high-risk or high-impact crashes that are a subset of an existing emphasis area or emerging risks and new innovations, where safety implications are unknown. These evolving emphasis areas include work zones, drowsy and ill driving, rail grade crossings, roadway transit, micromobility, and connected and automated vehicles.

## Florida's Highway Safety Improvement Program

While the FTP and the SHSP both highlight the statewide commitment to a vision of zero deaths, the Florida Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Annual Report documents statewide performance and progress toward that vision. It also lists all HSIP projects that were obligated during the reporting year and the relationship of each project to the SHSP.

As discussed above, in the 2023 HSIP Annual Report, FDOT reported calendar year 2024 statewide safety performance targets at " 0 " for each safety performance measure to reflect the vision of zero deaths. Annually, FHWA determines whether Florida has met the targets or performed better than the baseline for at least four of the five measures. If this does not occur FDOT must submit an annual implementation plan with actions, it will take to meet targets in the future.

On April 20, 2023, FHWA reported the results of its 2021 safety target assessment. FHWA concluded that Florida had not met or made significant progress toward its 2021 safety targets, noting that zero had not been achieved for any measure and that only three out of five measures (number of serious injuries, serious injury rate, and number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries) were better than the baseline. Subsequently, FDOT developed an HSIP Implementation Plan
to highlight additional strategies it will undertake in support of the safety targets. The HSIP Implementation Plan was submitted with the HSIP Annual Report to FHWA on August 31, 2023.

Consistent with FHWA requirements, the HSIP Implementation Plan focuses specifically on implementation of the HSIP as a core federal-aid highway program and documents the continued enhancements planned for Florida's HSIP to better leverage the benefits of this program. However, recognizing that FDOT already allocates all HSIP funding to safety programs - and building on the integrated approach that underscores FDOT's safety programs - the HSIP Implementation Plan also documents how additional FDOT, and partner activities may contribute to progress toward zero. Building on the foundation of prior HSIP Implementation Plans, the 2023 HSIP Implementation Plan identifies the following key commitments:

- Improve partner coordination and align safety activities.
- Maximize HSIP infrastructure investments.
- Enhance safety data systems and analysis.
- Implement key safety countermeasures.
- Focus on safety marketing and education on target audiences.
- Capitalize on new and existing funding opportunities.

Florida conducts extensive safety data analysis to understand the state's traffic safety challenges and identify and implement successful safety solutions. Florida's transportation system is evaluated using location-specific analyses that evaluate locations where the number of crashes or crash rates are the highest and where fatalities and serious injuries are most prominent. These analyses are paired with additional systemic analyses to identify characteristics that contribute to certain crash types and prioritize countermeasures that can be deployed across the system as a whole. As countermeasures are implemented, Florida also employs predictive analyses to evaluate the performance of roadways (i.e., evaluating results of implemented crash modification factors against projected crash reduction factors).

FDOT's State Safety Office works closely with FDOT Districts and regional and local traffic safety partners to develop the annual HSIP updates. Historic, risk-based, and predictive safety analyses are conducted to identify appropriate proven countermeasures to reduce fatalities and serious injuries associated with Florida's SHSP emphasis areas, resulting in a list of projects that reflect the greatest needs and are anticipated to achieve the highest benefit. While these projects and the associated policies and standards may take years to be implemented, they are built on proven countermeasures for improving safety and addressing serious crash risks or safety problems identified through a data-driven process. Florida continues to allocate all available HSIP funding to safety projects. FDOT's HSIP Guidelines provide detailed information on this data-driven process and funding eligibility.

Florida received an allocation of approximately $\$ 156$ million in HSIP funds for use during the 2023 state fiscal year from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023, and fully allocated those funds to safety projects. FDOT used these HSIP funds to complete projects that address intersections, lane departure, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and other programs representing the remaining SHSP emphasis areas. This year's HSIP allocated $\$ 128.7$ million in infrastructure investments on state-maintained roadways and $\$ 27.5$ million in infrastructure investments on local roadways. A list of HSIP projects can be found in the HSIP 2023 Annual Report.

Beginning in fiscal year 2024, HSIP funding is distributed among FDOT Districts based on a statutory formula to allow the Districts to have more clearly defined funding levels for which they can better plan to select and fund projects. MPOs and local agencies coordinate with FDOT Districts to identify and implement effective highway safety improvement projects on non-state roadways.

## Additional FDOT Safety Planning Activities

In addition to HSIP, safety is considered as a factor in FDOT planning and priority setting for projects in preservation and capacity programs. Data is analyzed for each potential project, using traffic safety data and traffic demand modeling, among other data. The Florida PD\&E Manual requires the consideration of safety when preparing a proposed project's purpose and need as part of the analysis of alternatives. Florida design and construction standards include safety criteria and countermeasures, which are incorporated in every construction project. FDOT also recognizes the importance of the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Highway Safety Manual (HSM). Through dedicated and consistent training and messaging over the last several years, the HSM is now an integral part of project development and design.

FDOT holds Program Planning Workshops annually to determine the level of funding to be allocated over the next 5 to 10 years to preserve and provide for a safe transportation system. Certain funding types are further analyzed and prioritized by FDOT Central Offices after projects are prioritized collaboratively by the MPOs, local governments, and FDOT Districts; for example, the Safety Office is responsible for the HSIP and Highway Safety Program (HSP) and the Systems Implementation Office is responsible for the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS). Both the Safety and SIS programs consider the reduction of traffic fatalities and serious injuries in their criteria for ranking projects.

## Safety Investments in the TIP

The Martin MPO in coordination with FDOT, aims to make roads safe for all users in Martin County and to meet the safety performance targets set on an annual basis. The TIP considers potential projects that fall into specific investment priorities
established by the MPO in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The process used to develop the MPO's LongRange Transportation Plan includes analysis of safety data trends, including the location and factors associated with crashes with emphasis on fatalities and serious injuries. This data is used to help identify regional safety issues and potential safety strategies for the LRTP and TIP. Consistent with the MPO's 2045 LRTP, the TIP includes funding that is used for programs that improve safety in areas with a high number of bicycle and pedestrian crashes. The TIP also includes planning funds that are used by the MPO to educate and reinforce the message of how to walk, bicycle, and drive safely. For the Martin MPO, this includes programs and projects such as:

- Annually launching a ‘Call for Projects’ for eligible Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) projects. TAP provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and infrastructure projects for enhanced mobility and overall safety. Projects approved by the MPO Grant Screening Committee go through the MPO process, including presentations at the MPO advisory committee and Policy Board meetings for approval.
- Implementing congestion mitigation projects, such as FM\# 441700-1 - Cove Road widening may include sidewalks or a shared-use pathway and FM\# 419669-3 - Willoughby Blvd. extension that will include a new two-lane roadway with bike lanes and a shared-use pathway.
- Martin MPO staff attends the Regional Treasure Coast Community Traffic Safety Team (CTST) quarterly meetings. Staff regularly presents upcoming Transportation Planning studies and public outreach previously held within the MPO planning boundary.
- CR 714/SW Martin Highway Realignment at SR 710.
- SW Warfield Blvd/SR-710 widening project.

The TIP includes specific investment priorities that support all the MPO's goals including safety, using the prioritization and project selection process established in the LRTP totaling over 77 million dollars. This process evaluates projects that have an anticipated effect of reducing both fatal and injury crashes. The MPO's goal of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes is linked to this investment plan and the process used in prioritizing the projects is consistent with federal requirements. The FY25-FY29 TIP includes improving safety conditions County-wide. These projects fall into the categories below. The Martin MPO continues monitoring investments in the TIP and demonstrating progress toward goals and objectives.

- Bicycle Lane/Sidewalk
- Lighting
- Traffic control devices/system
- Safety projects
- Corridor improvements
- Add turning lanes
- Signing and pavement markings

Because safety is inherent in so many FDOT and Martin MPO programs and projects, and because of the broad and holistic approach FDOT is undertaking with its commitment to Vision Zero, the program of projects in this TIP is anticipated to support progress towards achieving the safety targets.

## Pavement and Bridge Condition Measures (PM2)

FHWA's Bridge \& Pavement Condition Performance Measures Final Rule, which is also referred to as the PM2 rule, requires state DOTs and MPOs to establish targets for the following six performance measures:

1. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in good condition.
2. Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) classified as in poor condition.
3. Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition.
4. Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition.
5. Percent of non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) pavements in good condition; and
6. Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition.

For the pavement measures, five pavement metrics are used to assess condition:

- International Roughness Index (IRI) - an indicator of roughness; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements.
- Cracking percent - percentage of pavement surface exhibiting cracking; applicable to asphalt, jointed concrete, and continuous concrete pavements.
- Rutting - extent of surface depressions; applicable to asphalt pavements only.
- Faulting - vertical misalignment of pavement joints; applicable to jointed concrete pavements only; and
- Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) - a quality rating applicable only to NHS roads with posted speed limits of less than 40 miles per hour (e.g., toll plazas, border crossings). States may choose to collect and report PSR for applicable segments as an alternative to the other four metrics.


## Pavement and Bridge Condition Statewide Targets

Federal rules require state DOTs to establish two-year and four-year targets for bridge and pavement condition measures. On December 16, 2022, FDOT established statewide bridge and pavement targets for the second performance period ending in 2025. These targets are identical to those set for 2019 and 2021, respectively. Florida's performance through

2021 exceeds the targets. The two-year targets represent bridge and pavement conditions at the end of calendar year 2023, while the four-year targets represent conditions at the end of 2025. Table 6 presents the statewide targets.

Table 6 - Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Targets

| Performance Measure | 2022 <br> Statewide <br> Conditions | 2023 <br> Statewide <br> Target | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ <br> Statewide <br> Target |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in good condition | $58.2 \%$ | $\geq 50.0 \%$ | $\geq 50.0 \%$ |
| Percent of NHS bridges (by deck area) in poor condition | $.6 \%$ | $\leq 10.0 \%$ | $\leq 10.0 \%$ |
| Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition | $73.4 \%$ | $\geq 60.0 \%$ | $\geq 60.0 \%$ |
| Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition | $0.2 \%$ | $\leq 5.0 \%$ | $\leq 5.0 \%$ |
| Percent of non-Interstate pavements in good condition | $48.8 \%$ | $\geq 40.0 \%$ | $\geq 40.0 \%$ |
| Percent of non-Interstate pavements in poor condition | $0.6 \%$ | $\leq 5.0 \%$ | $\leq 5.0 \%$ |

Source: 2022 Statewide Conditions fdotsourcebook.com.
In determining its approach to establishing performance targets for the federal bridge and pavement condition performance measures, FDOT considered many factors. FDOT is mandated by Florida Statute 334.046 to preserve the state's bridges and pavement to specific state-defined standards. To adhere to the statutory guidelines, FDOT prioritizes funding allocations to ensure the current transportation system is adequately preserved and maintained before funding is allocated for capacity improvements. These state statutory guidelines envelope the statewide federal targets that have been established for bridges and pavements.

In addition, FDOT developed a Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) for the state NHS bridge and pavement assets. The TAMP must include investment strategies leading to a program of projects that would make progress toward the achievement of the State's targets for asset condition and performance of the NHS. FDOT's current TAMP was submitted on December 30, 2022, and recertified by FHWA on February 23, 2023.

Further, the federal pavement condition measures require a data collection methodology that is a departure from the methods historically used by FDOT. For bridge condition, performance is measured in deck area under the federal measure, while FDOT programs its bridge repair or replacement work on a bridge-by-bridge basis. As such, the federal measures are not directly comparable to the methods that are most familiar to FDOT.

FDOT collects and reports bridge and pavement data to FHWA each year to track performance and progress toward the targets. The percentage of Florida's bridges in good condition is slowly decreasing, which is to be expected as the bridge inventory grows older. Reported bridge and pavement data through 2022 exceeded the established targets. Based on analyses of the data, the previous statewide targets are still appropriate for 2023 and 2025.

FHWA determined that FDOT made significant progress toward its 2021 PM2 targets; FHWA's assessment of progress toward the 2023 targets is anticipated to be provided in 2024.

## Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets for Martin MPO

MPOs must set four-year targets for the six bridge and pavement condition measures within 180 days of when FDOT established targets. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the statewide targets or establish their own quantifiable targets for the MPO's planning area for one or more measures.

On April 17, 2023, the Martin MPO agreed to support FDOT's statewide pavement and bridge 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.

## Pavement and Bridge Investments in the TIP

The Martin MPO TIP reflects investment priorities established in the 2045 LRTP. The TIP devotes a significant amount of resources to projects that will maintain pavement and bridge condition performance. Investments in pavement and bridge condition include resurfacing and bridge replacement/rehabilitation projects. The following are some example projects funded in this TIP that address system preservation/maintenance of pavement and bridge conditions:

- I-95 from South of Kanner Highway to Martin/St. Lucie County Line - Resurfacing
- SW Martin Hwy from East of SW Stuart W Blvd to West of Citrus Blvd - Resurfacing
- Fox Brown Rd. from SW Warfield Blvd. to SW Martin Hwy. - Resurfacing
- SE Bridge Road Bascule Bridge - Bridge Rehabilitation
- SW 96th Street Arundel Bridge - Bridge Rehabilitation
- US-1 from North of SE Fischer St. to North of SE Decker Ave - Resurfacing
- US-1 from 0.5 mile South of SE Dixie Highway to Osprey Street - Resurfacing
- I-95 North of Bridge Road to South of Kanner Highway - Resurfacing

The TIP seeks to address system preservation in the metropolitan planning area and provides funding for targeted improvements. The Infrastructure Maintenance and Congestion Management Goal in the 2045 LRTP includes objective the of Prioritizing improvements that help maintain existing roadways and bridges as well as identifying the PM2 performance measures and targets as metrics to monitor progress. Further, investments in pavement and bridge conditions include resurfacing and bridge replacement/rehabilitation projects in the TIP. The TIP includes over \$196,275,674 million in resurfacing and bridge projects.

The projects included in the TIP are consistent with FDOT's Five Year Work Program. Therefore, they reflect FDOT's approach of prioritizing funding to ensure the transportation system is adequately preserved and maintained. Per federal planning requirements, the state selects projects on the NHS in cooperation with the MPO from the approved TIP. Given the significant resources devoted in the TIP to pavement and bridge projects, the MPO anticipates that once implemented, the TIP will contribute to progress towards achieving the statewide pavement and bridge condition performance targets.

## System Performance, Freight, Congestion Mitigation \& Air Quality Improvement Program Measures (PM3)

FHWA's System Performance/Freight/CMAQ 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 (NHPP)

1. Percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate system that are reliable;
2. Percent of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable;

## National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)

3. Truck Travel Time Reliability index (TTTR);

## Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

4. Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita (PHED);
5. Percent of non-single occupant vehicle travel (Non-SOV); and
6. Cumulative 2-year and 4-year reduction of on-road mobile source emissions (NOx, VOC, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) for CMAQ funded projects.

Because all areas in Florida meet current national air quality standards, the three CMAQ measures do not apply in Florida. A description of the first three measures is below.

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 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.

## System Performance and Freight Statewide Targets

Federal rules require state DOTs to establish two-year and four-year targets for the system performance and freight targets. On December 16, 2022, FDOT established statewide performance targets for the second performance period ending in 2025. The 2 -year and 4 -year targets set for this performance period are identical to the 2 -year and 4 -year targets set for the previous performance period. Florida's performance through 2021 exceeds the targets. The two-year targets represent performance at the end of calendar year 2023, while the four-year targets represent performance at the end of 2025. Table 7 presents the statewide targets.

Table 7 - System Performance and Freight Targets

| Performance Measure | 2022 <br> Statewide <br> Conditions | 2023 <br> Statewide <br> Target | 2025 <br> Statewide <br> Target |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable | $85.7 \%$ | $\geq 75.0 \%$ | $\geq 70.0 \%$ |
| Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable | $92.1 \%$ | $\geq 50.0 \%$ | $\geq 50.0 \%$ |
| Truck travel time reliability (Interstate) | 1.46 | 1.75 | 2.00 |

Source: 2022 Statewide Conditions fdotsourcebook.com.
FDOT collects and reports reliability data to FHWA each year to track performance and progress toward the reliability targets. Actual performance in 2021 was better than the 2021 targets. FHWA's assessment of progress toward the 2023 targets is anticipated to be released in March 2024.

System performance and freight are addressed through several statewide initiatives:

- Florida's Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) is composed of transportation facilities of statewide and interregional significance. The SIS is a primary focus of FDOT's capacity investments and is Florida's primary network for ensuring a strong link between transportation and economic competitiveness. These facilities, which span all modes and includes highways, are the workhorses of Florida's transportation system and account for a dominant share of the people and freight movement to, from and within Florida. The SIS includes 92 percent of NHS lane miles in the state. Thus, FDOT's focus on improving performance of the SIS goes hand-in-hand with improving the NHS, which is the focus of the FHWA's TPM program. The SIS Policy Plan was updated in early 2022 consistent with the updated FTP. The SIS Policy Plan defines the policy framework for designating which facilities are part of the SIS, as well as how SIS investment needs are identified and prioritized. The development of the SIS Five-Year Plan by FDOT considers scores on a range of measures including mobility, safety, preservation, and economic competitiveness as part of FDOT's Strategic Investment Tool (SIT).
- In addition, FDOT's Freight Mobility and Trade Plan (FMTP) defines policies and investments that will enhance Florida's economic development efforts into the future. The FMTP identifies truck bottlenecks and other freight investment needs and defines the process for setting priorities among these needs to receive funding from the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP). Project evaluation criteria tie back to the FMTP objectives to ensure high priority projects support the
statewide freight vision. In May 2020, FHWA approved the FMTP as FDOT's State Freight Plan. An update to the FMTP will be adopted in the spring of 2024.


## System Performance and Freight Targets for Martin MPO

MPOs must establish four-year targets for all three performance measures. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the statewide targets or establish their own quantifiable targets for the MPO's planning area for one or more measures.

On April 17, 2023, the Martin MPO agreed to support FDOT's statewide system performance and freight targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the statewide targets.

## System Performance and Freight Investments in TIP

The Martin MPO TIP reflects investment priorities established in the 2045 LRTP. The focus of Martin MPO's investments that address system performance and freight include the some of the following example projects detailed in this TIP:

- Willoughby Blvd from Monterey Road to US 1 - New two-lane road
- Cove Road from Kanner Highway to US-1 - Widening
- Monterey Road at FEC Railroad Crossing - Grade Separation
- I-95 Martin Weigh Station - Inspection Barn Upgrades
- CR 713/High Meadow Ave from I-95 to Martin Hwy - Widening
- SR 710/Warfield Boulevard Widening projects

The TIP devotes a significant number of resources to programs and projects that will improve system performance and freight reliability on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS. The Martin MPO TIP reflects priorities in the Martin MPO 2045 LRTP that looked to address system reliability and congestion mitigation through various means, including capacity expansion and operational improvements. The Infrastructure Maintenance and Congestion Management Goal includes several objectives, such as managing traffic congestion, supporting improvements to major freight corridors, implementing strategies to reduce per capita vehicle miles of travel, and prioritizing funding to support smaller-scale congestion management projects and programs. Further, several performance measures including PM3 are identified to evaluate and prioritize projects. As part of the 2045 LRTP, several strategies were included in the CMP Update. The Martin MPO's
investments in the TIP that address system performance and freight on the NHS include over $\$ 71,963,977$ million in intersection/congestion management and freight projects.

The projects included in the TIP are consistent with FDOT's Five Year Work Program. Therefore, they reflect FDOT's approach of prioritizing funding to address performance goals and targets. Per federal planning requirements, the state selects projects on the NHS in cooperation with the MPO from the approved TIP. Given the significant resources devoted in the TIP to programs that address system performance and freight, the MPO anticipates that once implemented, the TIP will contribute to progress towards achieving the statewide reliability performance targets.

## Transit Asset Management Measures

FTA's Transit Asset Management (TAM) regulations apply to all recipients and subrecipients of Federal transit funding that own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets. The regulations define the term "state of good repair," require that public transportation providers develop and implement TAM plans, and established state of good repair standards and performance measures for four asset categories: equipment, rolling stock, transit infrastructure, and facilities. Table 8 identifies the TAM performance measures.

## Table 8 - FTA TAM Performance Measures

| Asset Category | Performance Measure |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Equipment | Percentage of non-revenue, support-service, and maintenance <br> vehicles that have met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark |
| 2. Rolling Stock | Percentage of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that <br> have either met or exceeded their Useful Life Benchmark |
| 3. Infrastructure | Percentage of track segments with performance restrictions |
| 4. Facilities | Percentage of facilities within an asset class rated below condition <br> 3 on the TERM scale |

For equipment and rolling stock classes, useful life benchmark (ULB) is defined as the expected lifecycle of a capital asset, or the acceptable period of use in service, for a particular transit provider's operating environment. ULB considers a provider's unique operating environment such as geography, service frequency, etc.
Public transportation providers are required to establish and report TAM targets annually for the following fiscal year. Each public transportation provider or its sponsors must share its targets with each MPO in which the public transportation provider's projects and services are programmed in the MPO's TIP. MPOs are not required to establish TAM targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, MPO targets must be established when the MPO updates the LRTP (although it is recommended that MPOs reflect the most current transit provider targets in the TIP if they have not yet taken action to update MPO targets). When establishing TAM targets, the MPO can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish its own separate regional TAM targets for the MPO planning area. MPO targets may differ from agency targets, especially if there are multiple transit agencies in the MPO planning area. To the maximum extent practicable, public transit providers, states, and MPOs must coordinate with each other in the selection of performance targets.
The TAM regulation defines two tiers of public transportation providers based on size parameters. Tier I providers are those that operate rail service, or more than 100 vehicles in all fixed route modes, or more than 100 vehicles in one non-fixed route mode. Tier II providers are those that are a subrecipient of FTA 5311 funds, or an American Indian Tribe, or have 100 or less vehicles across all fixed route modes or have 100 or less vehicles in one non-fixed route mode. A Tier I provider must establish its own TAM targets, as well as report performance and other data to FTA. A Tier II provider has the option to establish its own targets or to participate in a Group Plan with other Tier II providers whereby targets are established for the entire group in coordination with a group plan sponsor, typically a state DOT.

## Transit Asset Management Targets

Martin County Public Transit (MCPT) is the sole Tier II provider of public transit in the Martin MPO planning area. MCPT reviewed and approved TAM targets for each of the applicable asset categories on February 1, 2023. Table 9 on the following page presents these targets.

Table 9 - MCPT Asset Management Targets

| Asset Category | Performance Measure | Asset Class |  | Performance Target |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 |
| Revenue Vehicles | Age - percent of revenue vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life | BU | Bus | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | CU | Cutaway | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| Equipment | Age - percent of vehicles within a particular asset class that have met or exceeded their Useful Life | Non-Revenue/ <br> Service <br> Automobile 2017 |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Truc Rub Veh | and other <br> Tire <br> s 2018 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Facilities | Condition - percent of facilities with a condition rating below 3.0 on the FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale | Maintenance facility (leased) |  | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

The transit provider's TAM targets are based on the condition of existing transit assets and planned investments in equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, and facilities. The targets reflect the most recent data available on the number, age, and condition of transit assets, and capital investment plans for improving these assets. The table summarizes both existing conditions for the most recent year available, and the current targets.

## MPO Transit Asset Management Targets

As discussed above, MPOs are not required to establish TAM targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, MPO's must revisit targets each time the MPO updates the LRTP. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish separate regional TAM targets for the MPO planning area. MPO targets may differ from agency targets, especially if there are multiple transit agencies in the MPO planning area.

On May 6, 2024, the Martin MPO agreed to support the Martin County Public Transit's TAM targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that will, once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the transit provider targets.

## Transit Asset Management Investments in the TIP

The Martin MPO TIP was developed and is managed in cooperation with MCPT. It reflects the investment priorities established in the 2045 LRTP.

FTA funding, as programmed by the region's transit providers and FDOT, is used for programs and products to improve the condition of the region's transit assets. The focus of Martin MPO's investments that address transit state of good repair include:

- Section 5307 Formula Funds
- Section 5339 Capital for Bus \& Bus Facilities

Transit asset condition and state of good repair is a consideration in the methodology Martin MPO uses to select projects for inclusion in the TIP. The TIP includes specific investment priorities that support all the MPO's goals, including supporting improvements to transit, using a prioritization and project selection process established in the LRTP. This process evaluates projects that, once implemented, are anticipated to improve transit state of good repair in the MPO's planning area. This prioritization process considers factors such as transit supply, demand and cost; system reliability; system performance; maintenance of resources; maintain fleet revenue vehicles; and maintenance of other equipment.

The TIP devotes resources to projects that will maintain and improve transit state of good repair. Investments in transit assets in the TIP include over $\$ 6$ million for capital purchases.

The Martin MPO TIP has been evaluated and the anticipated effect of the overall program is that, once implemented, progress will be made towards achieving the TAM performance targets. The Martin MPO will continue to coordinate with MCPT to maintain the region's transit assets in a state of good repair. For more information on these programs and projects, see Section B of the appendix.

## Transit Safety Performance

FTA's Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) regulations established transit safety performance management requirements for providers of public transportation systems that receive federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53.

The regulations apply to all operators of public transportation that are a recipient or sub-recipient of FTA Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program funds under 49 U.S.C. Section 5307, or that operate a rail transit system that is subject to FTA's State Safety Oversight Program. The PTASP regulations do not apply to certain modes of transit service that are subject to the safety jurisdiction of another Federal agency, including passenger ferry operations regulated by the United States Coast Guard, and commuter rail operations that are regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.

The PTASP must include performance targets for the performance measures established by FTA in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan. The transit safety performance measures are:

- Total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
- Total number of reportable injuries and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
- Total number of reportable safety events and rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode.
- System reliability - mean distance between major mechanical failures by mode.

In Florida, each Section 5307 or 5311 transit provider must develop a System Safety Program Plan (SSPP) under Chapter 14-90, Florida Administrative Code. FDOT technical guidance recommends that Florida's transit agencies revise their existing SSPPs to be compliant with the new FTA PTASP requirements. ${ }^{1}$

[^1]Each public transportation provider that is subject to the PTASP regulations must certify that its SSPP meets the requirements for a PTASP, including transit safety targets for the federally required measures. Providers were required to certify their initial PTASP and safety targets by July 20, 2021. Once the public transportation provider establishes safety targets it must make the targets available to MPOs to aid in the planning process. MPOs are not required to establish transit safety targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, MPO targets must be established when the MPO updates the LRTP (although it is recommended that MPOs reflect the current transit provider targets in their TIPs).

When establishing transit safety targets, the MPO can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish its own separate regional transit safety targets for the MPO planning area. In addition, the [insert MPO name] must reflect those targets in LRTP and TIP updates.

## Transit Agency Safety Targets

MCPT established the transit safety targets identified in Table 10 below on January 23, 2024:
Table 10 - MCPT Safety Performance Targets

| Mode of Transit | Fatalities <br> (Total) | Fatalities <br> (Rate per <br> Total VRM) | Injuries <br> (Total) | Injuries <br> (Rate per <br> Total VRM) | Safety <br> Events <br> (Total) | Safety Events <br> (Rate per Total <br> VRM) | System <br> Reliability <br> (VRMMfailures) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed Route Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54,950 |
| Commuter Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,661 |
| ADA Paratransit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## MPO Transit Safety Targets

As discussed above, MPOs are not required to establish transit safety targets annually each time the transit provider establishes targets. Instead, MPO's must revisit targets each time the MPO updates the LRTP. MPOs can either agree to program projects that will support the transit provider targets or establish separate regional transit safety targets for the

MPO planning area. MPO targets may differ from agency targets, especially if there are multiple transit agencies in the MPO planning area.

On September 21, 2020, the Martin MPO agreed to support MCPT's transit safety targets, thus agreeing to plan and program projects in the TIP that once implemented, are anticipated to make progress toward achieving the provider's targets.

## Transit Safety Improvements in the TIP

The Martin MPO TIP was developed and is managed in cooperation with MCPT. It reflects the investment priorities established in the 2045 LRTP. Factors such as travel time reliability, level of service, delay, funding, quality of life, safety (number of fatalities and injury crashes), environment, environmental justice, accessibility to jobs, strategic projects, and community support are considered when creating the LRTP. Transit projects were prioritized consistent with Martin County's Transit Development Plan (TDP), 2020-2029 adopted in August 2019.

FTA funding, as programmed by the region's transit providers and FDOT, is used for programs and products to improve the safety of the region's transit systems. The MCPT PTASP is included in the appendix. Transit safety is a consideration in the methodology Martin MPO uses to select projects for inclusion in the TIP. The TIP includes specific investment priorities that support all of the MPO's goals, including transit safety, using a prioritization and project selection process established in the LRTP. This prioritization process considers safety as a factor in this prioritization process.

The TIP is also consistent with the Goals and Objectives in the 2045 LRTP. An objective under Goal \#2 in the LRTP is to reduce transit vehicle crashes and facility accidents. This process evaluates projects that, once implemented, are anticipated to improve transit safety in the MPO's planning area. The Martin MPO TIP has been evaluated and the anticipated effect of the overall program is that, once implemented, progress will be made towards achieving the transit safety performance targets. The Martin MPO will continue to coordinate with MCPT to maintain and improve the safety of the region's transit system and maintain transit assets in a state of good repair. To read the PTASP, please see Appendix B.

### 2.8 CONSISTENCY WITH REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS

The 2045 LRTP was adopted by the MPO on October 19, 2020, after a duly advertised public hearing. The transportation goals found within Martin County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan and the City of Stuart's Comprehensive Plan are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies in the 2045 LRTP as well as the Florida Transportation Plan.

To the maximum extent feasible, the TIP is consistent with the 2045 Treasure Coast Regional Long Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP), Witham Field Airport Master Plan, the Martin County Transportation Disadvantaged Service Plan, the Transit Development Plan, and the approved Comprehensive Plans of Martin County, the City of Stuart, the Town of Sewall's Point, the Town of Jupiter Island, the Village of Indiantown, and the Town of Ocean Breeze.

### 2.9 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Maintenance of a Congestion Management Process (CMP) or System is a requirement for all MPOs under Florida law and for MPOs in Transportation Management Areas under Federal law. A CMP is a tool that provides information needed to evaluate and improve traffic flows. The CMP is intended to help relieve congestion and enhance mobility by establishing methods to monitor and evaluate performance, identify alternative actions, assess and implement costeffective actions, and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented actions.

Candidate road sections are selected in a three-phase selection. The first phase identifies road segments that have a potential for congestion. The second phase is the development of a preliminary list of congested segments. The third phase is to determine and verify potential congested segments. Based on the analysis, there were a total of 14 corridors that were determined to have potential segments for congestion:

```
- Bridge Road
- Jensen Beach Boulevard
- SW Kanner Highway/SR-76
- SW Martin Highway/CR-714
- SE Monterey Road
```

[^2]- SW Joan Jefferson Way
- Indian River Drive
- CR 723
- SR-A1A


### 3.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### 3.1 CONSISTENCY WITH PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

The TIP was developed in accordance with the adopted MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP). Once the Draft TIP is completed, a notice will be advertised announcing that it is available for a 45-day public review period. During the public review process, the Draft TIP will be made available on the MPO website. It will also be presented at public meetings in conjunction with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Bicycle \& Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), and the MPO Board. After the 45-day review period, the Draft TIP will be brought before the MPO Board for a public hearing and final approval. This process fulfills the public involvement requirements for the Martin County Public Transit (MCPT) Program of Projects (POP) under Section 5307.

As described above, TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications will also be advertised and made available for public review and comment before being brought before the MPO Board for final review and approval. Comments received during the review period will be summarized by category and addressed through documented modifications to the TIP.

### 3.2 TIMELINE OF EFFORTS

See Table 11 for the Martin MPO timeline of Public Involvement efforts for this TIP.

Table 11
Timeline of Public Involvement Efforts

| TASK | DATE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Distribute Draft TIP in the Joint Advisory Committee Agenda Packet | 22-Apr-24 |
| Begin 45 Days Public Review Period | 26-Apr-24 |
| Post Draft TIP on the MPO Website | 26-Apr-24 |
| Draft TIP on Martin County Government/Library System website | 26-Apr-24 |
| Send Draft TIP to Federal and State agencies for preliminary review | 26-Apr-24 |
| Publish Notice of Public Hearing for MPO Board | 26-Apr-24 |
| Review Draft TIP @ Joint Advisory Committee Meeting | 29-Apr-24 |
| Distribute Draft TIP in the MPO Policy Board Agenda Packet | 29-Apr-24 |
| Review Draft TIP @ MPO Board Meeting | 6-May-24 |
| Distribute Final Draft TIP in the TAC Agenda Packet | 24-May-24 |
| Distribute Final Draft TIP in the CAC Agenda Packet | 29-May-24 |
| Distribute Final Draft TIP in the FTAC Agenda Packet | 31-May-24 |
| Review Final Draft TIP @ TAC Meeting | 3-Jun-24 |
| Distribute Final Draft TIP in the BPAC Agenda Packet | 3-Jun-24 |
| Review Final Draft TIP @ CAC Meeting | 5-Jun-24 |
| Review Final Draft TIP @ FTAC Meeting | 7-Jun-24 |
| Review Final Draft TIP @ BPAC Meeting | 10-Jun-24 |
| Distribute Final Draft TIP in the MPO Board Agenda Packet | 10-Jun-24 |
| Review and Approve Final TIP @ MPO Board Meeting / Public Hearing | 17-Jun-24 |

### 3.3 PUBLIC COMMENTS \& RESPONSE

Martin County does not have any Tribes or Federal Lands. Thus, the federal requirement to coordinate with these entities does not apply to Martin MPO. Public comments related to the TIP can be submitted in various ways:

Online through the MPO website - www.martinmpo.com
Email - martinmpo@martin.fl.us
Phone - (772) 223-7983
Mail/Hand Delivery - 3481 SE Willoughby Boulevard, Suite 101, Stuart, FL 34994
TIP Public Hearing - June 17, 2024, at 9:00 AM in the Martin County Administrative Center, 2401 SE Monterey Road, Stuart, FL 34996

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCM - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (CM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4417001 COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO | 1,035,129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,035,129 |
| Total | 1,035,129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,035,129 |
| ACNP - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION NHPP |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4132532 SR-9/l-95 FROM MARTIN/PALM BEACH COUNTY | 1,600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,600,000 |
| 4132542 SR-9/I-95 FROM CR-708/BRIDGE ROAD TO HIGH | 1,600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,600,000 |
| 4226815 SR-9/I-95 FROM HIGH MEADOWS AVE TO | 2,200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,200,000 |
| 4491591 SR-9/ I-95 N OF BRIDGE RD TO S OF KANNER HWY | 11,043,698 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,043,698 |
| 4491601 SR-9/ I-95 FROM S OF KANNER HWY TO MARTIN/ | 43,044,863 | 65,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43,109,863 |
| 4533331 SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD FR FPL ACCESS RD | 975,000 | 1,600,000 | 2,500,000 | 1,945,860 | 5,022,445 | 12,043,305 |
| 4533332 SR-710 FROM MARTIN/OKEECHOBEE CO LINE TO | 1,660,000 | 6,499,019 | 1,178,213 | 6,827,060 | 6,073,186 | 22,237,478 |
| Total | 62,123,561 | 8,164,019 | 3,678,213 | 8,772,920 | 11,095,631 | 93,834,344 |
| ACNR - AC NAT HWY PERFORM RESURFACING |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4484471 SR-5/US-1 FR .5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY | 0 | 14,234,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,234,584 |
| Total | 0 | 14,234,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,234,584 |
| ACPR - AC - PROTECT GRANT PGM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4416991 CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM I-95 TO | 0 | 198,643 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198,643 |
| 4417001 COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO | 0 | 125,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125,760 |
| 4476501 A1A FROM NE SHORE VILLAGE TER TO | 0 | 930,001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 930,001 |
| Total | 0 | 1,254,404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,254,404 |
| ACSS - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SS,HSP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4470021 INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT | 10,290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,290 |
| 4475551 SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD AT CR-714/SW MARTIN | 113,859 | 176,187 | 150,330 | 0 | 0 | 440,376 |
| Total | 124,149 | 176,187 | 150,330 | 0 | 0 | 450,666 |
| ACSU - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SU) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4444052 SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal | 143,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143,898 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACSU - ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SU) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4444151 | SR-5/US-1 AT BAKER RD | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25,000 |
| Total |  | 168,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168,898 |
| BNIR - INTRASTATE R/W \& BRIDGE BONDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4533331 | SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD FR FPL ACCESS RD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,000,000 | 0 | 3,000,000 |
| 4533332 | SR-710 FROM MARTIN/OKEECHOBEE CO LINE TO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,500,000 | 0 | 4,500,000 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,500,000 | 0 | 7,500,000 |
| BRRP - STATE BRIDGE REPAIR \& REHAB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4505872 | SR-707/DIXIE HWY. BRIDGE \# 890003 | 789,915 | 0 | 9,395,125 | 0 | 0 | 10,185,040 |
| 4529221 | US-1/SR-5 ROOSEVELT BRIDGE OVER ST LUCIE | 0 | 50,000 | 660,438 | 0 | 4,174,281 | 4,884,719 |
| 4533211 | SR-A1A/NE OCEAN BLVD. "ERNEST F. LYONS" | 0 | 50,000 | 609,073 | 0 | 4,521,166 | 5,180,239 |
| Total |  | 789,915 | 100,000 | 10,664,636 | 0 | 8,695,447 | 20,249,998 |
| CARB - CARBON REDUCTION GRANT PGM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600,000 | 0 | 600,000 |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,376,378 | 0 | 1,376,378 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,976,378 | 0 | 1,976,378 |
| CARU - CARB FOR URB. AREA > THAN 200K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277,236 | 0 | 277,236 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277,236 | 0 | 277,236 |
| CM - CONGESTION MITIGATION - AQ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4416991 | CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM I-95 TO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124,160 | 124,160 |
| 4444052 | SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal | 28,780 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28,780 |
| 4444151 | SR-5/US-1 AT BAKER RD | 55,000 | 264,397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 319,397 |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,488,223 | 0 | 1,488,223 |
| Total |  | 83,780 | 264,397 | 0 | 1,488,223 | 124,160 | 1,960,560 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D - UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2337031 | MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS ROADWAY | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,500,000 |
| 2337032 | MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS BRIDGES | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 0 | 140,000 |
| 2342651 | MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-ROADWAY | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 40,000 |
| 2342652 | MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-BRIDGES | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 60,000 |
| 4505591 | MARTIN COUNTY ASSET MAINTENANCE | 2,092,790 | 3,092,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,667,905 | 13,039,065 |
| 4515801 | MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& | 0 | 0 | 0 | 655,652 | 864,322 | 1,519,974 |
| Total |  | 2,449,790 | 3,449,790 | 2,949,790 | 3,605,442 | 3,844,227 | 16,299,039 |
| DDR - DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4071894 | MARTIN COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING | 313,604 | 404,165 | 417,575 | 430,102 | 430,102 | 1,995,548 |
| 4278035 | MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& | 0 | 0 | 256,694 | 0 | 0 | 256,694 |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 0 | 1,045,391 | 3,000 | 430,050 | 0 | 1,478,441 |
| 4435051 | SR-5/US-1 FROM SE BRIDGE ROAD TO HOBE | 0 | 72,850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72,850 |
| 4444161 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW NORTH RIVER SHORES BLVD | 148,000 | 34,830 | 200,000 | 0 | 0 | 382,830 |
| 4444171 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW SUNSET BLVD | 200,000 | 427,638 | 4,661 | 0 | 0 | 632,299 |
| 4462561 | SR-76/KANNER HWY @ SW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE | 0 | 780,074 | 29,053 | 0 | 0 | 809,127 |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 849,680 | 1,190,134 | 127,676 | 0 | 2,167,490 |
| 4476491 | SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO | 5,856,272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,856,272 |
| 4484461 | SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY FROM E OF SW STUART | 0 | 726,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 726,759 |
| 4484471 | SR-5/US-1 FR . 5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY | 0 | 2,087,166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,087,166 |
| 4498291 | SR-714/SE MONTEREY ROAD FROM SW PALM CITY | 338,908 | 0 | 5,346,570 | 0 | 0 | 5,685,478 |
| Total |  | 6,856,784 | 6,428,553 | 7,447,687 | 987,828 | 430,102 | 22,150,954 |
| DI - ST. - S/W INTER/INTRASTATE HWY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4533332 | SR-710 FROM MARTIN/OKEECHOBEE CO LINE TO | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIH - STATE IN-HOUSE PRODUCT SUPPORT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 27,398 | 54,000 | 0 | 74,218 | 0 | 155,616 |
| 4435051 | SR-5/US-1 FROM SE BRIDGE ROAD TO HOBE | 0 | 116,559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116,559 |
| 4444161 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW NORTH RIVER SHORES BLVD | 18,000 | 0 | 33,982 | 0 | 0 | 51,982 |
| 4462561 | SR-76/KANNER HWY @ SW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE | 0 | 34,369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,369 |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 12,000 | 24,000 | 99,264 | 0 | 135,264 |
| 4476491 | SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO | 75,430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,430 |
| 4476501 | A1A FROM NE SHORE VILLAGE TER TO | 0 | 95,795 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95,795 |
| 4484461 | SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY FROM E OF SW STUART | 0 | 84,507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84,507 |
| 4484471 | SR-5/US-1 FR . 5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY | 0 | 50,490 | 52,062 | 0 | 0 | 102,552 |
| 4498291 | SR-714/SE MONTEREY ROAD FROM SW PALM CITY | 0 | 0 | 127,991 | 0 | 0 | 127,991 |
| 4505872 | SR-707/DIXIE HWY. BRIDGE \# 890003 | 0 | 0 | 106,879 | 0 | 0 | 106,879 |
| 4529221 | US-1/SR-5 ROOSEVELT BRIDGE OVER ST LUCIE | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,825 | 10,825 |
| 4533211 | SR-A1A/NE OCEAN BLVD. "ERNEST F. LYONS" | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,825 | 10,825 |
| Total |  | 120,828 | 457,720 | 344,914 | 173,482 | 11,650 | 1,108,594 |
| DITS - STATEWIDE ITS - STATE 100\%. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4278035 | MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& | 536,831 | 569,040 | 346,489 | 0 | 0 | 1,452,360 |
| Total |  | 536,831 | 569,040 | 346,489 | 0 | 0 | 1,452,360 |
| DPTO - STATE - PTO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4071894 | MARTIN COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING | 78,789 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,789 |
| 4459781 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT PDC AND MIRL | 0 | 0 | 3,180,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,180,000 |
| 4481171 | WITHAM FIELD MILL \& RESURFACE, MITL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,368,000 | 1,368,000 |
| 4496091 | WITHAM FIELD PUBLIC SAFETY AVIATION HANGAR | 0 | 1,200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,200,000 |
| 4496401 | WITHAM FIELD REPLACE PAPIS ON 12-30 W/ LED | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
| 4533591 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - HOLD BAY | 42,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,500 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DPTO - STATE - PTO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4533601 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIRFIELD SIGNAGE | 320,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320,000 |
| 4533611 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - REHABILITATION OF | 75,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,000 |
| 4533841 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 |
| Total |  | 516,289 | 1,210,000 | 3,260,000 | 0 | 1,368,000 | 6,354,289 |
| DS - STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS \& PTO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229,674 | 0 | 229,674 |
| 4476491 | SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO | 64,115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64,115 |
| 4476501 | A1A FROM NE SHORE VILLAGE TER TO | 0 | 4,933,602 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,933,602 |
| 4484461 | SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY FROM E OF SW STUART | 0 | 6,421,922 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,421,922 |
| 4498291 | SR-714/SE MONTEREY ROAD FROM SW PALM CITY | 0 | 0 | 5,100,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,100,000 |
| Total |  | 64,115 | 11,355,524 | 5,100,000 | 229,674 | 0 | 16,749,313 |
| DU - STATE PRIMARY/FEDERAL REIMB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4259774 | MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5311, OPERATING | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |
| Total |  | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |
| DWS - WEIGH STATIONS - STATE 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4419951 | MARTIN MAINLINE WEIGH IN MOTION (WIM) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,585,948 | 0 | 4,585,948 |
| 4478681 | I-95 MARTIN WEIGH STATION - INSPECTION BARN | 0 | 0 | 549,613 | 0 | 0 | 549,613 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 549,613 | 4,585,948 | 0 | 5,135,561 |
| FAA - FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4496401 | WITHAM FIELD REPLACE PAPIS ON 12-30 W/ LED | 0 | 180,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,000 |
| 4533591 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - HOLD BAY | 765,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 765,000 |
| 4533611 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - REHABILITATION OF | 75,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,000 |
| Total |  | 840,000 | 180,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,020,000 |
| FTA - FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4134931 | PSL UZA - MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5307 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 5,800,000 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FTA - FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4346611 | PSL UZA - MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5339 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 130,000 | 650,000 |
| Total |  | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 6,450,000 |
| GRSC - GROWTH MANAGEMENT FOR SCOP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4459531 | FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD | 975,089 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 975,089 |
| 4480891 | CR-708/SE BRIDGE ROAD BASCULE BRIDGE | 0 | 285,938 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285,938 |
| 4495081 | SW CITRUS BLVD FROM CR 714/MARTIN HWY TO | 0 | 0 | 1,733,659 | 0 | 0 | 1,733,659 |
| 4522571 | SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137,805 | 0 | 137,805 |
| Total |  | 975,089 | 285,938 | 1,733,659 | 137,805 | 0 | 3,132,491 |
| LF - LOCAL FUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4071894 | MARTIN COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING | 393,393 | 405,165 | 417,575 | 430,102 | 430,102 | 2,076,337 |
| 4259774 | MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5311, OPERATING | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |
| 4459531 | FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD | 637,744 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 637,744 |
| 4459781 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT PDC AND MIRL | 0 | 0 | 795,000 | 0 | 0 | 795,000 |
| 4480891 | CR-708/SE BRIDGE ROAD BASCULE BRIDGE | 0 | 251,411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251,411 |
| 4481171 | WITHAM FIELD MILL \& RESURFACE, MITL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 342,000 | 342,000 |
| 4489971 | SE AVALON DRIVE FROM SE COVE ROAD TO SE | 91,880 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91,880 |
| 4495071 | CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 371,440 | 0 | 0 | 371,440 |
| 4495081 | SW CITRUS BLVD FROM CR 714/MARTIN HWY TO | 0 | 0 | 736,076 | 0 | 0 | 736,076 |
| 4496091 | WITHAM FIELD PUBLIC SAFETY AVIATION HANGAR | 0 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300,000 |
| 4496401 | WITHAM FIELD REPLACE PAPIS ON 12-30 W/ LED | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
| 4508231 | SE WASHINGTON STREET FR US-1/SE FEDERAL | 0 | 150,805 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150,805 |
| 4522571 | SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 719,194 | 0 | 719,194 |
| 4529971 | SOUTH DIXIE HIGHWAY FROM COLORADO | 0 | 0 | 308,187 | 0 | 0 | 308,187 |
| 4533591 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - HOLD BAY | 42,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,500 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LF - LOCAL FUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4533601 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIRFIELD SIGNAGE | 80,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 |
| 4533611 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - REHABILITATION OF | 1,350,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,350,000 |
| 4533841 | WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 |
| 4539191 | SW KANSAS AVENUE FROM 100 FT S OF CAMP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295,204 | 295,204 |
| Total |  | 2,759,693 | 1,289,296 | 2,828,305 | 1,337,464 | 1,255,474 | 9,470,232 |
| PKYI - TURNPIKE IMPROVEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4461651 | SR91 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS AT SR714 | 5,750,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 16,340,000 |
| 4462191 | WIDEN TPK(SR91), PALM BEACH C/L TO I-95 | 14,551,766 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,551,766 |
| 4463321 | WIDEN TPK(SR91), I-95 CONNECTOR TO | 10,758,960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,758,960 |
| 4463331 | WIDEN TPK(SR91), SW MARTIN HWY TO ST.LUCIE | 5,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,900,000 |
| 4466181 | THOMAS B MANUEL BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (SB | 3,407,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,407,505 |
| Total |  | 40,368,231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 50,958,231 |
| PKYR - TURNPIKE RENEWAL \& REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4485241 | BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - 890083 (SR 91) (MP 138) | 55,569,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55,569,281 |
| Total |  | 55,569,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55,569,281 |
| PL - METRO PLAN (85\% FA; 15\% OTHER) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4393285 | MARTIN COUNTY FY 2024/2025-2025/2026 UPWP | 567,164 | 571,463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,138,627 |
| 4393286 | MARTIN COUNTY FY 2026/2027-2027/2028 UPWP | 0 | 0 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 0 | 1,142,926 |
| 4393287 | MARTIN COUNTY UPWP FY 2028/2029-2029/2030 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571,463 | 571,463 |
| Total |  | 567,164 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 2,853,016 |
| SA - STP, ANY AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425,000 | 0 | 425,000 |
| 4444151 | SR-5/US-1 AT BAKER RD | 0 | 0 | 730,706 | 0 | 0 | 730,706 |
| 4444171 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW SUNSET BLVD | 0 | 0 | 38,039 | 0 | 0 | 38,039 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA - STP, ANY AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 605,866 | 0 | 0 | 605,866 |
| 4476491 | SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO | 2,506,739 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,506,739 |
| 4484471 | SR-5/US-1 FR . 5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY | 0 | 163,361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163,361 |
| Total |  | 2,506,739 | 163,361 | 1,374,611 | 425,000 | 0 | 4,469,711 |
| SCED-2012 SB1998-SMALL CO OUTREACH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4495071 | CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 487,805 | 0 | 0 | 487,805 |
| 4522571 | SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 487,805 | 457,058 | 944,863 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 487,805 | 487,805 | 457,058 | 1,432,668 |
| SCOP - SMALL COUNTY OUTREACH PROGRAM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4459531 | FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD | 16,327 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,327 |
| 4480891 | CR-708/SE BRIDGE ROAD BASCULE BRIDGE | 0 | 468,293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 468,293 |
| 4495071 | CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 55,053 | 0 | 0 | 55,053 |
| 4495081 | SW CITRUS BLVD FROM CR 714/MARTIN HWY TO | 0 | 0 | 423,971 | 0 | 0 | 423,971 |
| 4522571 | SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454,146 | 0 | 454,146 |
| 4539191 | SW KANSAS AVENUE FROM 100 FT S OF CAMP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442,805 | 442,805 |
| Total |  | 16,327 | 468,293 | 479,024 | 454,146 | 442,805 | 1,860,595 |
| SCWR-2015 SB2514A-SMALL CO OUTREACH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4459531 | FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD | 554,865 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 554,865 |
| 4495071 | CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 568,293 | 0 | 0 | 568,293 |
| 4522571 | SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 570,244 | 0 | 570,244 |
| 4539191 | SW KANSAS AVENUE FROM 100 FT S OF CAMP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442,806 | 442,806 |
| Total |  | 554,865 | 0 | 568,293 | 570,244 | 442,806 | 2,136,208 |
| SL - STP, AREAS $<=200 \mathrm{~K}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4444171 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW SUNSET BLVD | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SL - STP, AREAS <= 200K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 |
| SM - STBG AREA POP. W/ 5K TO 49,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538,823 | 0 | 538,823 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538,823 | 0 | 538,823 |
| SU - STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4196693 | WILLOUGHBY BLVD FROM SR-714/MONTEREY RD | 0 | 380,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 380,000 |
| 4383452 | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,008,222 | 0 | 1,008,222 |
| 4416991 | CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM I-95 TO | 0 | 978,352 | 0 | 0 | 1,394,888 | 2,373,240 |
| 4417001 | COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO | 498,193 | 1,465,991 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,964,184 |
| 4444052 | SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal | 964,319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 964,319 |
| 4444151 | SR-5/US-1 AT BAKER RD | 0 | 0 | 757,106 | 0 | 0 | 757,106 |
| 4444161 | SR-5/US-1 AT NW NORTH RIVER SHORES BLVD | 0 | 0 | 738,140 | 0 | 0 | 738,140 |
| 4462571 | SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 904,380 | 1,404,381 | 2,308,761 |
| 4507921 | CR-609/ALLAPATAH RD FR SR-710 TO 2,800 FEET | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 |
| Total |  | 1,462,512 | 2,829,343 | 1,495,246 | 1,912,602 | 2,799,269 | 10,498,972 |
| TALM - TAP AREA POP. 5K TO 50,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4529971 | SOUTH DIXIE HIGHWAY FROM COLORADO | 0 | 0 | 78,426 | 0 | 0 | 78,426 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 78,426 | 0 | 0 | 78,426 |
| TALT - TRANSPORTATION ALTS- ANY AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4489971 | SE AVALON DRIVE FROM SE COVE ROAD TO SE | 214,397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214,397 |
| 4508231 | SE WASHINGTON STREET FR US-1/SE FEDERAL | 0 | 214,508 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214,508 |
| 4529971 | SOUTH DIXIE HIGHWAY FROM COLORADO | 5,000 | 0 | 206,657 | 0 | 0 | 211,657 |
| Total |  | 219,397 | 214,508 | 206,657 | 0 | 0 | 640,562 |
| TALU - TRANSPORTATION ALTS- >200K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4489971 | SE AVALON DRIVE FROM SE COVE ROAD TO SE | 183,831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183,831 |

## 5-Year Summary of Projects by Funding Category

| Project \# | Project Name | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TALU - TRANSPORTATION ALTS- > 200 K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4508231 | SE WASHINGTON STREET FR US-1/SE FEDERAL | 0 | 365,711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365,711 |
| 4529971 | SOUTH DIXIE HIGHWAY FROM COLORADO | 0 | 0 | 177,137 | 0 | 0 | 177,137 |
| Total |  | 183,831 | 365,711 | 177,137 | 0 | 0 | 726,679 |
| TLWR-2015 SB2514A-TRAIL NETWORK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4435001 | SE GOMEZ AVENUE FROM SE OSPREY STREET TO | 486,892 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,749,953 | 8,236,845 |
| 4435051 | SR-5/US-1 FROM SE BRIDGE ROAD TO HOBE | 0 | 4,823,629 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,823,629 |
| 4473981 | SAILFISH CAPITAL TRAIL/MARTIN TRAIL | 0 | 1,600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,600,000 |
| Total |  | 486,892 | 6,423,629 | 0 | 0 | 7,749,953 | 14,660,474 |
| TRIP - TRANS REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4417001 | COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO | 1,811,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,811,977 |
| Total |  | 1,811,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,811,977 |

## 5-Year Summary of Funding Source

| Funding Source | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6 / 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7 / 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8 / 2 9}$ | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Federal | $70,769,336$ | $29,879,892$ | $10,330,049$ | $17,440,813$ | $16,068,691$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 , \mathbf { 4 8 8 } , \mathbf { 7 8 1 }}$ |
| Local | $2,759,693$ | $1,289,296$ | $2,828,305$ | $1,337,464$ | $1,255,474$ | $\mathbf{9 , 4 7 0 , 2 3 2}$ |
| R/W and Bridge Bonds | 0 | 0 | 0 | $7,500,000$ | 0 | $\mathbf{7 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| State $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $15,179,702$ | $30,748,487$ | $42,500,216$ | $11,232,374$ | $23,442,048$ | $\mathbf{1 2 3 , 1 0 2 , 8 2 7}$ |
| Toll/Turnpike | $95,937,512$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $10,590,000$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 , 5 2 7 , 5 1 2}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 4 , 6 4 6 , 2 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 , 9 1 7 , 6 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 6 5 8 , 5 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 , 5 1 0 , 6 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 , 3 5 6 , 2 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 1 , 0 8 9 , 3 5 2}$ |

## 5-Year Summary of Funding Source by Codes

| Project \# Fund Code |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACCM | ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (CM) | 1,035,129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,035,129 |  |
| ACNP | ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION NHPP | 62,123,561 | 8,164,019 | 3,678,213 | 8,772,920 | 11,095,631 | 93,834,344 |  |
| ACNR | AC NAT HWY PERFORM RESURFACING | 0 | 14,234,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,234,584 |  |
| ACPR | AC - PROTECT GRANT PGM | 0 | 1,254,404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,254,404 |  |
| ACSS | ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SS,HSP) | 124,149 | 176,187 | 150,330 | 0 | 0 | 450,666 |  |
| ACSU | ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION (SU) | 168,898 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168,898 |  |
| CARB | CARBON REDUCTION GRANT PGM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,976,378 | 0 | 1,976,378 |  |
| CARU | CARB FOR URB. AREA > THAN 200K | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277,236 | 0 | 277,236 |  |
| CM | CONGESTION MITIGATION - AQ | 83,780 | 264,397 | 0 | 1,488,223 | 124,160 | 1,960,560 |  |
| DU | STATE PRIMARY/FEDERAL REIMB | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |  |
| FAA | FEDERAL AVIATION ADMIN | 840,000 | 180,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,020,000 |  |
| FTA | FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 6,450,000 |  |
| PL | METRO PLAN (85\% FA; 15\% OTHER) | 567,164 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 2,853,016 |  |
| SA | STP, ANY AREA | 2,506,739 | 163,361 | 1,374,611 | 425,000 | 0 | 4,469,711 |  |
| SL | STP, AREAS <= 200K | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 | 0 | 0 | 1,127,939 |  |
| SM | STBG AREA POP. W/ 5K TO 49,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538,823 | 0 | 538,823 |  |
| SU | STP, URBAN AREAS > 200K | 1,462,512 | 2,829,343 | 1,495,246 | 1,912,602 | 2,799,269 | 10,498,972 |  |
| TALM | TAP AREA POP. 5 K TO 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 78,426 | 0 | 0 | 78,426 |  |
| TALT | TRANSPORTATION ALTS- ANY AREA | 219,397 | 214,508 | 206,657 | 0 | 0 | 640,562 |  |
| TALU | TRANSPORTATION ALTS- >200K | 183,831 | 365,711 | 177,137 | 0 | 0 | 726,679 |  |
| Total |  | 70,769,336 | 29,879,892 | 10,330,049 | 17,440,813 | 16,068,691 | 144,488,781 |  |
| Local |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LF | LOCAL FUNDS | 2,759,693 | 1,289,296 | 2,828,305 | 1,337,464 | 1,255,474 | 9,470,232 |  |
| Total |  | 2,759,693 | 1,289,296 | 2,828,305 | 1,337,464 | 1,255,474 | 9,470,232 |  |

## 5-Year Summary of Funding Source by Codes

| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R/W and Bridge Bonds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BNIR INTRASTATE R/W \& BRIDGE BONDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,500,000 | 0 | 7,500,000 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,500,000 | 0 | 7,500,000 |
| State 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BRRP STATE BRIDGE REPAIR \& REHAB | 789,915 | 100,000 | 10,664,636 | 0 | 8,695,447 | 20,249,998 |
| D UNRESTRICTED STATE PRIMARY | 2,449,790 | 3,449,790 | 2,949,790 | 3,605,442 | 3,844,227 | 16,299,039 |
| DDR DISTRICT DEDICATED REVENUE | 6,856,784 | 6,428,553 | 7,447,687 | 987,828 | 430,102 | 22,150,954 |
| DI ST. - S/W Inter/INTRASTATE HWY | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 | 0 | 0 | 8,568,306 |
| DIH STATE IN-HOUSE PRODUCT SUPPORT | 120,828 | 457,720 | 344,914 | 173,482 | 11,650 | 1,108,594 |
| DITS STATEWIDE ITS - STATE 100\%. | 536,831 | 569,040 | 346,489 | 0 | 0 | 1,452,360 |
| DPTO STATE - PTO | 516,289 | 1,210,000 | 3,260,000 | 0 | 1,368,000 | 6,354,289 |
| DS STATE PRIMARY HIGHWAYS \& PTO | 64,115 | 11,355,524 | 5,100,000 | 229,674 | 0 | 16,749,313 |
| DWS WEIGH STATIONS - STATE 100\% | 0 | 0 | 549,613 | 4,585,948 | 0 | 5,135,561 |
| GRSC GROWTH MANAGEMENT FOR SCOP | 975,089 | 285,938 | 1,733,659 | 137,805 | 0 | 3,132,491 |
| SCED 2012 SB1998-SMALL CO OUTREACH | 0 | 0 | 487,805 | 487,805 | 457,058 | 1,432,668 |
| SCOP SMALL COUNTY OUTREACH PROGRAM | 16,327 | 468,293 | 479,024 | 454,146 | 442,805 | 1,860,595 |
| SCWR 2015 SB2514A-SMALL CO OUTREACH | 554,865 | 0 | 568,293 | 570,244 | 442,806 | 2,136,208 |
| TLWR 2015 SB2514A-TRAIL NETWORK | 486,892 | 6,423,629 | 0 | 0 | 7,749,953 | 14,660,474 |
| TRIP TRANS REGIONAL INCENTIVE PROGM | 1,811,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,811,977 |
| Total | 15,179,702 | 30,748,487 | 42,500,216 | 11,232,374 | 23,442,048 | 123,102,827 |
| Toll/Turnpike |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PKYI TURNPIKE IMPROVEMENT | 40,368,231 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 50,958,231 |
| PKYR TURNPIKE RENEWAL \& REPLACEMENT | 55,569,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55,569,281 |
| Total | 95,937,512 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 106,527,512 |

## Martin County

## FY24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

| Project | Project \# | Cor N | Total | To Date | Unfunded | FY2024 | FY2025 | FY2026 | FY2027 | FY2028 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FY2029 - } \\ \text { FY2033 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIDEWALKS / PATHWAYS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Pathways | 1011 | N | 800,000 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 400,000 |
| SE MacArthur Boulevard Crosswalk | 101108 | N | 365,000 | 0 | 365,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365,000 |
| NE Plantation Road Sidewalk | 101110 | N | 110,500 | 0 | 110,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110,500 |
| Riverside Park Neighborhood Improvements - City of Stuart | 101111 | N | 766,872 | 0 | 0 | 766,872 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Avalon Drive Sidewalk | 101112 | N | 533,228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 533,228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Washington Street Sidewalk | 101113 | N | 585,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,000 | 520,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Improvements | 1016 | C | 5,763,400 | 0 | 0 | 408,400 | 595,000 | 595,000 | 595,000 | 595,000 | 2,975,000 |
| Traffic Signals and Streetlight Rehabilitations | 101601 | N | 10,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| SE Salerno Road- SE Cable Drive Turn Lane | 101603 | N | 480,000 | 0 | 0 | 480,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SR-76 (S Kanner Hwy) Turn Lane at SW South River Drive | 101605 | C | 510,491 | 0 | 0 | 16,949 | 0 | 463,692 | 29,850 | 0 | 0 |
| US-1 (NW Federal Highway) Turn Lane at NW Baker Road | 101608 | C | 1,265,481 | 0 | 0 | 219,962 | 319,397 | 0 | 726,122 | 0 | 0 |
| US-1 (SW Federal Highway) Turn Lane at SR-76 (S Kanner Highway) | 101609 | C | 4,279,005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142,000 | 1,628,000 | 2,509,005 | 0 |
| SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal Pathway | 101611 | C | 1,216,997 | 80,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,136,997 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Bridge Road Turn Lane at SE Powerline Avenue | 101612 | C | 530,000 | 30,000 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 |
| SE Salerno Road at S Kanner Highway | 101613 | C | 812,100 | 20,000 | 0 | 792,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SW 96th Street Pedestrian Lighting | 101614 | N | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ROADWAY / DRAINAGE / SEWER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resurfacing and Drainage Maintenance | 1017 | N | 49,072,314 | 0 | 0 | 1,140,483 | 400,483 | 245,483 | 202,967 | 530,483 | 46,552,415 |
| Pavement Marking Maintenance | 1017PM | N | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 |
| Jensen Beach Neighborhood Restoration | 101719 | N | 1,831,000 | 571,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 710,000 | 550,000 | 0 |
| Old Palm City (South) Neighborhood Restoration | 101738 | N | 5,141,500 | 2,541,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,600,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Port Salerno/New Monrovia Neighborhood Restoration | 101739 | N | 3,635,500 | 1,835,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,800,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Coral Gardens Neighborhood Restoration | 101742 | N | 2,465,000 | 1,225,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,240,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie Park Neighborhood Restoration | 101745 | N | 1,170,000 | 120,000 | 0 | 1,050,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rocky Point Neighborhood Restoration | 101747 | N | 5,538,000 | 288,000 | 0 | 2,200,000 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 2,050,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Tropic Vista Neighborhood Restoration | 101760 | N | 1,910,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110,000 | 1,800,000 | 0 | 0 |
| SPS/Manatee Business Park Restoration | 101762 | N | 1,930,000 | 130,000 | 0 | 450,000 | 1,350,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Beau Rivage Neighborhood Restoration | 101763 | N | 1,922,000 | 1,422,000 | 0 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zeus Park Neighborhood Restoration | 101765 | N | 2,300,000 | 0 | 2,300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,300,000 |
| Old Palm City (North) Neighborhood Restoration | 101766 | N | 6,230,000 | 130,000 | 2,350,000 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,000,000 |
| South County Neighborhood Restoration | 101767 | N | 1,800,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 1,650,000 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Shell Avenue Realignment | 101773 | N | 980,000 | 0 | 825,000 | 155,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 825,000 |
| Rio Neighborhood Restoration | 101776 | N | 5,685,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185,000 | 1,850,000 | 1,550,000 | 2,100,000 | 0 |
| South Fork Neighborhood Restoration | 101777 | N | 2,650,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250,000 | 2,400,000 | 0 |
| Dirt Road Paving (Urban Service District) | 101778 | N | 3,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 1,750,000 |
| CR-723 (NE Savannah Road) Sidewalk \& Intersection Modifications | 101779 | N | 1,108,000 | 0 | 1,108,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,108,000 |
| CR-714 (SW Martin Highway) Resurfacing (SR-710 to SW Fox Brown Road) | 101780 | N | 2,678,540 | 155,000 | 0 | 2,523,540 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NE Jensen Beach Boulevard Resurfacing | 101781 | N | 990,287 | 80,000 | 0 | 910,287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Port Salerno Peninsula Neighborhood Restoration | 101783 | N | 1,989,000 | 1,339,000 | 0 | 650,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SW Fox Brown Road Resurfacing | 101784 | N | 2,805,914 | 0 | 0 | 250,000 | 2,555,914 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NE Candice Avenue Extension | 101785 | N | 1,705,000 | 0 | 1,705,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,705,000 |
| Citrus Blvd Resurfacing (SR-714 to C-23 Canal) | 101786 | N | 3,024,304 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 2,944,304 | 0 | 0 |
| SW Kansas Avenue Resurfacing | 101787 | N | 850,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 850,000 | 0 |
| SE Countyline Road Resurfacing (US-1 to Wooden Bridge Lane) | 101788 | N | 3,025,000 | 0 | 875,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,025,000 | 0 |
| CR-609 Resurfacing (SR-710 to North of Minute Maid Road) | 101789 | N | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 0 |
| ANNUAL COMMITMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Commitments | 1019 | N | 5,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 2,500,000 |
| BRIDGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge Replacements/Renovations | 1053 | N | 3,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,500,000 |
| NW Pine Lake Drive Bridge Replacement | 105307 | N | 2,275,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250,000 | 50,000 | 1,975,000 | 0 |
| SE County Line Road Bridge Replacement | 105311 | N | 6,500,000 | 350,000 | 0 | 6,150,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Island Way WFespande rapladerant | 105313 | N | 2,600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300,000 | Page,0¢才 | 05p2049 |  |


| CR 708 Bridge Scour Protection | 105314 | N | 1,554,231 | 0 | 0 | 30,000 | 70,000 | 0 | 1,454,231 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arundel Bridge (SW 96th St.) Scour Repair | 105315 | N | 1,585,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 0 | 1,485,760 | 0 |
| TRAFFIC / CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Safety Measures | 1064 | N | 5,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 2,500,000 |
| SR-710 (SW Warfield Boulevard) Widening | 1066A | C | 1,333,310 | 1,333,310 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SR-714 (SW Martin Highway) Widening | 1123A | C | 23,816,729 | 20,388,739 | 0 | 3,427,990 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SE Willoughby Boulevard Extension | 1124 | C | 4,515,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,515,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CR-713 (SW High Meadow Avenue) Widening | 1125 | C | 5,662,431 | 2,005,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,176,995 | 0 | 2,480,436 | 0 |
| SE Cove Road Widening | 1126 | C | 5,210,803 | 0 | 0 | 25,000 | 3,311,290 | 1,874,513 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LANDSCAPE/BEAUTIFICATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enhanced Landscape Rehabilitation | TBD | N | 2,500,000 | 0 | 2,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,500,000 |
| HEAVY EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Equipment Replacement | 4957 | N | 8,245,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 805,000 | 805,000 | 805,000 | 805,000 | 4,025,000 |
| Expenditure Totals |  |  | 223,952,697 | 34,044,049 | 12,638,500 | 30,691,583 | 15,307,309 | 13,142,683 | 23,915,474 | 23,735,684 | 83,115,915 |

## ROADS REVENUE SUMMARY

| Revenue | Total | To Date | Carryover | FY2024 | FY2025 | FY2026 | FY2027 | FY2028 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2029- } \\ \text { FY2033 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road MSTU | 31,825,086 | 2,303,000 | 1,247,256 | 2,712,483 | 2,812,483 | 2,812,483 | 2,812,483 | 2,812,483 | 14,312,415 |
| Ad Valorem | 20,527,000 | 2,582,000 | 445,000 | 1,640,000 | 1,640,000 | 1,640,000 | 1,640,000 | 1,640,000 | 9,300,000 |
| Gas Tax | 16,434,500 | 211,500 | 143,000 | 1,608,000 | 1,608,000 | 1,608,000 | 1,608,000 | 1,608,000 | 8,040,000 |
| Private Contribution | 584,564 | 0 | 424,820 | 159,744 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grant | 11,415,303 | 0 | 0 | 2,649,382 | 1,949,142 | 1,204,231 | 3,322,548 | 2,290,000 | 0 |
| FPL Franchise Fee | 79,900,500 | 5,120,500 | 4,780,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| State Funds | 47,730,247 | 23,727,049 | 0 | 8,204,901 | 4,767,684 | 3,657,200 | 2,383,972 | 4,989,441 | 0 |
| Impact Fees | 1,180,680 | 100,000 | 280,680 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 400,000 |
| City Funds | 316,317 | 0 | 0 | 316,317 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fire MSTU | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 150,000 |
| Stormwater MSTU | 1,100,000 |  | 200,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 |
| Revenue Total | 211,314,197 | 34,044,049 | 7,320,756 | 24,400,827 | 19,887,309 | 18,031,914 | 18,877,003 | 20,449,924 | 67,202,415 |

Town of Sewall's Point DRAFT

## FY24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

## TOWN OF SEWALL'S POINT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2024-2028

## PROJECT COSTS

## CAPITAL PROJECTS

South Sewall's Point Road Phase 1 Part 4 South Sewall's Point Road Phase 2
South Sewall's Point Road Phase 3
South Sewall's Point Road Phase 4
North Sewall's Point Road
Stormwater/Vulnerability Master Plan South Sewall's Point Septic to Sewer
Police Department Remodel
Police Patrol Cars
Computer Replacements
Town Hall Resiliency Project

| FY25 |  | FY26 |  |  | FY27 |  | FY28 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## CAPITAL MAINTENANCE

Engineering
Streetlights \& Signs
Streets \& Bridges/Seawalls
Storm Water System Maintenance
Parks \& Landscaping
Streetscaping
Tree Maintenance
Town Hall

| $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 75,000 | $\$$ | 375,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | 15,000 | $\$$ | 15,000 | $\$$ | 15,000 | $\$$ | 15,000 | $\$$ | 15,000 | $\$$ | 75,000 |
| $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 100,000 | $\$$ | 500,000 |
| $\$$ | 125,000 | $\$$ | 125,000 | $\$$ | 125,000 | $\$$ | 125,000 | $\$$ | 125,000 | $\$$ | 625,000 |

TOTAL

| $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 35,000 | $\$$ | 35,000 | $\$$ | 35,000 | $\$$ | 35,000 | $\$$ | 165,000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 100,000 |
| $\$$ | 20,000 | $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 25,000 | $\$$ | 120,000 |
| $\$$ | 380,000 | $\$$ | 395,000 | $\$$ | 395,000 | $\$$ | 395,000 | $\$$ | 395,000 | $\$$ | $1,960,000$ |

COST GRAND TOTAL | $\$ 22,721,546$ | $\$ 31,784,780$ | $\$ 12,411,988$ | $\$ 9,853,000$ | $\$ 2,955,000$ | $\$ 79,726,314$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

# Village of Indiantown DRAFT 

## FY24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

## Capital Improvements - 5 Year CIP

| Project Name | FY 23-24 | FY 24-25 | FY 25-26 | FY 26-27 | FY 27-28 | Total Projected Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tyler Technolgies ERP System | 570,000 |  |  |  |  | 570,000 |
| CDGB Seminole Avenue | 400,000 | 300,000 |  |  |  | 700,000 |
| CDBG-MIT Civic Center | 225,000 | 225,000 |  |  |  | 460,000 |
| Lincoln Street | 500,000 | 300,000 |  |  |  | 800,000 |
| Uptown Drainage Design | 350,000 | 350,000 |  |  |  | 700,000 |
| Uptown Drainage Construction |  | 1,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |  | 7,000,000 |
| 12-minch Fire Loop (ARPA / MC) | 2,000,000 | 1,300,000 |  |  |  | 3,300,000 |
| SRF Water Plant Construction | 3,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 4,100,000 |  |  | 12,100,000 |
| FDEP Sower improvements | 10,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 14,000,000 |  |  | 38,000,000 |
| Wastewater Plant Construction | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |  |  |  | 10,000,000 |
| New ROWTP | 5,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 |  | 60,000,000 |
| Railroad Avenue Water Main | 500,000 | 4,000,000 | 150,000 |  |  | 6,000,000 |
| 151st Street Water Main | 500,000 | 2,500,000 |  |  |  | 3,000,000 |
| Water/Sewer R\&R | 300,000 | 309,000 | 318,300 | 427,800 | 440,600 | 1,795,700 |
| Total | 28,345,000 | 49,284,000 | 41,568,300 | 23,427,800 | 440,600 | 144,415,700 |

Town of Jupiter Island FY24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

## Town of Jupiter Island

| Road Microsurfacing and Last Update | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Asphalt } \\ & \text { /28/2024 } \end{aligned}$ | verlay R | tation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Pricing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Surfacing | \$11.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asphalt Overlay | \$18.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full Depth Reclaimation | \$50.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Road | Group | Grading | Length | Width | Sq. Feet | Sq. Yards | Type | Last Pave | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 | 2023-2024 | 2024-2025 | 2025-2026 | 2026-2027 | 2027-2028 |
| Gomez Road | 15 | 90 | 11409 | 19 | 216,771 | 24,085 | AO | 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Reed Place | 1 | 95 | 429 | 9 | 3,816 | 429 | AO | 2015 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estrada Road | 2 | 100 | 705 | 13 | 14,940 | 1,660 | FDR | 2015 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greenville West | 1 | 98 | 394 | 13 | 5,122 | 569 | AO | 2016 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greenville East | 3 | 100 | 394 | 13 | 5,122 | 569 | AO | 2016 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bunker Hill Road | 8 | 85 | 530 | 13 | 6,890 | 765 | AO | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| River Road (the ramble) | 1 | 90 | 1614 | 9 | 14,526 | 1,614 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Grassy Trail | 7 | 95 | 530 | 13 | 6,890 | 765 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Palmetto Trail | 7 | 95 | 530 | 13 | 6,890 | 765 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Rabbit Run | 7 | 95 | 530 | 13 | 9,903 | 741 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Black Bear Trail | 7 | 95 | 530 | 13 | 6,916 | 768 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| South Trail | 7 | 85 | 530 | 8 | 4,240 | 471 | AO | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Palm Trail | 11 | 95 | 303 | 13 | 3,939 | 438 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Angas Trail | 11 | 95 | 300 | 13 | 3,900 | 433 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Allen Trail | 11 | 95 | 347 | 13 | 4,511 | 501 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Links Road fka Delespine | 9 | 95 | 576 | 15 | 37,592 | 960 | AO | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Links Road | 9 | 90 | 2000 | 15 | 37,592 | 3,333 | AO | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Pitou Trail | 12 | 90 | 384 | 17 | 6,528 | 725 | MS | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Public Safety Parking | 5 | 95 |  |  | 17,163 | 1,907 | AO | 2018 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| North Beach Road Drainag | 5 | 100 | 8,884 | 18 | 159,912 | 17,768 | FDR | 2019 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Beach Road | 6 | 100 | 8,884 | 18 | 159,912 | 17,768 | FDR | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Town Hall Parking | 6 | 50 |  |  | 43,515 | 4,835 | AO | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Isle Ridge E/W Street | 10 | 50 | 600 | 16 | 9,600 | 1,067 | AO+Widening | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Isle Ridge N/S Streets | 10 | 50 | 1200 | 9 | 10,800 | 1,200 | AO | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Devonshire Lane West | 3 | 50 | 786 | 13 | 10,218 | 1,139 | AO | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Barrow Place West | 3 | 60 | 496 | 13 | 5,148 | 572 | MS | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Barrow Place East | 3 | 60 | 496 | 13 | 5,148 | 572 | MS | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Clear View Avenue | 13 | 60 | 387 | 12 | 4,644 | 516 | AO | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Osceola Avenue | 13 | 70 | 434 | 16 | 6,944 | 772 | MS | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Bright View Avenue | 13 | 80 | 720 | 16 | 11,520 | 1,280 | AO | ? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Harmony Lane | 13 | 84 | 771 | 12 | 9,252 | 1,028 | MS | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Bassett Creek Trail | 14 | 70 | 1013 | 18 | 18,234 | 2,026 | MS | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Bassett Creek Trail North | 14 | 78 | 1698 | 18 | 30,564 | 3,396 | MS | 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Edge Repairs | - | - | varies | - | - | - | Edge | - | \$3,500 |  | \$3,500 |  | \$3,500 |  | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,500 |
| Mobilization | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 |
| Total | - | - | 40,246 | - | 663,135 | 69,263 | - | - | \$3,500 | \$2,500 | \$6,000 | \$2,500 | \$6,000 | \$2,500 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 |



 North Beach Road will need a combination of Roadway Miling, Asphat overlay and micro surfacing, approximately 4500 sq yards will be Asphalt overlay roadway and 13,268 sq yards will be Micro Surface.

## City of Stuart

## FY24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

ITEM NUMBER:419669 3
ITEM NTRICT:04
DISTRICT: 04
FUND
CODE COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: . 000

## 2023

$\qquad$
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT SA
SU

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-9/I-95 FROM PALM BEACH/MARTIN CO LINE TO CR-708 INTERCHANGE COUNTY:MARTIN PROJECT LENGTH: 7.910MI

TYPE OF WORK:SAFETY PROJEC

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT HSP

$$
2023
$$

-501,915
PHASE: GRANTS AND MISCELLANEOUS / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDO

|  | $-9,073$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| тотаL 4342734 | SA |
| TOTAL 434273 | 4 |

ITEM NUMBER:435139 2
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY TD:89030000
FUND
CODE

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT

| TOTAL 435139 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | -462 |

TOTAL 4351392


PROJECT DESCRIPTION:MURPHY ROAD BRIDGE
COUNTY:MARTIN
PROJECT LENGTH: 020MI
FUND
CODE
ROJECT DESCRIPTION:CR-707/SE BEACH ROAD FROM PALM BEACH/MARTIN CL TO CR-708/SE BRIDGE RD COUNTY:MARTIN PROJECT LENGTH: 7.052MI

2023
-462 $-462$

## HIGHWAYS

ITEM NUMBER:437838 1
ITEM NUMBER:437838
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89010000
ROADWAY ID:89010000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-5/US-1 FROM S. OF SE HERITAGE BLVD. TO NORTH OF SE SALERNO RD COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: 3.570MI

## 2023

$-18,182$
$-18,182$
$-18,182$
TOTAL 437838 S 1
NMMBER:438343
ITEM NUMBER:438343 1
DISTRICT:04
ROAD
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:CR-609 FROM NORTH OF MINUTE MAID ROAD TO THE S CURVE COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: 3.336MI

## FUND CODE

2023

$$
70,181
$$

CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
SU

TOTAL 438343 S
total 4383431

ITEM NUMBER:438346 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SE OCEAN BLVD FROM WEST OF SE HOSPITAL AVE TO SE PALM BEACH ROAD ISTRICT: 04
ROADWAY ID:89040000
FUND
CODE
2023
RELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT } & -1,619 \\ \text { TALT }\end{array}$
TOTAL 4383462
TOTAL 4383462

| ITEM NUMBER:438347 1 | PROJECT DESCRIPTION:INDIAN STREET FROM DIXIE HIGHWAY TO ST. LUCIE BLVD. |
| :--- | :---: |
| DISTRICT:04 |  |
| ROADWAY ID: 89000014 | COUNTY:MARTIN |
| PROJECT LENGTH: |  |

ROADWAY ID:89000014

CODE
2023
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT SU
$-5,77$
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY C CONS
SU
1
-16,275
тотAL 4383471
TOTAL 4383471

[^3]TYPE OF WORK:GUARDRAIL
*NON-SIS*
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

[^4]TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
*NON-SIS*
: 2/ $2 / 0$

ITEM NUMBER:438348 1
ITEM NUMBER:438348 1
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID: 89000016
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:ST. LUCIE BLVD FROM INDIAN ST TO E. OCEAN BLVD COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: 2.437MI

## FUND CODE

2023

$$
-14,715
$$

-31,359
$-46,074$ -46,074

ITEM NUMBER:440811 1
DISTRICT: 04
ROADWAY ID:89510000
FUND
CODE

PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT

ITEM NUMBER:441567 1
ISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89900038
FUND
CODE
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SE FLORIDA ST. FROM SE JOHNSON AVE. TO CR-707/DIXIE HWY
COUNTY:MARTIN
PROJECT LENGTH: .503MI

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
тотAL 441567 1
-793
-793
TOTAL 4415671

ITEM NUMBER:441699 1 ISTRICT:04
ROADWA ID:89000032
FUND
CODE
$1,419,684$
19,000
$\mathbf{1 , 4 3 8 , 6 8 4}$
$1,438,684$
$1,438,684$
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT GFSA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM SR-9/I-95 TO CR-714/MARTIN HWY COUNTY:MARIIN LENGTH: 2.670MI

TOTAL 441699 SA TOTAL 4416991 TOTAL 4416991
*NON-SIS*
TYPE OF WORK:MISCELLANEOUS CONSTRUCTION LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/2/0

TYPE OF WORK:SIDEWALK LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ $2 / 2$

OF WORK:SIDEWALK
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: $2 / 2 / 0$

|  | 3,617 |
| :--- | :--- |
| TOTAL 440811 |  |
| TOTAL |  |
| 440811 | 1 |$\quad 3,617$

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:CR-708/SW BRIDGE RD FROM CR-711/PRATT WHITNEY TO SR-5/US-1 COUNTY:MARTIN PROJECT LENGTH: 8.680MI

$$
2023
$$

TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
*NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ $2 / 0$

ITEM NUMBER:441701 1
ITEM NUMBER:4
DISTITT:04
ROADWAY ID:89000003
FUND
CODE
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:COVE ROAD FROM SR-5/US-1 TO DIXIE HIGHWAY COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: 1.080MI

RRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT SA

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT SA
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY C CARM

| CARM | 110,896 |
| :--- | ---: |
| SA | 981,189 |
| TOTAL $\mathbf{4 4 1 7 0 1} \mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1 2 4 , 2 6 6}$ |
| TOTAL $\mathbf{4 4 1 7 0 1} \mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 2 4 , 2 6 6}$ |

ITEM NUMBER:442317 1
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89060000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY @ CSX CROSSING 628084L
COUNTY:MARTIN
PROJECT LENGTH: .013MI
FUND
CODE
2023
PHASE: RAILROAD AND UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOI

| TAL 4423171 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad-17,029$

TOTAL 4423171
-17,029

ITEM NUMBER:442318 1 DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89000010
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SOUTHWEST SILVER FOX LANE @ CSX CROSSING 915300T COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: .029MI
FUND
CODE
PHASE: RAILROAD AND UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT TOTAL 442318 TOTAL 4423181
$-122,647$ $-122,647$

ITEM NUMBER:442319 1 DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89900039
FUND
CODE
CODE
DESCRIPTION:SOUTHWEST TOMMY CLEMENTS STREET @ CSX CROSSING 628073 Y
PROJECT LENGTH: .020MI
2023 $\qquad$
PHASE: RAILROAD AND UTILITIES / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT

TYPE OF WORK:MISCELLANEOUS CON *NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ $2 /$

TYPE OF WORK:RAIL SAFETY PROJECT ${ }^{*}$ NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

TYPE OF WORK: RAIL SAFETY PRO *NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ $2 / 0$

TYPE OF WORK:RAIL SAFETY PROJECT *NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

ANNUAL OBLIGATIONS REPORT

ITEM NUMBER:443992 1
ITEM NUMBER:4
ROADWAY ID:89010000
FUND
CODE
COUNTY:MARTIN $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT LENGTH: } \quad 1.426 \mathrm{MI}\end{aligned}$

TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 4/ 0

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT

ITEM NUMBER:444345 1
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89000039
FUND
CODE COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: .204MI

TYPE OF WORK:BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK *NON-SIS* LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ 2/ 0

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT TALU

TOTAL 4443451

ITEM NUMBER:444705 1
ITEM NUMBER
ROADWAY ID:89030000
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:NE DIXIE HWY, NW ALICE ST AND SE PETTWAY ST @ FEC COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: .117MI

## FUND CODE <br> CODE

-3,807
$-3,807$
$-3,807$

PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
TOTAL 444705
total 4447051

ITEM NUMBER:446072 1
ITEM NUMBER
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89000004
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SALERNO ROAD FROM SOUTHEAST WILLOUGHBY TO SOUTHEAST CABLE DRIVE COUNTY:MARTIN PROJECT LENGTH: .911MI

911MI

## 2023

$-3,576$
PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT TALT

PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT tALT
PHASE: CONSTRUCTION / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY C SM TALT
TALU

143,299
175,464
TOTAL 4460721
511,339
TOTAL 4460721
511,339

ITEM NUMBER:447002 1
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89091000
FUND
CODE
CODE
COUNTY:MARTIN
PROJECT LENGTH: .015MI

TYPE OF WORK:LIGHTING
*NON-SIS*
LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 4/ 0/ 0

PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
TOTAL 447002
тотAL 4470021
74,114
74,114

ITEM NUMBER:447555 1
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89070000
FUND
CODE
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD
COUNTY:MARTTN
COUNTY:MARTIN
PROJECT LENGTH: 10.085MI

## 2023

RRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
PHASE: HS
TOTAL 4475551
TOTAL 4475551

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD TURN LANE AT TOMMY CLEMENTS STREET COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: .386MI

690,60
1,113,647
192,903
3,196,053
5,193,212
5,193,212
TOTAL 448397
TOTAL 4483971

ITEM NUMBER:448997 1
ISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:89900061
FUND
CODE
-
RELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY FDOT
TALU 5,000
TOTAL 4489971
TOTAL 4489971
5,000
5,000

ITEM NUMBER:449159 1 DISTRICT: 04 ROADWAY ID:89095000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:SR-9/I-95 N OF BRIDGE RD TO S OF SR-76/KANNER HWY COUNTY:MARTIN

PROJECT LENGTH: 3.675MI

## 2023

FUND
CODE
$\qquad$

122,76
122,764
7,474,452
7,474,452

ITEM NUMBER:439328 3
ITEM NUMBER:
DISTRICT:04
ROADWAY ID:
FUND
CODE

PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: RESPONSIBLE AGENCY NOT AVAILABLE

| TOTAL 439328 3 |
| :--- |
| TOTAL $439328 \mathbf{3}$ | DISTRICT:04

COUNTY:MROJECT LENGTH: . 000
FUND
CODE 2023

PHASE: PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING / RESPONSIBLE AGENCY: MANAGED BY MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY C TOTAL 4393284 TOTAL DIST: 04 871,168 total planning 871,168 871,168
638,784 638,784

2023 Federally Obligated Transit Funds

| FM\# | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | FUND | WORK MIX | PHASE | 2023 FUNDING |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4134931 | MARTIN COUNTY TRANSIT SECTION 5307 | FTA | FIXED ROUTE | TRANSIT OPERATING | \$ | 425,451.00 |
| N/A | MARTIN COUNTY TRANSIT SECTION 5307-CARES ACT | FTA | FIXED ROUTE | TRANSIT OPERATING | \$ | 599,157.00 |
| 425977-3-84-01 | MARTIN COUNTY TRANSIT SECTION-5311 CARES ACT | FTA | FIXED ROUTE | TRANSIT OPERATING | \$ | 104,699.00 |
| 425977-3-84-01 | MARTIN COUNTY TRANSIT SECTION-5311 | FTA | FIXED ROUTE | TRANSIT OPERATING | \$ | 78,338.00 |

Table 12 - Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Program - FY25

| Trip \& Equipment Grant Allocation |  |  | Planning Grant Allocation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TD Trust Fund | Local Match | Total | TD Trust Fund | Local Match | Total |
| $\$ 280,704$ | $\$ 31,189$ | $\$ 311,893$ | $\$ 25,741$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 25,741$ |

Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) services are provided pursuant to Florida Statute 427.015. In Martin County, the MPO is the Designated Official Planning Agency (DOPA) and the Senior Resource Association is the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC). For FY 2024/25, the Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged has programmed the following funds for the Martin County TD program:

TD is defined as those persons who, because of physical or mental disability, income status or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase transportation and are, therefore, dependent on others to obtain access to health care, employment, education, shopping, social activities or other life-sustaining activities. These persons also include children who are handicapped or high-risk or at risk as defined in Ch. 411, F.S.



| Name of Entity That <br> Drafted This Plan | Ashman Beecher，Transit Administrator |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Approval by the Joint <br> Safety Committee | Date of Approval |  |
|  | $11 / 15 / 2022$ | Date of Signature |
| Signature by the <br> Accountable Executive | Signature of Accountable Executive | W／2／$/ 2$ |
|  | James Gorton，Public Works Director |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\forall / \mathrm{N}$ |  <br>  10 （se！）Kэue6૪ ไ！sue」』 ๖0 ssejppy pue әuen |
|  | $\forall / N$ | （s）ұиәшә6иени ృ0 uo！！d！ıssad |  | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \\ & \mathrm{ON} \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | ¿Кұ！ <br>  səэ！ィләs t！sueд әр！＾олd Кэиә6е әчł səod |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  | （әэ！へıаs рәృэедйоэ ло рәңедәdо <br>  ！！sue»」 әчъ Кq pәp！＾одd eכ！へ」еS $\ddagger 0$（s）əpow |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6६६G } \\ & \text { LO\&G } \end{aligned}$ | ＇Lع६S＇L0عS＇ $6 \cdot$ •） 6u！pun」 $\forall \perp$－ |  | ఛ！suenexed <br> ؛sng дәұпшшол ：sng əұnoy pəx！ـ |  |  | ueld s！̣ı Кq рәләлоэ <br>  |
| лоңедs！u！ |  |  |  |  |  | ขณ！ุทวขхヨ <br> SWS do גəગ！HO <br>  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  <br>  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ssəıpp $\forall$ Kэuəб $\forall$ ！！suedı |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | amen Kэuәбъ \＃！sued |





|  |  |  |  |  |  | Safety Management PC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  | －＾uessəoəu әде ишшәәр рие шлец әsneว we u！pəлןоsәa pue＇ys！ e s！ $\boldsymbol{\\|}$＇sə！！！！！ d wप् ә૫ł səsn 人」yヲW |
| ¡иәшssəsse प्र！！ <br>  －spıezey <br>  <br>  ：6и！рпри！＇ssәэолd ұиәшәбеиеw ssooold $\ddagger$ | дәдеs до дипsәд e IIW Ys！！KıəлеS <br> イəәеs рә！！！ииәр！ S $\forall$ Ys！！ <br> ＇spıezey әиł рлеzeн кұәјеS <br> s！y Kıəəes ә૫ł әq！ハンsəด mə6euew ys！y Кłəjes |
| ұuәuəбеuew ysil Kıəృes＂G |  |
| －səэuełsqns рәןодииоэ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  лоңеи！ ：зКем биммо｜ㅣ әчъ и！ <br>  <br>  |  |
| mes6osd 6u！podəy Кıəjes әәКоןdü |  |
|  | әәи！шшоэ КъәృеS ұu！ |
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and/or severity of potential consequences of hazards.
The Chief Safety Officer will review current methods of safety risk mitigation and establish methods or procedures to
mitigate or eliminate safety risk associated with specific hazards. MCPT can reduce safety risk by reducing the likelihood


Describe activities to monitor information reported through internal safety reporting programs.
All records will be maintained by the Chief Safety Officer for a minimum of five years from the date of completion of the
investigation.

 whether:
The Final Report and all documentation of the investigation, will be given to the Chief Safety Officer, for determination
investigations see Transit's Contractor Corporate Policy Statement for Injury Investigation and Accident/Incident
Reporting. identified causal factors and any identified corrective action plan. For Specific procedures for conducting safety

In the case of any of these events, drivers are required to contact dispatch immediately. Dispatch calls 911 should
MARTY conducts safety investigations of events (accidents, incidents, and occurrences, as defined by FTA) to find causal
and contributing factors and review the existing mitigations in place at the time of the event.
Describe activities to conduct investigations of safety events, including the identification of causal factors.
or take other action to manage the safety risk
determined for each mitigation and determine if a specific safety risk mitigation is not implemented or performing as
intended. If the mitigation is not implemented or performing as intended, the Chief Safety Officer will modify the mitigation MARTY Chief Safety Officer will review the performance of individual risk mitigations based on the reporting schedule
determined for each mitigation and determine if a specific safety risk mitigation is not implemented or performing as performance observations; or other activities. The Chief Safety Officer will endeavor to make use of existing MARTY
processes and activities before assigning new information collections activities. mechanisms may include tracking a specific metric on daily, weekly, or monthly logs or reports; conducting job
performance observations; or other activities. The Chief Safety Officer will endeavor to make use of existing MARTY The Chief Safety Officer establishes one or more mechanisms for monitoring safety risk mitigations as part of the
mitigation implementation process and assigns monitoring activities to the appropriate staff. These monitoring mechanism for monitoring safety risk mitigations varies depending on the mitigation. MARTY monitors safety risk mitigations to determine if they have been implemented and are effective, appropriate, and
working as intended. The Chief Safety Officer maintains a list of safety risk mitigations in the Safety Risk Register. The inappropriate, or were not implemented as intended
Describe activities to monitor operations to identify any safety risk mitigations that may be ineffective, $\square$

nolpowodd Kıəృes *


Safety Management Policy means a transit agency's documented commitment to safety, which defines the
transit agency's safety objectives and the accountabilities and responsibilities of its employees in regard to
safety.




 the Federal Railroad Administration, or any such system in engineering or construction. Rail fixed guideway
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 or more injuries requiring medical transport; or damage to facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure


 FTA means the Federal Transit Administration, an operating administration within the United States



 directly to a transit agency's chief executive officer, general manager, president, or equivalent officer. A Chief
Safety Officer may not serve in other operational or maintenance capacities, unless the Chief Safety Officer

 the agency's Transit Asset Management Plan; and control or direction over the human and capital resources Accountable Executive means a single, identifiable person who has ultimate responsibility for carrying out any derailment of a rail transit vehicle, at any location, at any time, whatever the cause.
 MAR TY incorpo
Plan regulation.
transportation, as required by 49 U.S.C. 5326 and 49 CFR part 625.


State of good repair means the condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of State means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands,
Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.


 Results in a fracture of any bone (except simple fractures of fingers, toes, or noses);
Causes severe hemorrhages, nerve, muscle, or tendon damage.
Involves any internal organ; or Requires hospitalization for more than 48 hours, commencing within 7 days from the date of the injury Plan for identifying hazards and analyzing, assessing, and mitigating safety risk.
Safety Risk Management means a process within a transit agency's Public Transportation Agency Safety
 Safety Promotion means a combination of training and communication of safety information to support SMS
as applied to the transit agency's public transportation system. Safety Management System (SMS) Executive means a Chief Safety Officer or an equivalent.
Safety performance target means a Performance Target related to safety management activities procedures, practes, and (SMS) Executive means a Chief Safety Officer or an equivalent.


| Acronym | Word or Phrase |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 |
| ASP | Agency Safety Plan (also referred to as PTASP in Part 673) |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| ESRP | Employee Safety Reporting Program |
| FDOT | Florida Department of Transportation |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| MCBOCC | Martin County Board of County Commissioners |
| MCPT | Martin County Public Transit (aka MARTY) |
| MPO | 49 CFR Part 673 (public Transportation Agency Safety Plan) |
| Part 673 | Safety Management System |
| SMS | Safety Performance Targets |
| SPT | Safety Risk Management Process |
| SRM | System Safety Program Plan |
| SSPP | Transportation Safety Institute |
| TSI | United States Code |
| U.S.C. | Vehicle Revenue Miles |
| VRM |  |

List of Acronyms Used in the ASP




James Gorton, Public Works Director, FTA Authorized Representative
HełS әn!łeגłs!u!up $\forall$ UeId WVI NLY $\forall W$
sұиәшәяррәмоижวヲ
6:00am and 8:00pm, Monday thru Friday. services, within a defined service area of the County, as well as a Commuter bus service which provides MARTY operates four fixed routes and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary Paratransit maintenance and dispatching services are performed at 3210 SE Slater Street, Stuart FL. parking and pre-trip inspections are conducted from 2225 SE Avenger Circle, Stuart FL. The vehicle and field operations are conducted from 2401 SE Monterey Rd, Stuart, FL. Fueling, bus washing, overnight
MARTY has three transit locations in which work is performed. Administration, planning, trip reservation, some of its operating tasks through a competitive bid process.
MARTY provides service under the Purchased Transit model whereas a contractor(s) is hired to perform MARTY in Martin County, Florida.
Martin County is managed by a five-member Board and oversees the public transit service known as the (FTA) Operating and Capital Assistance funds, pursuant to Section 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53. Martin County Board of County Commissioners is a designated recipient of Federal Transit Administration

## A18もW $\ddagger$ noq*

Provide a reliable, safe, and efficient public transit system to Martin County residents.
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Below is the inventory of vehicles used to provide the MARTY program: Martin County's public transit service, MARTY, provides approximately 90,000 unlinked passenger trips

Agency Overview
funds (revenues from all sources) towards improving asset condition and achieving a sufficient level of
performance within those means. not in a State of Good Repair; and (4) deciding how to best balance and prioritize reasonably anticipated Good Repair); (3) identify the unacceptable risks, including safety risks, in continuing to use an asset that is determine what condition and performance of its assets should be (if they are not currently in a State of MARTY has developed this TAM Plan to aid in: (1) Assessment of the current condition of capital assets; (2)

- Lower system performance (missed runs due to breakdown)
Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM) Plan Policy: Higher maintenance costs. Decreased system reliability (on-time performance)

Safety risks (accidents per 100,000 revenue miles)
The consequences of an asset not being in SGR include:
System Safety \& Performance outcomes. Data-driven maintenance decisions.

Optimized capital investment and maintenance decisions investments.

Improved transparency and accountability for safety, maintenance, asset use, and funding By implementing a TAM Plan, the benefits include: optimal prioritization of funding at transit agencies, to keep transit systems in a State of Good Repair (SGR) A Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan is a business model that uses the condition of assets to guide the

 Compliance \& TAM Program Coordinator shall be responsible for ensuring reporting requirements in

 transportation agency safety plan. to-day operations, and expansion needs in approving and carrying out the TAM Plan and public Works Director. The County's Accountable Executive must balance transit asset management, safety, dayExecutive" to implement the TAM Plan. The County's Accountable Executive shall be the County Public Per FTA TAM requirements, each transit operator receiving FTA funding shall designate an "Accountable
assets, and/or operations occurring at the County TAM Plan shall be amended during the four-year horizon period when there is a significant change to staff, practicable cost. This document shall cover a "horizon period" of time (10/1/2023 to 9/30/2027). This will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at a minimum a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that assets, with a focus on both engineering and economic analysis based on quality of information, to identify


 's.nnoy әЈ!^ฝəs regular service or have 100 or fewer vehicles in general demand response service during peak regular public transportation systems and have 100 or fewer vehicles in fixed-route revenue service during peak 625.45 (b)(1). Tier II transit providers are those transit agencies that do not operate rail fixed guideway The County is currently operating as an FTA-defined Tier II transit operator in compliance with (49 CFR S.S. the outcome of operating assets in the parameters of State of Good Repair (SGR) of investment (available funding), rehabilitation and replacement actions, and performance measures with
 service with safe vehicles.

MARTY is committed to operating a public transit system that offers reliable, accessible, and convenien

Decision Support Tool: Means an analytic process or methodology: (1) To help prioritize projects to
improve and maintain the state of good repair of capital assets within a public transportation system,
based on available condition data and objective criteria; or (2) To assess financial needs for asset
investments over time.



 Asset Class: Means a subgroup of capital assets within an asset category. For example, buses, trolleys, and stock, a grouping of infrastructure, and a grouping of facilities

Asset Category: Means a grouping of asset classes, including a grouping of equipment, a grouping of rolling
and the agency's transit asset management plan in accordance with 49 U.S. Code § 5326 maintain both the agency's public transit agency safety plan, in accordance with 49 U.S. Code § 5329 (d), management practices; and control or direction over human and capital resources needed to develop and the safety management system of the public transit agency; responsibility for carrying out transit asset Accountable Executive: Means a single, identifiable person who has ultimate responsibility for carrying out

## suo!!!u!yod

$$
\text { accordance with } \S 625.53
$$

develop its investment prioritization


 Stock.

1) Asset Inventory Portfolio: An inventory of the number and type of capital assets to include Rolling following elements:

As a Tier II transportation provider, MARTY has developed and implemented a TAM Plan containing the
 Public Transportation System: Means the entirety of a transit provider's operations, including the services
Performance Target: Means a quantifiable level of performance or condition, expressed as a value for the
measure, to be achieved within a time period required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
 quantifiable indicator of performance or condition is an arithmetic difference between scheduled and measure for on-time performance is the percent of trains that arrive on time, and a corresponding
 Performance Measure: Means an expression based on a quantifiable indicator of performance or condition

Life-Cycle Cost: Means the cost of managing an asset over its whole life
Key Asset Management Activities: Means the cost of managing an asset over its whole life.
sources that a transit provider reasonably anticipates will be available over the TAM plan horizon period. maintain a state of good repair. An investment prioritization is based on financial resources from all Investment Prioritization: Means a transit provider's ranking of capital projects or programs to achieve or transit provider reasonably anticipates will be available over the TAM plan horizon period. state of good repair. An investment prioritization is based on financial resources from all sources that a Infrastructure: Means a transit provider's ranking of capital projects or programs to achieve or maintain a sources that a transit provider reasonably anticipates will be available over the TAM plan horizon period maintain a state of good repair. An investment prioritization is based on financial resources from all Implementation Strategy: Means a transit provider's ranking of capital projects or programs to achieve or performance of its TAM Plan. FTA standard horizon period is four years. Horizon Period: Means the fixed period of time within which a transit provider will evaluate the capital asset is in a state of good repair. Full Level of Performance: Means the objective standard established by FTA for determining whether a
Facility: Means a building or structure that is used in providing public transportation. by a transit provider or used for servicing their vehicles
Exclusive-Use Maintenance Facility: Means a maintenance facility that is not commercial and either owned

[^5]Direct Recipient: Means an entity that receives Federal financial assistance directly from the Federal Transit
maintaining, and improving public transportation capital assets effectively, throughout the life cycle of
those assets. Transit Asset Management (TAM) System: Means a strategic and systematic process of operating, policy for TAM including its objectives and performance targets.
 condition assessment of inventoried assets, a decision support tool, and a prioritization of investments.
 transportation. risks, and costs over their life cycles, for the purpose of providing safe, cost-effective, and reliable public inspecting, maintaining, rehabilitating, and replacing transit capital assets to manage their performance, Transit Asset Management (TAM): Means the strategic and systematic practice of procuring, operating, Tribe.
> route mode, (2) a sub recipient under the 5311 Rural Area Formula Program, (3) or any American Indian in revenue service during peak regular service across all non-rail fixed route modes or in any one non-fixed

> Tier II Provider: Means a recipient that owns, operates, or manages (1) one hundred (100) or fewer vehicles fixed route mode, or (2) rail transit. more vehicles in revenue service during peak regular service across all fixed route modes or in any one nonTier I Provider: Means a recipient that owns, operates, or manages either (1) one hundred and one (101) or 3.0 - Adequate, 2.0 - Marginal, and 1.0 - Poor

Economic Requirements Model (TERM) to describe the condition of an asset: 5.0 - Excellent, 4.0-Good,
 direct recipient

Sub recipient: Means an entity that receives Federal transit grant funds indirectly through a State or a performance

State of Good Repair: (SGR): Means the condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of work for a public transportation system or for delivery of materials, equipment, or tools.

Service Vehicle: Means a unit of equipment that is used primarily either to support maintenance and repair carrying passengers on fare-free services.

Rolling Stock: Means a revenue vehicle used in providing public transportation, including vehicles used for directly from FTA or as a sub recipient.

Recipient: Means an entity that receives Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, either

 System reliability: On-time performance by mode (Number of accidents x 100,000 VRM)/Actual Annual VRM)

Safety risks: Number of accidents per 100,000 revenue miles by mode
(Number of accidents $x$ 100,000 VRM)/Actual Annual VRM) (Table1.1): MARTY shall establish annual TAM goals, which are separate from annual SGR performance goals, based on
tangible criteria related to asset performance. TAM goals include monitoring the following criteria:


 maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacements (ULB).
(4) The assets life-cycle investment needs have been met or recovered, including all scheduled and/or deny accessibility.
(3) The use of the asset in its current condition does not pose an identified unacceptable safety risk (2) The asset is able to perform its manufactured design function. other capital assets within a public transit system are in a SGR. individual capital asset may operate at a full level of performance regardless of whether or not
(1) If the asset is in a condition sufficient for the asset to operate at a full level of performance. An

A capital asset is in a state of good repair (SGR) when each of the following objective standards are met:

## KIIOd spxepuets (y9S) य!edəy poov fo əұełs

capital asset, as determined by a transit provider, or the default benchmark provided by FTA.
Useful life benchmark (ULB): Means the expected life cycle or the acceptable period of use in service for a service determined by FTA. Useful life: Means either the expected life cycle of a capital asset or the acceptable period of use in a U.S.C. Chapter 53 that owns, operates, or manages capital assets used in providing public transportation. Transit Provider (provider): Means a recipient or sub recipient of Federal financial assistance under 49
vehicles．FTA guidelines for Minimum Useful Life are as follows：
 lifecycles specifically those standards found in FTA Circular 5010．1E，IV－24：Recipients of federal assistance

 －д！edәл poos fo әłеłs e u！әq
 within the service area，historical maintenance records，manufacturer guidelines，and the default asset ULB Benchmark＇s（ULB），the County recognized and considered the local operating environment of its assets unique operating environment（service frequency，weather，geography）．When developing Useful Life provider＇s operating environment．ULB criteria are user defined，whereas ULB considers a provider＇s provider＇s operating environment，or the acceptable period of use in service for a particular transit The Useful Life Benchmark（ULB）is defined as the expected lifecycle of a capital asset for a particular transit

## ॠешиวuәg ә！！｜nfəsत

TAM Plan implementation and monitoring provides a framework for maintaining an SGR by considering the
condition of assets in relation to the local operating environment．MARTY has developed its SGR policies to
account for the prevention，preservation，maintenance，inspection，rehabilitation，disposal，and
replacement of capital assets．The goal of these policies is to allow MARTY to determine and predict the
cost to improve asset conditions（s）at various stages of the asset life cycle，while balancing prioritization of
capital，operating and expansion needs．The two foundational criteria of SGR performance measures are
Useful Life Benchmark（ULB）and Condition．
（яว）әрои әэиешлонәд шәłsイs
System Performance mode（DR）
System Performance mode（MB）
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Maintenance Resources Number of Vehicles out of service for 30 or more days by mode（CB） Maintenance Resources Number of Vehicles out of service for 30 or more days by mode（DR）
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MARTY Asset Useful Life Benchmarks
Table 1．4
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The physical condition of an asset is rated as an SGR performance measure because it is a direct reflection
of its ability to perform its intended function. As part of the TAM Plan SGR Standards, the County requires
each vehicular asset and facility meeting FTA TAM Plan criteria to have a physical condition assessment
conducted on an annual basis, where applicable. The condition assessments use a rating scale to rate the
current physical appearance, maintenance requirements, safety, and accessibility of an asset, "as it
currently sits". See Section 3 for more on condition assessments.


MARTY TAM Asset Inventory Summary：FY2023，Authority owned with direct Capital
Responsibility
Rolling Stock，Equipment，and Facilities（Table 2．1）
as contractor owned and operated are also included in the TAM Plan asset inventory，are comprised of：
OITOJIYOd AYOLNヨANI IヨSSV：Z NOILכヨS

> SGR Status
 Purchase Source (Dealer/Vendor)
Grant Source Used to Purchase Purchase Status (New/Used) Seating/Standing/Wheelchair Purchase Cost
Purchase Date Reported Condition Assessment Rehab Year
License Plate $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Manufacturer } & \text { Anticipated Replacement or } \\ \text { Rehab Year } & \text { Year Built/In Service Date/Ag }\end{array}$ VIN Number Useful Life Benchmark (UBL) Mileage Expected Useful Miles $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Vehicle Type } & \text { Last Maintenance Performed } \\ \text { Vehicle Title Ownership } & \text { Expected Useful Life }\end{array}$ Asset Description Classification External Vehicle Asset Tag \#
are maintained for each rolling stock asset (public transit vehicle): public transportation, and includes vehicles used for support services. The following required data fields Rolling stock is either a MARTY-owned or a contractor owned, and operated vehicle used in the provision of
primarily used for Driver exchanges．One Chevy Equinox is used for road Supervising．One pick－up truck is
used for maintenance－related road calls． MARTY operates 5 non－revenue service vehicles in its daily operations（Table 2．3）．Three Chevy Cruzes are Equipment：Non－Revenue Service Vehicles MARTY does not utilize or operate any third－party non－revenue service vehicle equipment assets． includes non－revenue service vehicles that are primarily used to support maintenance and repair work for a
public transportation system，supervisory work，or for the delivery of materials，equipment，or tools． value，and any County－owned equipment with a cost of $\$ 50,000$ or less in acquisition value．Equipment Equipment evaluated per FTA requirements in the TAM Plan，is all non－revenue vehicles regardless of

Equipment：

วつ08วW 08LZ9
$\qquad$
 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Asset Category } & \text { Asset Class } & \text { Asset Name } \\ \text { RevenueVehicles CU－Cutaway } & 23^{\prime} \text { Bus（7）}\end{array}$

Paratransit $\qquad$ RevenueVehicles BU－Bus

RU RevenueVehicles BU－Bus RevenueVehicles | RevenueVehicles | $B U-$ Bus |
| :--- | :--- |
| RevenueVehicles | $B U-$ Bus | RevenueVehicles BU－Bus

 RevenueVehicles BU－Bus RevenueVehicles BU－Bus RevenueVehicles BU－Bus RevenueVehicles BU－Bus $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Asset Category } & \text { Asset Class } \\ \text { RevenueVehicles } & \text { BU－Bus }\end{array}$
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$$
\text { Grant Source Used to Purchase } \quad \text { Grant Number }
$$

$\qquad$ Fuel Type Purchase Source（Dealer／Vendor） （pas＠／mən）snłets əseyound д！ечગәәчМ／ви！риетS／8u！̣еәऽ Purchase Date
 License Plate Manufacturer
Rehab Year VIN Number Mileage Vehicle Title Ownership Vehicle Type Asset Description External Vehicle

The following required data fields are maintained for each non－revenue service vehicle equipment asset Disposition Date，Cost \＆Buyer Current Status of Vehicle
Storage Location Length of Vehicle Book Value Vehicle Features
Capacity Gross Vehicle Weight SGR Status Year Built／In Service Date／Age Useful Life Benchmark（UBL） Expected Useful Miles Expected Useful Life Last Maintenance Performed Classification

Asset Tag \＃
MARTY Facility TAM Plan
Table 2.4
Asset
Category Asset Class
Facilities Maintenance
Lot Size
SGR Status
 Grant Source Used
Vendor/Builder Replacement Year
Grant Source Used Rehabilitation Year Last Maintenance
Book Value Reported Condition
Last Maintenance Age/Year Built
Reported Condition Status Asset Type External ID
Classification Asset Tag \# Physical Location/Address Asset Ownership
Asset Description/Name
facility asset:
vehicles as well as other support functions. The following required data fields are maintained for each MARTY currently utilizes 1, third-party leased facility for exclusive use for maintenance of the MARTY
5 of which are used for its paratransit service.
assigned an asset condition rating. Currently the County owns 28 vehicles, has a true lease for 23 vehicles County owned, and $3^{\text {rd }}$ party owned rolling stock assets (regardless of direct capital responsibility) are rolling stock asset. However, for the purposes of NTD reporting (Inventory \& Condition Submittal), all asset is owned by a $3^{\text {rd }}$ party, and/or where the County does not have a direct capital responsibility for the not conducted in the TAM Plan for rolling stock assets for which the County does not own, the rolling stock assets for which County owns and has a direct capital responsibility. The condition assessments ranking is
The TAM Plan Rolling Stock condition assessment consists of assigning a condition rating to all rolling stock

## Rolling Stock

or higher are in SGR. All completed asset inspection forms are documented. rating scale is based on numbers 1 to 5, with (5) being new and (1) being poor. Assets with a rating of 2.5 the visual and/or physical condition(s) presented by each individual asset throughout its life cycle. The condition rating assessment scale (Table 3.1). This rating scale assigns a numerical value or rank based on MARTY will assess the condition of its assets on an annual basis by utilizing both a visual and physical
equipment that is either a non-revenue service vehicle or a non-vehicle equipment asset with an
acquisition value of $\$ 50,000$ or more (individual line item or group). Furthermore, the equipment condition
assessment contains only assets for which the County owns and has a direct capital responsibility.
A condition assessment ranking is not conducted in the TAM Plan for equipment assets which the County
does not own, is owned by a 3rd party, the equipment has an acquisition cost below $\$ 50,000$ (individual line
item or group), or where the County does not have direct capital responsibility.
However, for the purposes of NTD reporting (Inventory \& Condition Submittal), all County owned
equipment (with direct capital responsibility) that is a non-revenue service vehicle are reported (Table 3.3).
Currently, the County does not own any non-revenue service vehicles or non-vehicle equipment assets with
an acquisition cost at or above $\$ 50,000$.


MARTY Vehicle Condition Rating Report FY23

 (Table 3.4). Only County owned facility assets with a direct capital responsibility are assigned a facility

 responsibility for the facility. condition assessment ranking is not conducted in the TAM Plan for facility assets for which MARTY does not
own the asset, the facility asset is owned by a $3^{\text {rd }}$ party, and/or where MARTY does not have direct capital The TAM Plan Facilities condition assessment consists of assigning a physical condition rating, based on the
FTA TERM Scale, to all facility assets for which MARTY owns and has a direct capital responsibility. A

| ON | 8 | 00'999'tz \$ | 92It9 | I |  |  | 7uәud!nb3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ON | 8 | $00^{\circ} 650$ 'tz \$ | 9とtt9 | โ | әр!чə^ Кұәјеऽ |  | 7uəud!!nb |
| ON | 8 | O0'ZLL'SI \$ | 826T9 | I | әр!чул кıәృеS | ә!!qouołn४ әЈ!мəऽ/ənuәләу u0N | 7uaud!nb] |
| ON | 8 | 00'986'92 \$ | TLE09 | I | әग!чə^ КıәјеS |  | 7uaud!nb3 |
| ON | 8 | 00'986'9L \$ | 0<809 | I | әр!чə^ ィıәృеS |  | 7uəud! ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 870 150 Cd | $87 ก$ |  | 12qunn Ieluas/al | tunos | amen tass | SSED PISSY |  <br> zZSSH |

MARTY Equipment Condition Report FY23
departments utilizes the following management practices, policies and technology throughout the lifecycle
of an asset.
Decision Support Tools:
The following analytical process is in place to support investment decision-making, including project
selection and prioritization (Table 4.1). Written policy manuals, bus replacement spreadsheets, and
electronic software IPS are utilized for asset lifecycle management, and investment planning.
An explanation of the decision tools can be found in (Table 4.2). Sections $4 \& 5$ of this document are interrelated and detail the process and tools used to manage the
lifecycle planning of capital public transit assets. MARTY staff within the planning and operations

SECTION 4: DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS \& MANAGEMENT APPROACH
 -(sұuәшәม!!nbaд $\forall$ Өฤ/sұиәр!



Management Approach to Asset Management:
 and non-capital surface transportation projects. The Metropolitan Planning Organization Improvement Program is a list
of upcoming transportation projects covering a period of at least four
years. The TIP is developed by MARTY's MPO. The TIP includes capital
projects needed in order to maintain SGR of an asset The Capital plan lists projects in rank of order on the priority list of -8u!дodəд ןenuue OIN pue

 requirements for the following: Asset Inventory portfolio, Asset contains information related to data collection and reporting transit system in a State of Good Repair (SGR). The TAM Plan also the optimal prioritization of funding in order to keep the agencies used in the provision of providing public transportation to help guide that uses the condition of assets (facility, rolling stock and equipment)
 procudures, and asset disposal procedures. contract/bidding requirements and regulations, asset purchasing
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improvement activities are assessed based on the asset's lifestyle. As applicable, describe any planned changes or MARTY Asset Management Approch: Acquisition and Renewal Strategy
Table 4.3

- TAM Plan - Risk Management Strategy (Mitigation) TAM Plan - Replacement Strategy (Disposal) TAM Plan - Overhaul Strategy (Rebuild)
TAM Plan - Maintenance Strategy (Operate/Maintain/Monitor)
TAM Plan - Acquisition \& Renewal Strategy (Design/Procurement)
The asset lifecycle stages consist of the following strategies: operation, maintained, and ultimately disposed of. The analysis is a snapshot of each asset's current status MARTY uses to maintain the SGR. This analysis follows the asset from the time it is purchased, placed in
Performing an analysis of the asset life cycle at the individual level is just one management approach
and procedures to mitigate risk are included in the documents presented in (Table 4.3 to 4.7). preventative projects with better return on investment higher in the investment prioritization risk. Policies MARTY's risk management philosophy is the proactive approach of identifying future projects and ranking

| jenuuv | uo！pordsu｜ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nןenuuv <br> 人וчzuow <br> 人ıчғuow／人！！ea |  | suolitets <br>  ‘әл！ұеגұร！u！uр $\forall$ | se！！！！！Pey |
|  |  |  | quamd！̣by |
|  |  |  | yoots su！！｜loy |
|  |  | sng－ng | yวots 8u！｜｜0y |
| Kıuənbad」 |  |  |  วueuəłu！ew <br> t＇t ə ગq®」 əss甘 Aıy甘W |


| MARTY Asset Management Approach: Overhaul Strategy Table 4.5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overhaul Strategy: Determine how and when assets get overhauled or replaced. Describe what activities take place during an overhaul. As applicable, describe any planned changes or improvements to these processes. |  |  |
| Asset Category | Asset Class | Acquisition and Renewal Strategy |
| Rolling Stock | BUS - Bus | It is MARTY's policy to repair damaged or nonfunctioning assets and componennts on an "as needed" basis. MARTY does not overhaul or rehabilitate its assets. Assets are replaced once |
|  | CU - Paratransit Cutaway |  |
| Rolling Stock | Van VN-Van |  |
| Equipment - Non revenue vehicles |  | the following conditions are met: (1) the asset's ULB has been met, (2) the asset is considered a total loss by covering insurance, (3) Complete |
|  | SUP - Support Vehicles |  |
| Facilities | Administration, Maintence, Transit | mechanical failure that is not cost effective to repair. |
|  | Stations, Fuel Stations |  |


| -Кцәdoıd әчъ $\ddagger 0$ d!чsıəuмо <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  <br>  'uo!̣eds!u!upy |
| :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  'pəddeıวs ло Кן <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  | sng-sng $\quad$ Yoots su!\||\%y |
|  | Sseןj fass Mosiote fess |
| -səssəวoud ə <br> Kue әq! <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |
| квәzents jes |  <br>  |


|  <br>  | 'spaezey <br> pue sıәıses!p әреш-иеш 10 ןедпъеи of әnp (s)łəsse јо ssoן ग!ч |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | *uo!?dnıs!p u!eyo Kıddns speed |
|  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  <br>  |  |
| к8әцедя ио!ұея! | Ys! ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  <br>  |
|  | L't ə əqе」 <br>  |

MARTY's list of prioritized investments can be found on (Table 4.1). ranked projects and programs at the asset class level that identify assets from the asset inventory.


The ranking of investment prioritization programs and projects will be expressed as: High Priority, Medium
 consideration its estimation of funding levels from all sources that it reasonably expects will be available in facilities. Furthermore, when developing an investment prioritization list, MARTY shall take into requirements (49 CFR Part 37) concerning maintenance of accessible features and alteration of transit throughout the TAM Plan. Priority consideration will be given to local projects and programs that: (1) both
improve SGR and correct an identified unacceptable safety risk; and (2) take into consideration ADA MARTY has direct capital responsibility. The ranking criteria of projects and programs shall be consistent MARTY will rank selected projects and programs to improve or manage the SGR of capital assets for which years.
projects and programs based on implementation priority over the TAM Plan horizon period of four (4) replacement. The investment prioritization list is a list containing the work plan(s) and schedule(s) of the
proposed projects and programs that MARTY estimates would achieve its SGR goals, and a ranking of investment decisions to improve SGR of our capital assets and define when an asset needs overhaul or
replacement. The investment prioritization list is a list containing the work plan(s) and schedule(s) of the implementation priority. The investment prioritization analysis aids MARTY in making more informed investments are needed and how to maintain SGR. These SGR projects will be ranked in order of
MARTY shall perform an investment prioritization analysis on a semi-annual basis to determine what capital

The Accountable Executive is required to approve each annual performance target submission to FTA/NTD. 'siseq ןenuue-!



 County Commissioners meeting of FY23. TAM Plan updates and adjusted targets shall be targets shall be established on or by no later than the date of the last Martin County Board of targets for the next fiscal year for each asset class included in this TAM Plan. These performance Within three months before the effective date of October 1, 2023, MARTY shall set performance -
 development of MARTY's SGR performance targets (Table 5.1) The FTA has enlisted the use of the following asset performance measure criteria for use in the 2. Does not pose a known and/or unacceptable safety risk (Condition) Can perform its designed function. when the asset can operate at a full level of performance. This means the asset: Repair (SGR) is a threshold that identifies desired performance condition. Specifically, an asset is in an SGR requirement for MARTY to set annual SGR performance targets. As introduced in Section 1, a State of Good This section lists the process, data sources, and methodology used in the development of the FTA

Plan data shall serve as a "baseline" measure for asset performance management. As more data is
incorporated in to MARTY's capital and budget planning, and reporting processes. Beginning in FY23, TAM
The TAM Plan is a "living document" that shall be reviewed on a semi-annual basis, updated, and
SECTION 8: UPDATES \& CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

$\frac{5}{\infty}$
?
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Prior Year Cost:
600,000
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:

2,200,000

## 4132542 SR-9/I-95 FROM CR-708/BRIDGE ROAD TO HIGH MEADOW AVE SIS



Prior Year Cost:
550,000
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost: $\quad 2,150,000$


| Prior Year Cost: | $5,092,284$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $5,472,284$ |



Prior Year Cost:
550,000
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:

2,750,000

## 4278035

## MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM

Non-SIS



| Prior Year Cost: | $1,642,647$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $3,351,701$ |

4383452


Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 4,206,102

## SR-5/US-1 @ J OAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 @ OCEAN BLVD Non-SIS

Project Description: 2023 MPO PRIORITY \#11 REPLACE THE SIGNAL MAST ARMS AND PROVIDE BACK PLATES WITH VIDEO DETECTION SYSTEM AT SR-5/US-1 AND SW JOAN JEFFERSON, \& SR-5/US-1 AND SW OCEAN BLVD INTERSECTIONS. PROVIDE QUEUE DETECTION CAMERA FOR EB TRAFFIC ALONG SW JOAN JEFFERSON WAY. R/W NEEDED. MPO AGREES TO GREEN MAST ARMS.

| From: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary |  | TRAFFIC SIGNALS |  | To: | SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 @ OCEAN BLVD |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Length: | . 113 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source |  |  | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| PE | DIH | 27,398 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,398 |
| ROW | DDR | 0 | 1,045,391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,045,391 |
| ROW | DIH | 0 | 54,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54,000 |
| RRU | DDR | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 |
| CST | SA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425,000 | 0 | 425,000 |
| CST | SM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538,823 | 0 | 538,823 |
| CST | SU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,008,222 | 0 | 1,008,222 |
| CST | CARB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600,000 | 0 | 600,000 |
| CST | DIH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74,218 | 0 | 74,218 |
| CST | DDR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430,050 | 0 | 430,050 |
| Total |  | 27,398 | 1,099,391 | 3,000 | 3,076,313 | 0 | 4,206,102 |

4393285 MARTIN COUNTY FY 2024/2025-2025/2026 UPWP Non-SIS


Project Description: FHWA PLANNING (PL) FUNDS
Work Summary: TRANSPORTATION From: PLANNING

To: N/A
Lead Agency: Martin MPO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| PhaseFund <br> Source | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6 / 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7 / 2 8}$ | 2028/29 | Total |  |
| PLN | PL | 567,164 | 571,463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 3 8 , 6 2 7}$ |
| Total |  | 567,164 | 571,463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 3 8 , 6 2 7}$ |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,138,627

## 4393286 MARTIN COUNTY FY 2026/2027-2027/2028 UPWP Non-SIS



Project Description: FHWA PLANNING (PL) FUNDS

| Work Summary: | TRANSPORTATION <br> PLANNING | From: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | To: |


| Lead Agency: |  | Martin MPO |  |  |  | 2028/29 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 |  | Total |
| PLN | PL | 0 | 0 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 0 | 1,142,926 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 571,463 | 571,463 | 0 | 1,142,926 |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,142,926
4393287 MARTIN COUNTY UPWP FY 2028/2029-2029/2030 Non-SIS


## Project Description:

| Work Summary: | TRANSPORTATION <br> PLANNING | From: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | To: |


| Lead Agency: | Martin MPO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Fund <br> Source | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6 / 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7 / 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8 / 2 9}$ | Total |
| Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PLN | PL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571,463 | $\mathbf{5 7 1 , 4 6 3}$ |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{5 7 1 , 4 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 1 , 4 6 3}$ |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 571,463

## 4416991 <br> CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM I-95 TO CR-714/MARTIN HWY <br> Non-SIS



| Prior Year Cost: | $2,250,886$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $4,946,929$ |

4417001 COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO SR-5/US-1 Non-SIS

|  | Project Description: 2023 MPO PRIORITY \#1 WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES NO R/W NEEDED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Work Summary |  | PD\&E/EMO STUDY |  | From: | SR-76/KANNER HWY |  |  |
|  |  |  | To: | SR-5/US-1 |  |  |
|  |  | d Agency: |  |  | FDOT |  | Length: | 3.23 |  |  |
|  | Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
|  | PE | ACCM | 1,035,129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,035,129 |
|  | PE | SU | 498,193 | 1,465,991 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,964,184 |
|  | PE (3NA) | TRIP | 1,811,977 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,811,977 |
|  | PE | ACPR | 0 | 125,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125,760 |
|  | Total |  | 3,345,299 | 1,591,751 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,937,050 |


| Prior Year Cost: | $3,074,696$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $8,011,746$ |

## 4419951 MARTIN MAINLINE WEIGH IN MOTION (WIM) SCREENING SIS



| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | MCCO WEIGH STATION STATIC/WIM |  | From: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: | (EAST SIDE | I-95) |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | Length: | 1.702 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | DWS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,585,948 | 0 | 4,585,948 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,585,948 | 0 | 4,585,948 |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 4,585,948

## 4435001 <br> SE GOMEZ AVENUE FROM SE OSPREY STREET TO SE BRIDGE ROAD <br> Non-SIS



Project Description: SUNTRAIL: MARTIN COUNTY SE GOMEZ AVENUE FEASIBILITY STUDY, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION PHASES UNDER A JPA WITH MARTIN COUNTY
Work Summary: BIKE PATH/TRAIL From: SE OSPREY STREET
To: SE BRIDGE ROAD
Lead Agency: FDOT Length: 2.647

|  | Fund <br> Source | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6 / 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7 / 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8 / 2 9}$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{4 8 6 , 8 9 2}$ |  |
| ENV | TLWR | 486,892 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $7,749,953$ | $\mathbf{7 , 7 4 9 , 9 5 3}$ |
| CST | TLWR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{7 , 7 4 9 , 9 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 2 3 6 , 8 4 5}$ |

Prior Year Cost:
100,000
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
8,336,845

## 4435051 SR-5/US-1 FROM SE BRIDGE ROAD TO HOBE SOUND WILDLIFE REFUGE Non-SIS



| Prior Year Cost: | 200,324 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $5,213,362$ |

## SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal Pathway

Non-SIS


Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,136,997


## Prior Year Cost: <br> 595,775

Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost: $2,427,984$


| Prior Year Cost: | 325,131 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $1,498,083$ |



Prior Year Cost: 864,775
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:

2,663,052

4459531 FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD. TO SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY. Non-SIS


Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,184,025

## 4462561

## SR-76/KANNER HWY @ SW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE

Non-SIS


Project Description: 2024 MPO PRIORITY \#6 SB RIGHT TURN LANE R/W NEEDED - TO BE DONATED BY HOA

| Work Summary: |  | ADD RIGHT TURN LANE(S) |  | From: | SR-76/KANNER HWY |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | To: | AT SW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | Length: | . 101 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | DIH | 0 | 34,369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34,369 |
| CST | DDR | 0 | 780,074 | 29,053 | 0 | 0 | 809,127 |
| Total |  | 0 | 814,443 | 29,053 | 0 | 0 | 843,496 |

Prior Year Cost: 214,113
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
1,057,609

## SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY


4470021 INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT Non-SIS


| Prior Year Cost: | 205,726 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | 216,016 |

4473981 SAILFISH CAPITAL TRAIL/MARTIN TRAIL (SEGMENT OF THE EST COAST GREENWAY) Non-SIS


## Prior Year Cost: <br> 645,000

Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:

2,245,000

## 4475551 <br> SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD AT CR-714/SW MARTIN HWY <br> SIS



Project Description: 2024 MPO PRIORITY \#3 G/W 447555.2; INCLUDES RELOCATION OF CR-714 TO SE 126 BLVD B/C RATIO $=4.3$ 1) FLATTEN THE HORIZONTAL CURVE ON CR-714 2) CONVERT THE EXISTING STOP CONTROLLED INTERSECTION SR 710

| Work Summary: | ROAD <br> RECONSTRUCTION - <br> 2 LANES | From: | SR-710 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | To: | at CR-714 |
| Lead Agency: | FDOT | Length: | 0.485 |


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROW | ACSS | 113,859 | 176,187 | 150,330 | 0 | 0 | 440,376 |
| Total |  | 113,859 | 176,187 | 150,330 | 0 | 0 | 440,376 |


| Prior Year Cost: | 574,929 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $1,015,305$ |

## 4476491 <br> SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO NORTH OF SE DECKER AVE <br> Non-SIS



Prior Year Cost:
865,657
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
9,368,213

## 4476501 <br> SR-A1A FROM NE SHORE VILLAGE TER TO SR-732/JENSEN BEACH CAUSEWAY <br> Non-SIS



| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | RESURFACING |  | From: | NE SHORE VILLAGE TER |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | To: | SR-732/JEN CAUSEWAY | $\mathrm{BEACH}$ |  |
|  |  | Length: | 2.372 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source |  |  | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | DIH | 0 | 95,795 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95,795 |
| CST | ACPR | 0 | 930,001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 930,001 |
| CST | DS | 0 | 4,933,602 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,933,602 |
| Total |  | 0 | 5,959,398 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,959,398 |

Prior Year Cost: 850,934
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
6,810,332

## 4478681 I-95 MARTIN WEIGH STATION - INSPECTION BARN UPGRADES SIS



| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | MCCO WEIGH STATION STATIC/WIM |  | From: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: |  |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | Length: | 20.608 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | DWS | 0 | 0 | 549,613 | 0 | 0 | 549,613 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 549,613 | 0 | 0 | 549,613 |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 549,613

## CR-708/SE BRIDGE ROAD BASCULE BRIDGE REHABILITATION

Non-SIS


Project Description: SMALL COUNTY OUTREACH PROGRAM (SCOP) SCOUR PROTECTION

Work Summary:
Phas

CST
CS
CS

Tot

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 1,005,642

| 4484461 | SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY FROM E OF SW STUART W BLVD TO W OF CITRUS BLVD |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-SIS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Work Summary: |  | RESURFACING |  | From: | E OF SW STUART W BLVD |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | To: | W OF CITRUS BLVD |  |  |
|  |  | Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | Length: | 3.623 |  | Total |
|  |  | Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 |  |
|  |  | CST | DIH | 0 | 84,507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84,507 |
|  |  | CST | DDR | 0 | 726,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 726,759 |
|  |  | CST | DS | 0 | 6,421,922 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,421,922 |
|  |  | Total |  | 0 | 7,233,188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,233,188 |

Prior Year Cost:
701,696
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost: $\quad 7,934,884$

| 4484471 | SR-5/US-1 FR . 5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY TO OSPREY ST |  |  |  |  |  | Non-SIS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Work Summary: | RESURFACING |  | From: | . 5 MILE S OF SE DIXIE HWY |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To: | OSPREY STREET |  |  |
|  |  | d Agency: | FDOT |  | Length: | 5.105 |  |  |
| ( | Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
|  | CST | SA | 0 | 163,361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163,361 |
|  | CST | DIH | 0 | 50,490 | 52,062 | 0 | 0 | 102,552 |
|  | CST | DDR | 0 | 2,087,166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,087,166 |
|  | CST | ACNR | 0 | 14,234,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,234,584 |
|  | Total |  | 0 | 16,535,601 | 52,062 | 0 | 0 | 16,587,663 |


| Prior Year Cost: | $1,605,124$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $18,192,787$ |

## 4489971 <br> SE AVALON DRIVE FROM SE COVE ROAD TO SE SALERNO ROAD Non-SIS



| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | SIDEWALK |  | From: | SE COVE ROAD |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: | SE SALERN | OAD |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | Martin County |  | Length: | 0.501 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | TALT | 214,397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214,397 |
| CST | TALU | 183,831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183,831 |
| CST | LF | 91,880 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91,880 |
| Total |  | 490,108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 490,108 |

## Prior Year Cost: <br> 5,000

Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
495,108
4491591 SR-9/ I-95 N OF BRIDGE RD TO S OF KANNER HWY SIS



Prior Year Cost:
865,089
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:

11,908,787

## 4491601 <br> SR-9/ I-95 FROM S OF KANNER HWY TO MARTIN/ ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE <br> SIS



| Project Description: G/W 449159-1 32-02: VE WORKSHOP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | RESURFACING |  | From: | S OF KANNER HWY |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: | MARTIN/ ST | CIE COUN | TY LINE |
| Lead Agency: |  | FDOT |  | Length: | 13.327 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | ACNP | 43,044,863 | 65,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43,109,863 |
| Total |  | 43,044,863 | 65,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43,109,863 |

Prior Year Cost:
Future Year Cost:
3,099,913

Total Project Cost:

0
46,209,776

## 4495071 <br> CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE REHABILITATION <br> Non-SIS



Prior Year Cost:
0
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
1,482,591

## SW CITRUS BLVD FROM CR 714/MARTIN HWY TO ST. LUCIE LINE

Non-SIS


| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | RESURFACING |  | From: | CR 714/MARTIN HWY |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: | ST. LUCIE | NTY LINE |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | Martin County |  | Length: | 5.469 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | SCOP | 0 | 0 | 423,971 | 0 | 0 | 423,971 |
| CST | GRSC | 0 | 0 | 1,733,659 | 0 | 0 | 1,733,659 |
| CST | LF | 0 | 0 | 736,076 | 0 | 0 | 736,076 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 2,893,706 | 0 | 0 | 2,893,706 |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 2,893,706


| Prior Year Cost: | 597,338 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $11,510,807$ |


Project Description: MOVABLE BRIDGE REHABILITATION (ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL AND
Project Description: STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS) OVER ST. LUCIE RIVER BRIDGE \# 890003 IS OWNED AND MAINTAINED BY FDOT
Work Summary:
BRIDGE
REHABILITATION
From:
To:
Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT Length: 0.235

| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PE | BRRP | 789,915 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 789,915 |
| CST | BRRP | 0 | 0 | 9,395,125 | 0 | 0 | 9,395,125 |
| CST | DIH | 0 | 0 | 106,879 | 0 | 0 | 106,879 |
| Total |  | 789,915 | 0 | 9,502,004 | 0 | 0 | 10,291,919 |

Prior Year Cost: 541,072
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
10,832,991

4507921 CR-609/ALLAPATAH RD FR SR-710 TO 2,800 FEET NORTH OF MINUTE MAID RD Non-SIS


| Prior Year Cost: | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | 5,000 |

## 4508231 <br> SE WASHINGTON STREET FR US-1/SE FEDERAL HWY TO SE EDISON AVENUE <br> Non-SIS



| Project Description: 2023 TA PRIORITY \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | SIDEWALK |  | From: | US-1 |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | Managed by FDOT |  | To: | SE Edison |  |  |
|  |  | Length: | 0.671 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source |  |  | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | TALT | 0 | 214,508 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214,508 |
| CST | TALU | 0 | 365,711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365,711 |
| CST | LF | 0 | 150,805 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150,805 |
| Total |  | 0 | 731,024 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 731,024 |

## Prior Year Cost: <br> 5,000

Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost: 736,024


| Prior Year Cost: | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | $2,826,252$ |

## 4529221 US-1/SR-5 ROOSEVELT BRIDGE OVER ST LUCIE RIVER BRIDGES 890151 \& 890152 Non-SIS



Prior Year Cost:
0
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
4,895,544


| Prior Year Cost: | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Future Year Cost: | 0 |
| Total Project Cost: | 775,407 |

4533211


## SR-A1A/NE OCEAN BLVD. "ERNEST F. LYONS" BRIDGE OVER ICWW Non-SIS

Project Description: REHABILITATION PROJECT FOR EPOXY OVERLAY ENTIRE BRIDGE CONCRETE DECK, FENDER SYSTEM REHABILITATION,

## Work Summary:

From:

To:

Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phase | Fund <br> Source | $\mathbf{2 0 2 4 / 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5 / 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6 / 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 7 / 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8 / 2 9}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE | BRRP | 0 | 50,000 | 609,073 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{6 5 9 , 0 7 3}$ |
| PE | DIH | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{5 , 0 0 0}$ |
| CST | BRRP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $4,521,166$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 2 1 , 1 6 6}$ |
| CST | DIH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,825 | $\mathbf{5 , 8 2 5}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 9 , 0 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 2 6 , 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 9 1 , 0 6 4}$ |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: 5,191,064


## 4533331 SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD FR FPL ACCESS RD TO CR-609/ALLAPATAH ROAD SIS



Prior Year Cost: 435,000
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: $\quad 15,478,305$

## 4533332 SR-710 FROM MARTIN/OKEECHOBEE CO LINE TO FPL POWER PLANT ACCESS ROAD SIS




Prior Year Cost: 580,000
Future Year Cost:
0
Total Project Cost:
35,885,784

## 4539191 SW KANSAS AVENUE FROM 100 FT S OF CAMP VALOR TO SW KANNER HIGHWAY Non-SIS



| Project Description: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Summary: |  | RESURFACING |  | From: | 100 FT S of Camp Valor |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | To: | SW Kanner |  |  |
| Lead Agency: |  | Martin County |  | Length: | 1.287 |  |  |
| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| CST | SCWR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442,806 | 442,806 |
| CST | SCOP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442,805 | 442,805 |
| CST | LF | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295,204 | 295,204 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,180,815 | 1,180,815 |

Prior Year Cost: 0
Future Year Cost: 0
Total Project Cost: $\quad 1,180,815$
-Section B - Transit

| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 4071894 (TIP\# ) MARTIN COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING ASSISTANCE |  |  |  |  | Length: . 000 *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPS | DPTO | 78,789 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78,789 |
| OPS | DDR | 313,604 | 404,165 | 417,575 | 430,102 | 430,102 | 1,995,548 |
| OPS | LF | 393,393 | 405,165 | 417,575 | 430,102 | 430,102 | 2,076,337 |
|  |  | 785,786 | 809,330 | 835,150 | 860,204 | 860,204 | 4,150,674 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 4,150,674 |
| FM\# 4134931 (TIP\# ) PSL UZA - MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5307 FORMULA FUNDS Type of Work: CAPITAL FOR FIXED ROUTE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County ${ }^{\text {*Non-SIS* }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit funding for fixed route |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPS | FTA | 510,000 | 510,000 | 510,000 | 510,000 | 510,000 | 2,550,000 |
| CAP | FTA | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 3,250,000 |
|  |  | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 1,160,000 | 5,800,000 |
|  | Prior Y ears | 12,783,824 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 18,583,824 |
| FM\# 4259774 (TIP\# ) MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5311, OPERATING RURAL FUNDS |  |  |  |  | Length: . 000 *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: OPERATING/ADMIN. ASSISTANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPS | DU | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |
| $\mathrm{OPS}_{\text {Total }}$ |  | 164,176 | 171,915 | 180,027 | 188,168 | 188,168 | 892,454 |
|  |  | 328,352 | 343,830 | 360,054 | 376,336 | 376,336 | 1,784,908 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 1,784,908 |


-Section C - Aviation


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 4496401 (TIP\# ) WITHAM FIELD REPLACE PAPIS ON 12-30 W/ LED UNITS (DESIGN \& CONSTRUCT) *Non-SIS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Work: AVIATION PRESERVATION PROJ ECT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAP | DPTO | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
| CAP | FAA | 0 | 180,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180,000 |
| CAP | LF | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
|  |  | 0 | 200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200,000 |
|  | Prior Y ear | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject C ost |  | 200,000 |
| FM\# 4533591 (TIP\# ) WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - HOLD BAY CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  | *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJ ECT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| CAP | DPTO | 42,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,500 |
| CAP | FAA | 765,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 765,000 |
| CAP | LF | 42,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,500 |
|  |  | 850,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 850,000 |
|  | Prior Year | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 850,000 |
| FM\# 4533601 (TIP\# ) WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIR FIE LD SIGNAGE REPLACEMENT (CONSTRUCT) Type of Work: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJ ECT |  |  |  |  | *Non-SIS* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| CAP | DPTO | 320,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320,000 |
| CAP | LF | 80,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 |
|  |  | 400,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400,000 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 400,000 |


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 4533611 (TIP\# ) WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - REHABILITATION OF TAXILANE B (CONSTRUCT) Type of Work: AVIATION CAPACITY PROJ ECT |  |  |  |  | *Non-SIS* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| CAP | DPTO | 75,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,000 |
| CAP | FAA | 75,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75,000 |
| CAP | LF | 1,350,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,350,000 |
|  |  | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500,000 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 1,500,000 |
| FM\# 4533841 (TIP\# ) WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT UPGRADE Type of Work: AVIATION SAFETY PROJ ECT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: ${ }_{\text {Responsible }}^{\text {*Non-SIS* }}$ Agency Not |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAP | DPTO | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 |
| CAP | LF | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 100,000 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 100,000 |


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 4461651 (TIP\# ) SR91 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS AT SR714 (MP 133.7-134.8) FROM SR91 Length: 0.285 *SIS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Type of Work: INTERCHANGE - ADD LANES Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE (PENA) | PKYI | 5,750,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,750,000 |
| ROW | PKYI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 10,590,000 |
|  |  | 5,750,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590,000 | 16,340,000 |
|  | Prior Yea | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 16,340,000 |
| FM\# 4462191 (TIP\# ) WIDEN TPK(SR91), PALM BEACH C/L TO I-95 CONNECTOR (MP117.7-125) (4T08) |  |  |  |  | Length: 7.147 *SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ADD LANES \& RECONSTRUCT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE (PENA) | PKYI | 14,551,766 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,551,766 |
| To |  | 14,551,766 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,551,766 |
|  | Prior Yea | 3,000 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 14,554,766 |
| FM\# 4463321 (TIP\# ) WIDEN TPK(SR91), I-95 CONNECTOR TO T.B.MANUEL BRIDGE (MP125-131)(4T08) |  |  |  |  | Length: 4.539 *SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ADD LANES \& RECONSTRUCT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE (PENA) | PKYI | 10,758,960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,758,960 |
| Total |  | 10,758,960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,758,960 |
|  | Prior Yea | 3,000 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 10,761,960 |


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 4463331 (TIP\# ) WIDEN TPK(SR91), SW MARTIN HWY TO ST.LUCIE C/L (MP134.8-138.08) (4T08) |  |  |  |  | Length: 3.622 *SIS* <br> Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT |  |  |
| Type of Work: ADD LANES \& RECONSTR UCT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE (PENA) | PKYI | 5,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,900,000 |
| To |  | 5,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,900,000 |
|  | Prior Y ears Cost | 10,704,865 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total Project Cost |  | 16,604,865 |
| FM\# 4466181 (TIP\# ) THOMAS B MANUEL BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (SB ONLY) (MP 131.2) |  |  |  |  | Length: 0.021 *SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Managed by FDOT |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PE (PENA) | PKYI | 3,407,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,407,505 |
| To |  | 3,407,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,407,505 |
|  | Prior Y ears Cost | 1,500 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 3,409,005 |
| FM\# 4485241 (TIP\# ) BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - 890083 (SR 91) (MP 138) MARTIN COUNTY AT MP 138 |  |  |  |  | Length: 0.543 *SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CST | PKYR | 55,569,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55,569,281 |
| To |  | 55,569,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55,569,281 |
|  | Prior Y ears Cost | 3,133,300 | Future Years Cost 0 |  | Total P roject Cost |  | 58,702,581 |

-Section E - Districtwide

| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 2337031 (TIP\#) MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS ROADWAY |  |  |  |  | Length: . 000 *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | LRTP | Goal 1.0, Page 7-4 |  |
| MNT | D | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,500,000 |
|  |  | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,500,000 |
|  | Prior Year | 14,703,183 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 16,203,183 |
| FM\# 2337032 (TIP\# ) MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS BRIDGES |  |  |  |  | Length: . 000 *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT <br> LRTP\#: Goal 1.0, Page 7-4 |  |  |
| MNT | D | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 0 | 140,000 |
|  |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 0 | 140,000 |
|  | Prior Year | 1,462,185 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total P roject Cost |  | 1,602,185 |
| FM\# 2342651 (TIP\#) MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-ROADWAY FROM INTERSTATE TO ROADWAY |  |  |  |  |  |  | *SIS* |
| Type of Work: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT LRTP\#: Goal 1.0, Page 7-4 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {M }}$ T | D | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 40,000 |
|  |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 40,000 |
|  | Prior Ye | 5,685,560 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 5,725,560 |


| Phase | Fund Source | 2024/25 | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM\# 2342652 (TIP\# ) MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-BRIDGES |  |  |  |  | Length: . 000 *SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | LRTP\#: Goal 1.0, Page 7-4 |  |  |
| MNT | D | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 60,000 |
|  |  | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 60,000 |
|  | Prior Years Cost | 508,035 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total P roject Cost | 568,035 |
| FM\# 4505591 (TIP\# ) MARTIN COUNTY ASSET MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  | *Non-SIS* |  |  |
| Type of Work: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: FDOT |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MNT | D | 2,092,790 | 3,092,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,667,905 | 13,039,065 |
|  |  | 2,092,790 | 3,092,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,592,790 | 2,667,905 | 13,039,065 |
|  | Prior Years Cost | 4,199,067 | Future Years Cost | 0 | Total Project Cost |  | 17,238,132 |
| FM\# 4515801 (TIP\# ) MARTIN COUNTY J PA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Non-SIS* |
| Type of Work: TRAFFIC SIGNALS |  |  |  |  | Lead Agency: Martin County |  |  |
| Project Type: Imported |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW MSCA TARGET STARTING IN FY28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MNT | D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 655,652 | 864,322 | 1,519,974 |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 655,652 | 864,322 | 1,519,974 |
|  | Prior Years Cost | 0 | Future Years Cost | 0 |  | Total Project Cost | 1,519,974 |

## Project Index (by Number)

FM \# ..... TIP \#
Project Name Page
2337031 MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS ROADWAY ..... E-2
2337032 MARTIN CO STATE HWY SYS BRIDGES ..... E-2
2342651 MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-ROADWAY ..... E-2
2342652 MARTIN COUNTY INTERSTATE-BRIDGES ..... E-3
4071894 MARTIN COUNTY BLOCK GRANT OPERATING ASSISTANCE ..... B-2
4132532 SR-9/I-95 FROM MARTIN/PALM BEACH COUNTY LINE TO CR-708/BRIDGE ROAD ..... A-2
4132542 SR-9/I-95 FROM CR-708/BRIDGE ROAD TO HIGH MEADOW AVE ..... A-3
4134931 PSL UZA - MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5307 FORMULA FUNDS ..... B-2
4196693 WILLOUGHBY BLVD FROM SR-714/MONTEREY RD TO SR-5/US-1/FEDERAL HWY ..... A-4
4226815 SR-9/I-95 FROM HIGH MEADOWS AVE TO MARTIN/ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE ..... A-5
4259774 MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5311, OPERATING RURAL FUNDS ..... B-2
4278035 MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM ..... A-6
4346611 PSL UZA - MARTIN COUNTY SECTION 5339 CAPITAL FOR BUS \& BUS FACILITIES ..... B-3
4383452 SR-5/US-1 @ JOAN JEFFERSON WAY \& SR-5/US-1 @ OCEAN BLVD ..... A-7
4393285 MARTIN COUNTY FY 2024/2025-2025/2026 UPWP ..... A-8
4393286 MARTIN COUNTY FY 2026/2027-2027/2028 UPWP ..... A-9
4393287 MARTIN COUNTY UPWP FY 2028/2029-2029/2030 ..... A-10
4416991 CR-713/HIGH MEADOW AVE FROM I-95 TO CR-714/MARTIN HWY ..... A-11
4417001 COVE ROAD FROM SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY TO SR-5/US-1 ..... A-12
4419951 MARTIN MAINLINE WEIGH IN MOTION (WIM) SCREENING ..... A-13
4435001 SE GOMEZ AVENUE FROM SE OSPREY STREET TO SE BRIDGE ROAD ..... A-14
4435051 SR-5/US-1 FROM SE BRIDGE ROAD TO HOBE SOUND WILDLIFE REFUGE ..... A-15
4444052 SR-714 SE Monterey Road and CR-A1A Multimodal Pathway ..... A-16
4444151 SR-5/US-1 AT BAKER RD ..... A-17
4444161 SR-5/US-1 AT NW NORTH RIVER SHORES BLVD ..... A-18
4444171 SR-5/US-1 AT NW SUNSET BLVD ..... A-19
4459531 FOX BROWN RD. FROM SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD. TO SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY ..... A-20

## Project Index (by Number)

FM \# ..... TIP \#
Project Name Page
4459781 WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT PDC AND MIRL REPLACEMENT 7-25 ..... C-2
4461651 SR91 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS AT SR714 (MP 133.7-134.8) ..... D-2
4462191 WIDEN TPK(SR91), PALM BEACH C/L TO I-95 CONNECTOR (MP117.7-125) (4TO8) ..... D-2
4462561 SR-76/KANNER HWY @ SW SOUTH RIVER DRIVE ..... A-21
4462571 SR-5/US-1 @ SR-76/KANNER HIGHWAY ..... A-22
4463321 WIDEN TPK(SR91), I-95 CONNECTOR TO T.B.MANUEL BRIDGE (MP125-131)(4TO8) ..... D-2
4463331 WIDEN TPK(SR91), SW MARTIN HWY TO ST.LUCIE C/L (MP134.8-138.08) (4TO8) ..... D-3
4466181 THOMAS B MANUEL BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (SB ONLY) (MP 131.2) ..... D-3
4470021 INTERSECTION LIGHTING RETROFIT IMPROVEMENT ..... A-23
4473981 SAILFISH CAPITAL TRAIL/MARTIN TRAIL ..... A-24
4475551 SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD AT CR-714/SW MARTIN HWY ..... A-25
4476491 SR-5/US-1 FROM NORTH OF SE FISCHER ST. TO NORTH OF SE DECKER AVE ..... A-26
4476501 A1A FROM NE SHORE VILLAGE TER TO SR-732/JENSEN BEACH CAUSEWAY ..... A-27
4478681 I-95 MARTIN WEIGH STATION - INSPECTION BARN UPGRADES ..... A-28
4480891 CR-708/SE BRIDGE ROAD BASCULE BRIDGE REHABILITATION ..... A-29
4481171 WITHAM FIELD MILL \& RESURFACE, MITL REPLACEMENT TAXIWAY C \& C1 ..... C-2
4484461 SR-714/SW MARTIN HWY FROM E OF SW STUART W BLVD TO W OF CITRUS BLVD ..... A-30
4484471 SR-5/US-1 FR . 5 MILE S OF SR-A1A/SE DIXIE HWY TO OSPREY STREET ..... A-31
4485241 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - 890083 (SR 91) (MP 138) MARTIN COUNTY ..... D-3
4489971 SE AVALON DRIVE FROM SE COVE ROAD TO SE SALERNO ROAD ..... A-32
4491591 SR-9/ I-95 N OF BRIDGE RD TO S OF KANNER HWY ..... A-33
4491601 SR-9/ I-95 FROM S OF KANNER HWY TO MARTIN/ ST. LUCIE COUNTY LINE ..... A-34
4495071 CR 76A/SW96TH STREET ARUNDEL BRIDGE REHABILITATION ..... A-35
4495081 SW CITRUS BLVD FROM CR 714/MARTIN HWY TO ST. LUCIE COUNTYLINE ..... A-36
4496091 WITHAM FIELD PUBLIC SAFETY AVIATION HANGAR 1 ..... C-2
4496401 WITHAM FIELD REPLACE PAPIS ON 12-30 W/ LED UNITS (DESIGN \& CONSTRUCT) ..... C-3
4498291 SR-714/SE MONTEREY ROAD FROM SW PALM CITY RD TO 400 FT S OF SR-5/US-1 ..... A-37

## Project Index (by Number)

FM \# TIP \# Project Name Page
4505591 MARTIN COUNTY ASSET MAINTENANCE ..... E-3
4505872 SR-707/DIXIE HWY. BRIDGE \# 890003 ..... A-38
4507921 CR-609/ALLAPATAH RD FR SR-710 TO 2,800 FEET NORTH OF MINUTE MAID RD ..... A39
4508231 SE WASHINGTON STREET FR US-1/SE FEDERAL HWY TO SE EDISON AVENUE ..... A-40
4515801 MARTIN COUNTY JPA SIGNAL MAINTENANCE \& OPS ON STATE HWY SYSTEM ..... E-3
4522571 SE COUNTY LINE ROAD SE WOODEN BRIDGE LANE TO US-1/SR5 ..... A-41
4529221 US-1/SR-5 ROOSEVELT BRIDGE OVER ST LUCIE RIVER BRIDGES 890151 \& 890152 ..... A-42
4529971 SOUTH DIXIE HIGHWAY FROM COLORADO AVENUE TO JOAN JEFFERSON WAY ..... A-43
4533211 SR-A1A/NE OCEAN BLVD. "ERNEST F. LYONS" BRIDGE OVER ICWW ..... A-44
4533331 SR-710/SW WARFIELD BLVD FR FPL ACCESS RD TO CR-609/ALLAPATAH ROAD ..... A-45
4533332 SR-710 FROM MARTIN/OKEECHOBEE CO LINE TO SW FP\&L ACCESS ROAD ..... A-46
4533591 WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - HOLD BAY CONSTRUCTION ..... C-3
4533601 WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIRFIELD SIGNAGE REPLACEMENT (CONSTRUCT) ..... C-3
4533611 WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - REHABILITATION OF TAXILANE B (CONSTRUCT) ..... C-4
4533841 WITHAM FIELD AIRPORT - AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT UPGRADE ..... C-4
4539191 SW KANSAS AVENUE FROM 100 FT S OF CAMP VALOR TO SW KANNER HIGHWAY ..... A-47

# FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY 

| MEETING DATE: June 7, 2024 | DUE DATE: <br> May 31, 2024 | UPWP\#: $5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WORDING: <br> FINAL DRAFT FY26 - FY30 LIST OF PROJECT PRIORITIES (LOPP) |  |  |
| REQUESTED BY: MPO | PREPARED BY: <br> Ricardo Vazquez / <br> Beth Beltran | DOCUMENT(S) REQUIRING ACTION: FY26 - FY30 LOPP |

## BACKGROUND

The MPO is required to submit its List of Project Priorities (LOPP) each year for consideration of funding for what will become the new fifth year of the Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) Work Program. Priority projects must be selected from the adopted Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Projects already in the Work Program remain on the list to guide in programming funds until the final phase is fully funded.

At the MPO Policy Board on February 26, 2024, the Board approved the Draft FY26 FY30 LOPP. Scoping Forms for the newly added SE Commerce Ave Improvement project (priority \#9) and US-1 at SW Palm City Road Intersection Improvement project (priority \#10) were submitted to FDOT. Also, the South River Condominium residents have decided not to dedicate the right-of-way necessary for constructing the southbound right turn lane on S Kanner Highway onto SW South River Drive, currently the \#5 ranked project on the LOPP. The final LOPP will be presented at the MPO Board meeting on June 17, 2024, for adoption.

## ISSUES

At the June 2024 Advisory Committee meetings, MPO staff will present the Lists of Roadway, Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program, and Public Transit Project Priorities for review and recommendation for MPO Board approval.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

a. Approve the Final Draft FY26-FY30 Lists of Project Priorities as presented.
b. Approve the Final Draft FY26-FY30 Lists of Project Priorities with comments.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The Lists of Project Priorities will guide FDOT with the application of transportation funds in next year's FY26 - FY30 Tentative Work Program.

## APPROVAL

MPO

## ATTACHMENTS

Final Draft FY26 - FY230 List of Project Priorities

MARTIN MPO FY26-FY30 Federal Attributable
FINAL DRAFT UNFUNDED List of Project Priorities

| FY26 <br> Rank | Facility | Segment Limits |  | Project Description | 2045 LRTP Page | Prev. <br> Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | From | To |  |  |  |
| 1 | SR-710 | SE of CR-609/ SW Allapattah Rd. | Martin/ <br> Okeechobee County Line | Widen from 2-lanes to 4-lanes | 76 | 1 |
| 2 | SE Cove Rd. | SR-76/ Kanner Hwy. | US-1 | Widen from 2-lanes to 4-lanes including bike lanes and shared use pathway | 69 | 2 |
| 3 | CR-714 | Realignment |  | Flatten curve of CR-714 before intersection at SR-710 | Appx. G, pg. 1 | 3 |
| 4 | Monterey Rd. | At FEC Railroad |  | Railroad/roadway grade separation | Appx. H, pg. 5 | 4 |
| 5 | SR-76/ <br> Kanner Hwy. | At SW South River Dr. |  | *New southbound right turn lane at South River Dr. \& traffic signal | 80 | 6 |
| 6 | NW Alice St. | FEC Crossing |  | Pedestrian facilities/realign roadway with NW Wright Blvd. | Appx. H, pg. 11 | 9 |
| 7 | CR-708/ <br> SE Bridge Rd. | Bascule Bridge |  | Bridge Replacement | 132 | 5 |
| 8 | SR-710 | At CR-609/SW Allapattah Rd. |  | Intersection improvements (Signal and Turn Lanes) | 128,132 | 13 |
| 9 | SE Commerce Ave. | SE Indian St. | SE Salerno Rd. | Roadway leveling, resurfacing, shoulder widening, drainage improvements, pedestrian crosswalks | 128, 132 |  |
| 10 | US-1 | At SW Palm City Rd. |  | Intersection reconstruction/Feasibility Study-Alternative 5 | 128, 132 |  |
| 11 | SW Palm City Rd. | Monterey Rd. | US-1 | Complete Streets improvements | 128, 132 |  |
| 12 | Monterey Rd. \& East Ocean Blvd. | Kingswood Ter. | St. Lucie Blvd. | Mid-block pedestrian crosswalks | Appx. H, pg. 11 | 8 |
| 13 | Willoughby Blvd. Extension | Monterey Rd. | US-1 | New 2-lane road with bike lanes and sidewalks/shared use pathways | 69 | 10 |
| 14 | CR-713/High Meadow Ave. | I-95 | CR-714/ Martin Hwy. | Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with shared-use pathway | 69 | 11 |
| 15 | Dixie Hwy. | Cove Rd. | Jefferson St. | Resurfacing/Complete Street improvements/CEI | 84 | 12 |
| 16 | SW Citrus Blvd. | SW Hemingway Ter. | SR-710 | Resurfacing/shoulder widening and bike lanes/safety improvements | 128, 132 | 15 |
| 17 | CR-609/ <br> SW Allapattah Rd. | SR-710 | 2,800 feet north of Minute Maid Rd. | Resurfacing/southbound left turn lane/shoulder widening/CEI | 128, 132 | 13 |
| 18 | CR-609/ <br> SW Allapattah Rd. | Approx. 3 miles North of Minute Maid Rd. | St. Lucie County Line | Resurfacing/shoulder widening/safety improvements | 128, 132 | 14 |
| 19 | N Sewall's Point Rd. | East Ocean Blvd. | NE Palmer St. | Mitigate for sea level rise impact | 87 | 16 |

*Design of right turn lane currently underway.

FINAL DRAFT FY26-FY30
Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Priorities

| Project Description | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SE Avalon Drive <br> Sidewalks | $\$ 398,228$ |  |  |  | Funded |
| SE Washington St. <br> Sidewalks <br> S Dixie Highway <br> Improvements <br> SW Bulldog Way <br> Sidewalks |  | $\$ 420,000$ |  |  |  |

FINAL DRAFT FY26-FY30
List of Public Transit Priorities

| Facility/ <br> Equipment | Project <br> Location/Description | Estimated <br> Amount | Funding <br> Source | 2045 LRTP or <br> TDP Page \# | Project Status/Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bus <br> Replacement <br> /Expansion | Rolling Stock | $\$ 146,920$ | $\S 5339$ | LRTP -pg. 64 |  |
| Operating | Operating <br> Assistance | $\$ 812,370$ | $\S 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 64 | Amount of funds <br> programmed is based on <br> anticipated procurements <br> and estimated costs and will <br> change year to year. |
| Security | $1 \%$ Security | $\$ 18,104$ | $\$ 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 64 |  |
| Safety | $.75 \%$ Safety | $\$ 13,578$ | $\$ 5307$ | LRTP -pg. 64 |  |

## FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC) MEETING AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

| MEETING DATE: June 7, 2024 | DUE DATE: <br> May 31, 2024 | UPWP\#: $5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WORDING: <br> FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FDOT) DISTRICT FOUR FREIGHT UPDATE |  |  |
| REQUESTED BY: <br> MPO | PREPARED BY: <br> Ricardo Vazquez / Beth Beltran | DOCUMENT(S) REQUIRING ACTION: N/A |

## BACKGROUND

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) continues to plan for an improved freight transportation system. A recently completed project is FDOT's Freight Activity Areas Identification and Freight Network Segments Analysis project. Justin Stroh, FDOT's District-Four Freight Coordinator, was the project manager for this planning effort.

## ISSUES

At the June 7, 2024, FTAC meeting, Justin Stroh will update committee members on FDOT's freight-related planning activities.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Provide comments

## ATTACHMENTS

PowerPoint presentation and agenda item backup to be sent next week before the meeting.


[^0]:    1 Federal Highway Administration Florida Division \& Federal Transit Administration Region 4. Certification Report: Port St. Lucie Transportation Management Area - St. Lucie Transportation Planning Organization \& Martin Metropolitan Planning Organization. March 2009.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ FDOT Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Guidance Document for Transit Agencies. Available at https://www.fdot.gov/transit/default.shtm

[^2]:    US-1/Federal Highway
    SW Murphy Road

    - SR 714
    - Dixie Highway
    - SW Ocean Boulevard

[^3]:    TYPE OF WORK:RESURFACING
    *NON-SIS*
    LANES EXIST/IMPROVED/ADDED: 3/ 3/ 0

[^4]:    TYPE OF WORK:BIKE LANE/SIDEWALK
    NON-SIS*
    $2 / 0$ IANES EXIST/TMPROVED/ADDED: 2/ $2 / 0$

[^5]:    Equipment: Means an article of nonexpendable, tangible property having a useful life of at least one year.

