

Indian River County MPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2035 Update

Financial Resources Analysis Summary Report

Indian River County
Metropolitan Planning Organization



Prepared by:

Stanley Consultants, Inc.
West Palm Beach, Florida



FINANCIAL RESOURCES

This technical memorandum presents the project cost estimates, revenue assumptions and projected revenues for the Indian River County (IRC) 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update.

DEVELOPMENT OF REVENUE PROJECTIONS

The Indian River County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is developing its Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the 2035 horizon year. The 2035 LRTP includes the MPO's plans for future capital investment in transportation infrastructure as well as ongoing operating and maintenance expenses. The Financial Resources section is a key component of the overall LRTP, as it provides an overview of the financial resources that are projected to be available to the Indian River County metropolitan area through 2035. The financial resources identified in this section will be used to prioritize future roadway and transit investments in a 'constrained' scenario which is limited to existing and reasonably likely funding sources. In addition, the review will discuss potential new funding sources which could be used to fund additional transportation investments.

The principal federal, state, and local funding programs which support transportation investment in Indian River County are reviewed and forecasted through 2035 in this section of the LRTP. This review includes information on the following subjects:

- Federal funding programs and revenue estimates for both highways and public transportation;
- State of Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) funding programs and revenue estimates; and
- Local option gas tax revenues, local option sales tax revenues, and transportation impact fee revenues.

Methodology and Changes for 2035 Revenue Forecasts

Federal planning regulations which were adopted in 2007 and corresponding MPO Advisory Council (MPOAC) guidelines now require that both cost and revenue forecasts be presented in year-of-expenditure (YOE) dollars, rather than in base year dollars as per the previous standard approach. FDOT revenue forecasts are now given in YOE dollars, and FDOT provides inflation forecasts which can be used to estimate YOE project costs.

FDOT's guidelines for estimating and presenting future revenues, as laid out in the *2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook* and subsequent supplements, revisions, and workshops, are followed in this review. The adopted Indian River County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the source for near-term revenue forecasts. Funding levels and sources for other periods covered in the LRTP are identified in the *Revenue Forecast Handbook*. In addition to the near-term revenue forecast, revenue estimates in the plan cover the 2016 to 2020, 2021 to 2025, 2026 to 2030, and 2031 to 2035 periods. Revenue growth rates for key local revenue sources, including gas taxes, the local option sales tax, and impact fees, were developed in consultation with MPO staff.



Limitations of the Analysis

This analysis describes only State FDOT revenues forecasted to flow to Indian River County for capital improvement purposes, identified in the *2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook* as Capacity Programs. The review does not include FDOT operating and maintenance funds (Non-Capacity Programs) that would be applied to facilities in Indian River County. FDOT implements the Non-Capacity Program throughout the state and does not provide district-level revenue estimates for the Non-Capacity Program. According to FDOT, the Department has projected sufficient revenues to meet the Non-Capacity safety, preservation, and support objectives in each metropolitan area in the state.

Federal Funding

This section describes the federal revenue sources (i.e., the Highway Trust Fund) and federal funding programs whose revenues flow to Indian River County, either directly or through FDOT. Federal revenues include both Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds, and these federal revenues may be either formula-based or discretionary depending on the program.

At the time of this 2035 LRTP update, the current federal surface transportation legislation – the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU – has been reauthorized through December 2010¹. The reauthorization maintains the same maximum spending levels for surface transportation programs out of the Trust Fund as were set in the FY 2010 Transportation Appropriations Act. In the next iteration of the surface transportation legislation, there is a potential for major policy changes, although there is no consensus among observers about what form those changes might ultimately take.

In addition, the Highway Trust Fund is facing insolvency (i.e., an inability to meet committed formula payments to states). Insolvency was averted in 2008 by an ‘emergency’ transfer of \$8 billion from the general fund to the highway trust fund. This funding crisis has been created by a combination of stagnation/reduction in vehicle miles traveled, increased fuel-efficiency of vehicles, and no change in federal gas tax since 1993 (i.e., inability to keep up with cost increases). Recently, the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Commission recommended an increase in the gas tax (plus indexing for inflation) as one of a set of policy options. Given the uncertainty of the surface transportation legislation, states and MPOs must continue to refer to SAFETEA-LU for a description of funding programs and authorized funding levels.

Federal Trust Fund Revenues and SAFETEA-LU Programs

As noted above, the following description of federal funding sources and programs has been prepared within the current SAFETEA-LU legislative framework. In the future, funding programs for transportation

¹ On March 18th, 2010, President Obama signed the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act (H.R. 2847) into law. The act includes an extension of surface transportation funding and Highway Trust Fund spending authority through December 31, 2010.



may change, and authorized funding levels for each program will change when Congress reauthorizes the transportation legislation. Following is a general description of current federal transportation funds.

The Highway Trust Fund (HTF) was created by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (Pub. L. 84-627) to provide a dependable source of funding for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to serve as the source of funding for the remainder of the Federal-aid Highway System. Like other federal trust funds, the HTF is a financing mechanism established by law to account for tax receipts that are collected by the federal government and are dedicated or "earmarked" for expenditure on special purposes. Originally, the HTF focused solely on highways. Congress later determined that some revenues from the highway-user taxes dedicated to the HTF should be used to fund transit needs. As a result, the Mass Transit Account was created within the HTF effective April 1, 1983. Since that time, a portion of the revenues earmarked for the HTF have been credited specifically to the Mass Transit Account.

Tax revenues directed to the HTF are derived from excise taxes on highway motor fuel and truck related taxes on truck tires, sales of trucks and trailers, and heavy vehicle use. The Mass Transit Account receives a portion of the motor fuel taxes (2.86 cents per gallon), as does the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (0.1 cent per gallon). The General Fund receives 2.5 cents per gallon of the tax on gasohol and some other alcohol fuels plus an additional 0.6 cent per gallon for fuels that are at least 10 percent ethanol. The Highway Account receives the remaining portion of the fuel tax proceeds. As of October 1, 1997, the 18.4 cents per gallon gasoline tax has been split as follows: 2.86 cents per gallon to the Mass Transit Account, 0.1 cent per gallon to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, and 15.44 cents to the Highway Account. All of the receipts from the non-fuel taxes are deposited in the Highway Account.

SAFETEA-LU established funding authorization levels (i.e., funding levels which may be used for the respective programs) and obligation limitations (i.e., a restriction on the amount of federal assistance that may be promised or obligated during a specific period—a given year, for example) for highway and transit programs for fiscal years 2005 through 2009. SAFETEA-LU extended the practice of establishing separate budget categories for highway and mass transit discretionary spending, thus establishing a budgetary "firewall" between each of those programs and all other discretionary programs. The firewall ensures that the protected highway and transit programs no longer have to compete with other domestic discretionary programs (e.g. housing or education) for a place in the annual federal budget. The budgetary firewall was instrumental in establishing "guaranteed" annual funding levels (or more accurately, obligation limitations) for both highway and transit programs. Any authorizations in excess of the guaranteed levels are in the budgetary "red zone" and remain part of the general discretionary budget category. Red zone funds may be made available through the annual budget and appropriations process and must compete with other budget priorities for their place in the budget each year. Table 3 presents the guaranteed funding levels available for obligation as authorized in SAFETEA-LU and summarized by USDOT.



Table 3: Authorized Federal Funding Levels (millions of dollars)

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
Guaranteed Available for Obligation						
Highway category						
Firewall	\$35,164	\$37,221	\$39,461	\$40,824	\$42,470	\$195,892
Exempt	\$739	\$739	\$739	\$739	\$739	\$3,695
Total	\$35,903	\$37,960	\$40,199	\$41,563	\$43,209	\$198,834
Mass Transit Category						
Firewall	\$7,646	\$8,623	\$8,975	\$9,731	\$10,338	\$45,313
TOTAL	\$43,550	\$46,583	\$49,174	\$51,294	\$53,547	\$244,148

Source: Federal Highway Administration, Appropriations Report, 2007

Federal Highway Administration Programs

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) receives federal revenues from five major programs (along with a number of smaller programs) and allocates the applicable funds to the regional MPOs through specific FDOT funding programs. FDOT's major programs can be divided into two general categories, Capacity Programs and Non-Capacity Programs. Capacity Programs include each major FDOT program that expands the capacity of existing transportation systems, while Non-Capacity Programs include the remaining FDOT programs that are designed to support, operate, and maintain the state transportation system. MPOs are responsible for planning, and receive revenue estimates only for those FDOT programs that are part of the Capacity Program. Thus, only those federal funding programs that are part of the FDOT Capacity Program are described in this review. The major FHWA federal funding programs, whose funds flow through the FDOT Capacity Program, are the National Highway System Program (NHS), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ). Indian River County is not a non-attainment area for air quality and therefore does not receive federal CMAQ funds. The other two major FHWA funding programs, Interstate Maintenance Program (IM) and the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP), provide funds that largely flow through the FDOT's Non-Capacity Program.

- **National Highway System Program (NHS):** The NHS Program provides funding for improvements to rural and urban roads that are part of the National Highway System, including the Interstate System and designated connections to major intermodal terminals. Under certain circumstances, NHS funds may also be used to fund transit improvements in NHS corridors. The federal share of project costs under the NHS program is 80 percent. If the funds are used for projects on the Interstate System, the federal share of project costs will be 90 percent (unless the project adds lanes that are not high occupancy- vehicle or auxiliary lanes, in which case the federal share will revert to the 80 percent level).
- **Surface Transportation Program (STP):** The STP provides flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects on any federal-aid highway, including the NHS, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intra-city and intercity bus terminals and facilities. A portion of funds reserved for rural areas may be spent on rural minor collectors. Within the STP program, there is a 10 percent set-aside of STP funds for safety improvement



projects including railway/highway crossings and a 10 percent set-aside for transportation enhancements. The federal share of project costs, under STP, is 80 percent. If the funds are used for projects on the Interstate System, the federal share of project costs will be 90 percent (unless the project adds lanes that are not high-occupancy-vehicle or auxiliary lanes, in which case the federal share will revert to the 80 percent level).

Federal Transit Administration Programs

The primary FTA funding program for public transportation capital and operating assistance in Indian River County is the FTA Section 5307 Small Urbanized Area program. Section 5307 Small Urbanized Area funds are allocated by formula to each state based on the small urbanized area (50,000 - 200,000) population within each state. Funds are allocated in this manner instead of directly to small urbanized areas because some small urbanized areas choose to not provide transit service. Therefore, all states receive an equitable proportion of funding based on small urbanized area population and can reallocate those funds at their discretion to eligible areas that provide transit. This process is known as the Governor's Apportionment. A description of the eligible uses of 5307 funds is as follows:

- Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program: The Section 5307 formula grants program provides transit capital and operating assistance to urbanized areas with populations of more than 50,000. SAFETEA-LU allows small urbanized areas (those with populations between 50,000 – 200,000 persons) to use these grants for either capital purposes (e.g., bus and rail vehicle replacement, and facility rehabilitation and replacement) or for operating assistance. Capital projects require a 20% local matching share while operating assistance requires a 50% matching share. In Florida, FDOT provides a toll revenue credit “soft match,” eliminating the need for local matching funds for capital items. FDOT also provides operating assistance effectively equaling 25% of total operating expenses, leaving local agencies responsible for the remaining 25% operating share.

Preventative maintenance expenses in the operating budget may be considered as “capital” items. This broad definition of “capital” expense effectively allows transit agencies the option of funding a large proportion of their operations from Section 5307 with no matching share required.

State of Florida Department of Transportation Funding

This section describes the State transportation funding programs and the forecasted revenues that are projected to flow to Indian River County through the year 2035. Revenues that are distributed by FDOT are comprised of three major funding-source categories: federal, state, and turnpike. The total forecasted revenues for the entire State of Florida over the plan period are shown in Table 4.



Table 4: Projected Total State Revenues (Millions of Dollars)

Major Revenue Sources	Time Period						29-Year Total 2007-2035
	2007-10	2011-15	2016-20	2021-25	2026-30	2031-35	
Federal	8,208	9,904	10,137	10,836	11,417	11,912	62,414
% of Total	23%	26%	26%	25%	24%	23%	24%
State	22,650	24,422	25,431	28,530	31,978	35,531	168,542
% of Total	65%	65%	66%	66%	67%	68%	66%
Turnpike	4,131	3,159	3,027	4,149	4,514	4,921	23,901
% of Total	12%	8%	8%	10%	9%	9%	9%
Total	34,989	37,485	38,594	43,514	47,910	52,365	254,857

Source: FDOT 2035 Revenue forecast Handbook, May 2008, Table 1, Page 6.

State Program Revenue Estimates

Beginning in 2008, FDOT prepared long-range revenue projections for the state's major funding categories based on the state's Adopted Work Program, current federal and state legislation, forecasts of federal funding, and internal FDOT policies. Due to the economic downturn nationally and in Florida, these projections continue to change and have been revised downward from their initial estimates. As the recession continues, the state's revenue estimates may continue to change, but this review presents the most current available estimates from FDOT. FDOT combines the Department's major programs into two general categories: Capacity Programs and Non-Capacity Programs.

- Capacity Programs include each major FDOT program that expands the capacity of existing transportation systems.
- Non-Capacity Programs include the remaining FDOT programs that are designed to support, operate and maintain the state transportation system. Based on input from local MPOs, FDOT takes the lead in developing and administering a statewide Non-Capacity Program. According to FDOT, the Department has projected sufficient revenues to meet safety, preservation and support objectives through 2035 throughout the state, including each metropolitan area. It is not necessary for MPOs to identify projects for these programs, so revenue estimates for these activities have not been developed for metropolitan areas.
- With regard to state programs and state funding, MPOs need to identify only projects that are funded through state Capacity Programs.

The major elements of the Capacity and Non-Capacity Programs and eligible projects are detailed in Table 5 below, taken from the current 2035 *Revenue Forecast Handbook*.



Table 5: FDOT Transportation Programs

Capacity Programs	Non-Capacity Programs
<p><u>SIS Highways/ FIHS Construction & ROW</u> - Construction, improvements, and associated right-of-way on SIS highways and the FIHS (i.e., Interstate, the Turnpike, other toll roads, and other facilities designed to serve interstate and regional commerce including SIS Connectors).</p>	<p><u>Safety</u> - Includes the Highway Safety Improvement Program, the Traffic Safety Grant Program, Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety activities, the Industrial Safety Program, and general safety issues on a Department-wide basis.</p>
<p><u>Aviation</u> - Financial and technical assistance to Florida’s airports in the areas of safety, capacity improvements, land acquisition, planning, economic development, and preservation.</p>	<p><u>Resurfacing</u> - Resurfacing of pavements on the State Highway System and local roads as provided by state law.</p>
<p><u>Rail</u> - Rail safety inspections, rail-highway grade crossing safety, acquisition of rail corridors, assistance in developing intercity and commuter rail service, and rehabilitation of rail facilities.</p>	<p><u>Bridge</u> - Repair and replace deficient bridges on the state highway system. In addition, 15 percent of federal bridge funds must be expended off the federal highway system (e.g., on local bridges not on the State Highway System).</p>
<p><u>Intermodal Access</u> - Improving access to intermodal facilities and acquisition of associated rights-of-way.</p>	<p><u>Product Support</u> - Planning and engineering required to “produce” FDOT products and services (i.e., each capacity program; Safety, Resurfacing, and Bridge Programs).</p>
<p><u>Seaport Development</u> - Funding for the development of eligible ports, including projects such as land acquisition, dredging, construction of storage facilities and terminals, and acquisition of container cranes and other equipment used in moving cargo and passengers.</p>	<p><u>Operations & Maintenance</u> - Activities to support and maintain transportation infrastructure once it is constructed and in place.</p>
<p><u>Other Arterial Construction/ROW</u> - Construction, improvements, and associated right-of-way on State Highway System roadways not designated as part of the SIS or FIHS. Also includes funding for the Economic Development Program, the County Incentive Grant Program, and the Small County Outreach Program.</p>	<p><u>Administration</u> - Resources required to perform the fiscal, budget, personnel, executive direction, document reproduction, and contract functions. Also includes the Fixed Capital Outlay Program, which provides for the purchase, construction, and improvement of non-highway fixed assets (e.g., offices, maintenance yards).</p>
<p><u>Transit</u> - Technical and operating/capital assistance to transit, paratransit, and ridesharing systems.</p>	<p><u>Other</u> – Technically, this category is not a “program.” It primarily represents FDOT financial commitments such as debt service and reimbursements to local governments.</p>

Source: FDOT 2035 Revenue forecast Handbook, May 2008, Table 2, Page 8.



Table 6 summarizes FDOT’s current revenue forecasts for its major program areas for Indian River County.

Table 6: FDOT Program Funding Estimates for Indian River County (Millions of Dollars)

Capacity Programs	2035 Revenue Forecast					
	FYs 14-15 Subtotal	FYs 16-20 Subtotal	FYs 21-25 Subtotal	FYs 26-30 Subtotal	FYs 31-35 Subtotal	22 Year Total
SIS Highways/FIHS Construction/ROW	0	.3	150.8	0	0	151.1
Other Arterial Construction/ROW	7.6	22.8	25.6	27.5	29.9	113.4
Transit	4.3	11.8	13.3	14.8	16.2	60.4
TOTAL CAPACITY PROGRAMS	11.9	34.9	189.7	42.3	46.1	324.9
<i>County Share of DISTRICT TRIP Funds – Illustrative Only¹</i>	1.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	18.0
<i>Enhancement Funds²</i>	0.8	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	9.3

1. TRIP funding is illustrative due to the uncertainty of the amount that will be allocated to Indian River County.
2. Enhancement Funds are for informational purposes only and do not represent additional funds.

Source: FDOT 2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook Supplement for Indian River County, May 2008, Table 1, Page 3 and Tables 3 & 4, Page 4.

As described in the footnote to Table 6 above, FDOT’s Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP) funds are shown as illustrative only, meaning they are not being used in the determination of the 2035 cost feasible plan. This is done for the following reasons:

- FDOT estimates TRIP funds only at the District level and not at the County level. The share of the projected District Four TRIP funds that will actually be allocated to Indian River County is not known. An estimate of four percent has been used in the illustrative calculation above and is based on Indian River County’s population as compared to all of District Four.
- The Indian River County MPO is not the “decision-maker” with respect to choosing projects that receive TRIP funding; the Treasure Coast Transportation Council is charged with that responsibility.

In terms of Enhancement Funds, the *2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook* provides the following guidance:

FDOT has provided estimates for the Enhancement Program, as defined by SAFETEA-LU, to assist MPOs in developing their plans. They are for informational purposes only and do not represent additional funds. That is, the estimates for Enhancement Funds have been included in the Other Arterials Construction & ROW estimates provided by FDOT.²

Given these constraints, the TRIP funds and Enhancement Funds are shown as illustrative only for informational purposes.

² 2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook, Page 12.



State Program Descriptions and Project Eligibility

This section presents a brief description of each major sub-program under the State Capacity Program and describes what types of planned projects and programs are eligible for funding across the different major sub-programs.

FDOT subdivides the state Capacity Programs into two additional areas of focus, Economic Competitiveness and Quality of Life goals. Planning and project identification responsibilities are divided between the State and the MPO across the two programs. The Economic Competitiveness program includes projects that help strengthen the State's comparative economic position and include the following major programs: FIHS Construction/ROW, Aviation, Rail, Seaport, and Intermodal Access. FDOT has "taken the lead" in identification of planned projects and programs that support the Economic Competitiveness Goal and provides detailed information to MPOs. As a result, metropolitan plans and programs that include state and federal funds for these major programs should be coordinated and consistent with state long range plans and programs. MPOs have been requested to "take the lead" in identification of planned projects and programs for the major programs that support the Quality of Life Goal. These programs include Other Arterial Construction and Right of Way (ROW) and Transit. The programs described below are presented under the subcategories of Economic Competitiveness, and Quality of Life goals.

Economic Competitiveness Goals

- **FIHS Construction and Right-of-Way:** As a statewide Economic Competitiveness Goal, FDOT "takes the lead" in identifying projects that are consistent with the FIHS Construction and ROW Program. The Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS) is a component of the State Highway System. Its primary purpose is to serve interstate and regional commerce and long distance trips. Metropolitan plans and programs for the FIHS should be consistent with the current FIHS Cost Feasible Plan, as provided to each MPO. Public transportation, intermodal access, and seaport development projects may be funded under this program, provided that they are included in the current FIHS Cost Feasible Plan. Capacity improvement projects eligible for funding in the current plan include:
 - Construction of additional lanes;
 - The capacity improvement component of interchange modifications;
 - New interchanges;
 - Exclusive lanes for through traffic, public transportation vehicles, and other high occupancy vehicles;
 - Bridge replacement for which the essential purpose is to provide increased capacity;
 - Other construction to improve traffic flow, such as intelligent transportation system (ITS), incident management systems, and vehicle control and surveillance systems;
 - A preferred alternative defined by an approved multimodal Interstate Master Plan; and
 - New weight and weigh-in-motion stations and rest areas.



- Rail: The state provides funding for acquisition of rail corridors and assistance in developing intercity passenger and commuter rail service, fixed guideway system development, rehabilitation of rail facilities and high speed transportation. Projects and programs eligible for funding include:
 - Assistance with acquisition of rail corridors;
 - Assistance with development of fixed guideway systems;
 - Assistance with rail passenger services including all aspects of intercity and commuter rail development;
 - Rehabilitation of rail branch lines where economically justified; and
 - Improvement of warning devices at public rail-highway grade crossings.

- Intermodal Access: The state provides assistance in improving access to intermodal facilities and the acquiring of associated rights-of-way. Projects and programs eligible for funding include:
 - Assistance with improving access to seaports and airports, particularly through highway and rail improvements; and
 - Assistance with development of intermodal terminals and facilities.

- Strategic Intermodal System: The 2003 Florida Legislature enacted Sections 339.61- 64, Florida Statutes that created the Florida Strategic Intermodal System, and adopted by reference the SIS Steering Committee's recommendations for designation criteria that established the initial statewide system of SIS hubs and corridors. The statutes also directed FDOT to develop a strategic plan for funding and managing the SIS, with input from external transportation partners. The need for a Strategic Intermodal System was identified by various entities with an interest in the funding of key transportation systems throughout the state. Among these entities were the Stakeholders Task Force, the Florida Chamber Foundation and the Transportation and Land Use Committee. The Strategic Intermodal System calls for a transportation system that is made up of statewide and regionally significant facilities and services (strategic); contains all forms of transportation for moving both people and goods, including linkages that provide for smooth and efficient transfers between modes and major facilities (intermodal); and integrates individual facilities, services, forms of transportation (modes) and linkages into a single, integrated transportation network (system).

Quality of Life Goals

- Other Arterial Construction and Right of Way: The primary purpose of this major program is to fund improvements on State Highway System roadways, or SHS, that are not designated as part of the SIS or FIHS. The approximately 8,000 miles (statewide) of non-FIHS highways represent about 68% of the current SHS. Projects and programs eligible for funding include:
 - Construction and traffic operations improvements on the SHS that add capacity, reconstruct existing facilities, improve highway geometrics (e.g., curvature), provide grade separations, and improve turning movements through signalization improvements and adding storage capacity within turn lanes;
 - Acquisition of land necessary to support the SHS construction and bridge programs;



- Acquisition of land in SHS corridors on an advanced basis (before construction is funded in the 5-year Work Program);
 - Construction and traffic operations improvements on certain local government roads³ that add capacity, reconstruct existing facilities, improve highway geometrics (e.g., curvature), provide grade separations, and improve turning movements through signalization improvements and adding storage capacity within turn lanes; and
 - Acquisition of land necessary to support the construction program for certain local government roads, as discussed immediately above.
- Transit: The state provides technical and operating/capital assistance to transit, paratransit and ridesharing systems. Projects and programs eligible for funding include:
 - Capital and operating assistance to public transit systems and Community Transportation Coordinators, through the Public Transit Block Grant Program;
 - Service Development projects, which are special projects that can receive initial funding from the state;
 - Commuter assistance programs that encourage transportation demand management strategies, ridesharing and public/private partnerships to provide services and systems designed to increase vehicle occupancy; and
 - Assistance with acquisition, construction, promotion and monitoring of park-and-ride lots.

Dedicated Gas Taxes and Transportation Impact Fees

There are a number of separate gasoline taxes in the State of Florida which can provide revenue for transportation improvements to Florida cities and counties. These gas taxes include:

- Constitutional Gas Tax (also known as the “Secondary Gas Tax”)
- County Gas Tax
- Local Option Six-Cent Gas Tax (the “6-Cent LOGT”)
- Second Local Option Gas Tax (the “5-Cent LOGT”)
- Ninth-Cent Gas Tax (Voted Gas Tax)

The first two taxes are imposed by the State and distributed to the Counties, while the remaining three are local option gas taxes which can be imposed by each county according to its discretion. This section describes the uses of each gas tax by county governments and the projected revenues within Indian River County.

State Motor Fuel Taxes Distributed to the County

- Constitutional Gas Tax (Secondary Gas Tax): Florida levies a two-cent tax per gallon on motor fuels sold known as the Constitutional Gas Tax (also referred to as the Secondary Gas Tax). Twenty percent of the Constitutional Gas Tax is directly returned to the county in which it was

³ By law, state funds cannot be used on local government roads except under certain subprograms subject to annual legislative appropriations. FDOT has directed that long range plans should not assume that state funds will be appropriated for local government road improvements.



collected, while the remaining eighty percent is pledged to the State's road and bridge bonds, which are administered by the State Board of Administration. If no such State bonds exist within a given county, then the eighty percent of the Constitutional Gas Tax revenues are remitted to the county in which it was collected. Any excess of the eighty percent portion not needed for State bonds is also remitted. By statute, the Constitutional Gas Tax must be used for the acquisition, construction and maintenance of roads.

- **County Gas Tax:** The County Gas Tax, formerly the Seventh-Cent Gas Tax, is a tax of one cent on every gallon of motor fuel sold in a county at the wholesale level. The State Department of Revenue administers the tax and redistributes net proceeds to the counties. County Gas Tax proceeds are to be used for transportation related capital and operating expenditures, and may be used as security for revenue bond financing.

Locally Imposed Gas Taxes

Currently, there is one local option gas tax imposed in Indian River County, the up to six cents Local Option Gas Tax (the "6-Cent LOGT"). The County has the option to impose the second Local Option Gas Tax and the Ninth-Cent Gas Tax. Local option gas taxes are authorized by the State Legislature and are imposed, with local discretion, by Indian River County.

- **6-Cent Local Option Gas Tax:** The 6-Cent LOGT is a tax of 1 to 6 cents on every gallon of motor fuel and special fuel sold at retail in a county. It may be levied by a majority vote of the governing body or by referendum. The proceeds may be used for transportation expenditures, both capital and operating, including public transportation. The 6-Cent LOGT may be used as security for revenue bond financing.
- **Ninth-Cent Gas Tax:** The Ninth-Cent Gas Tax, formerly the Voted Gas Tax, is a tax of one cent on every gallon of motor fuel and special fuel sold in a county. It may be levied by an extra-majority vote of the governing body or by referendum. Pursuant to Florida Statutes, the Ninth-Cent Gas Tax was required to be levied on diesel fuel in every county beginning January 1, 1994. The proceeds are to be used for establishing, operating and maintaining a transportation system, including both capital and operating expenditures. Counties are authorized to expend funds in conjunction with the state or federal government for joint transportation projects. The Ninth-Cent Gas Tax may be used as security for revenue bond financing.
- **5-Cent Second Local Option Gas Tax:** Passed during the 1993 legislative session, the second LOGT is a tax of 1 to 5 cents on every gallon of motor fuel, but not special fuel, sold at retail in a county. It may be levied by a majority plus one vote of the governing body or by referendum. The proceeds may be used for transportation expenditures needed to meet the requirements of the capital improvements element of an adopted comprehensive plan, including public transportation. The proceeds may not, however, be used for operations. The second LOGT may be used as security for revenue bond.

Gas Tax Revenues

Projecting gasoline tax revenues in the current environment is difficult. The original 2009 county-level gas tax projections from the state's *Local Government Financial Information Handbook* were subsequently reduced by 6.5 percent to address revenue drops caused by major reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The gasoline tax projections for Indian River County in Table 8 below assume that



collections will remain flat through 2014 and then resume a very modest growth back to equilibrium by 2020, and subsequently resume growth by approximately 1.6 percent per year to match the expected growth in population. Table 7 shows the projected gas tax revenues in the County over the plan period.

Table 7: Projected Gas Tax Revenues in Indian River County (Millions of Dollars)

Gas Tax	FYs 2016-20 Subtotal	FYs 2021-25 Subtotal	FYs 2026-30 Subtotal	FYs 2031-35 Subtotal	20-Year Total
Constitutional Gas Tax	\$7.5	\$7.8	\$8.5	\$9.2	\$33.0
County Gas Tax	\$3.3	\$3.4	\$3.7	\$4.1	\$14.5
6-Cent LOGT	\$14.9	\$15.6	\$16.9	\$18.3	\$65.7
5-Cent 2nd LOGT & Ninth-Cent Gas Tax ¹	\$12.1	\$13.0	\$14.1	\$15.3	\$54.5
Total Gas Taxes	\$37.8	\$39.8	\$43.2	\$46.9	\$167.7

1. The 5-Cent 2nd LOGT & Ninth-Cent Gas Tax is expected to be imposed by fiscal year 2013.

Transportation Impact Fees

Road impact fees are assessed in Indian River County for new developments. These fees are imposed on new development for the purpose of financing required infrastructure that is necessary to support the new development. The road impact fees collected by the County are applied to a variety of projects, including road and bridge capacity improvements, road widening and resurfacing, traffic control device installation, and intersection and safety improvements.

According to the Indian River County Office of Budget Management, road impact fees have declined substantially in the County since 2007 and are expected to remain low through the near term. Since the impact fees are tied to population and economic growth, these fees are expected to slowly recover over time, eventually leveling off over the long-term planning horizon to match future growth. The projected transportation impact fee revenues in the County during the plan period are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Projected Transportation Impact Fees in Indian River County (Millions of Dollars)

	FYs 2016-20 Subtotal	FYs 2021-25 Subtotal	FYs 2026-30 Subtotal	FYs 2031-35 Subtotal	20-Year Total
Transportation Concurrency Revenues	\$33.1	\$33.1	\$30.9	\$30.9	\$128.0

Summary of Forecast Revenues

A summary of the forecast revenues described above is presented in Table 9 in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars. While the MPO does not have direct decision-making influence over all the revenues shown here, it is important to show the full range of highway and transit funds that are expected to be available for use within the County over the coming years.



**Table 9: Summary of Projected Baseline Revenues (YOE dollars)
for Indian River County (millions of dollars)**

Revenues	FYs 2016-20 Subtotal	FYs 2021-25 Subtotal	FYs 2026-30 Subtotal	FYs 2031-35 Subtotal	20-Year Total
Capital Revenues					
State					
FDOT - SIS/FIHS ¹	\$0.3	\$150.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$151.1
Other Arterial Construction/ROW ²	\$20.8	\$23.5	\$25.3	\$27.7	\$97.3
Transit	\$11.8	\$13.3	\$14.8	\$16.2	\$56.1
Subtotal	\$32.9	\$187.6	\$40.1	\$43.9	\$304.5
County					
1 cent Local Option Sales Taxes (LOST)	\$18.2	\$20.0	\$22.4	\$25.1	\$85.7
6-Cent Local Option Gas Taxes (LOGT) ³	\$10.6	\$11.3	\$12.6	\$14.0	\$48.5
5-Cent 2nd LOGT and Ninth-Cent Gas Tax ⁴	\$12.1	\$13.0	\$14.1	\$15.3	\$54.5
Transportation Impact Fees	\$33.1	\$33.1	\$30.9	\$30.9	\$128.0
Subtotal	\$74.0	\$77.4	\$80.0	\$85.3	\$316.7
Operating Revenues					
County					
Constitutional Gas Tax	\$7.5	\$7.8	\$8.5	\$9.2	\$33.0
County Gas Tax	\$3.3	\$3.4	\$3.7	\$4.1	\$14.5
6-Cent LOGT ³	\$4.3	\$4.3	\$4.3	\$4.3	\$17.2
IRC GoLine	\$21.2	\$21.5	\$21.5	\$21.5	\$85.7
Subtotal	\$36.3	\$37.0	\$38.0	\$39.1	\$150.4
TOTAL	\$143.2	\$302.0	\$158.1	\$168.3	\$771.6

1. The revenue forecasts for FDOT program funding is supplemented by information included in the FDOT SIS Second Five Year Plan and SIS 2035 Cost Feasible Plan.
2. Other Arterial Construction/ROW does not include Enhancement Funds. The Enhancement Funds identified in Table 6 were not included.
3. A portion of the 6-cent LOGT is applied to Operating and Maintenance revenues.
4. For this analysis, the 5-Cent 2nd LOGT and Ninth-Cent Gas Tax are expected to be adopted by year 2013. An alternative revenue scenario without the additional taxes was prepared subsequent to this analysis and is included in the Cost feasible Plan Summary Report.

Included in the summary table above is a one-cent Local Option Sales Tax. It should be noted that this sales tax expires in December 2019. It was assumed that the LOST will be extended from 2020 to 2035. If the LOST is not extended, there will be a decrease of approximately \$71.3 million in capital revenues to the above estimates.



COST ASSUMPTIONS

This section summarizes the assumptions used in the development of cost estimates for the transportation projects included in the Adopted Needs Plan of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update. The cost assumptions are summarized for each mode. All costs used in developing the Cost Feasible Plan are estimated in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars as outlined in the *2035 Revenue Forecast Handbook* and subsequent supplements, revisions, and workshops. The YOE costs were estimated by applying inflation factors provided by FDOT. The inflation factors applied to the estimated project costs for the YOE are as follows:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Annual Rate</u>
2010 dollars	2011 dollars	4%
2011 dollars	2012 dollars	3.5%
2012 dollars	2013 dollars and beyond	3.3% each year

Roadway Costs

The following section summarizes the costs associated with roadways in Indian River County.

Project Development and Environment (PD&E), Preliminary Engineering (PE), and Construction Engineering and Inspection (CEI)

According to FDOT Transportation Costs by the FDOT Office of Policy Planning, engineering costs include PD&E, PE, CEI, material testing and research, and related overhead costs.

Right-of-Way Acquisition (ROW)

The ROW cost for improvements was calculated using information from the Indian River County MPO, Public Works Department, and Property Appraiser’s Office. The ROW costs for LRTP projects were calculated based on the following methodology:

- Parcel shapefiles from Indian River County, roadway capacity improvements, and grid densification improvements were imported into AutoCAD. Using right-of-way standards for each roadway improvement type obtained from the Indian River County Code of Ordinance (Section 952.08), an offset for each roadway improvement was identified. The offset was calculated from the centerline of the existing roadway where a road existed, and from the center of the right-of-way where a new roadway was proposed. Adjustments were made to the right-of-way offsets based on canal locations using high-resolution aerial photography and field reviews.
- The area of right-of-way offsets was overlaid onto the parcel data obtained from the Indian River County Property Appraiser’s Office. The area of the offset that extended onto adjacent parcels was calculated for each roadway improvement. Once the area of needed right-of-way was established for each improvement, the total was increased by 25 percent to adjust for undefined improvements.
- Finally, the cost of right-of-way needed for each improvement was calculated by multiplying the new adjusted area by the approximate cost of right-of-way (\$1.30 per square foot) and a cost



adjustment factor of 2.6. This factor was applied to cover the cost of appraisals, legal fees, and other associated acquisition costs.

Construction (CST)

The source for highway construction costs is the FDOT Long Range Estimation (LRE) System. The FDOT Estimates Office maintains the average bid-price of items included in FDOT construction contracts. These costs were used when there was no other source for the costs. When a more refined cost estimate, such as from the Strategic Intermodal System Plan, a Corridor Study, a PD&E Study, a PE Study, a Final Design, or a Construction Bid Estimate, was available, it was used. FDOT Long Range Estimates (LRE) were used for both state and county roads. County construction cost estimates were reviewed by the Indian River County Public Works Department and adjusted based on more detailed cost data, previous projects, and professional judgment as appropriate. The adjustment in the cost also addresses unique project characteristics, such as wetlands and habitat mitigation, need for pedestrian bridges, and other unique circumstances.

Summary of Cost Estimates for Adopted Needs Plan Projects

Using the cost assumptions identified above for PD&E, PE, CEI, ROW, and Construction, cost estimates for the Adopted Needs Plan roadway improvement projects were developed. The costs estimates for the Adopted Needs Plan are listed for the base year of 2010 as well as the LRTP implementation timeframes of 2016 to 2020, 2021 to 2025, 2026 to 2030, and 2031 to 2035. Tables 10 and 11 summarize the 2010 base year costs for the Adopted Needs Plan for Capacity Improvement Projects and Grid Densification Projects, respectively. Tables 12 and 13 summarize the Year of Expenditure cost estimates for the LRTP implementation timeframes for the Adopted Needs Plan for Capacity Improvement Projects and Grid Densification Projects, respectively.



Table 10: Summary of Projected Roadway Costs for Capacity Improvement Projects (2010 dollars)

Location	Description	Length	Construction Cost	R/W	CEI	Implementation Cost (Const., R/W & CEI)
SIS Highway Project Costs						
I-95 at Oslo Road Interchange	Construction of New Interchange	0.5	\$16,908,450.00	\$0.00	\$1,859,929.50	\$18,768,379.50
I-95 widening from Martin County Line to Brevard County Line	Widening from existing 4-lane divided section to proposed 6-lane divided section	19.1	\$84,772,800.00	\$0.00	\$7,629,552.00	\$92,402,352.00
Federal and State Roadway Project Costs						
US 1 from Highland to St. Lucie County Line	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	0.62	\$1,945,410.20	\$72,200.00	\$213,995.12	\$2,231,605.32
US 1 from 53rd Street to CR 510	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	4.3	\$9,268,315.28	\$3,577,712.46	\$1,019,514.68	\$13,865,542.42
US 1 from CR 510 to Schuman Drive	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	3	\$6,297,923.07	\$5,297,923.07	\$692,771.54	\$12,288,617.67
US 1 from Schuman Drive to CR 512	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	1.6	\$3,448,675.45	\$2,825,558.97	\$379,354.30	\$6,653,588.72
County and City Project Costs						
Roseland Rd- from CR 512 to US1	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to 4-lane undivided; new sidewalk on both sides; RR x-ing modification; roadway lighting; 2 new mast arm signals	4.7	\$10,157,066.59	\$3,822,040.63	\$1,117,277.32	\$15,096,384.54
CR 510- from CR 512 to 66 Avenue	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	4.2	\$23,557,367.40	\$2,919,629.00	\$2,591,310.41	\$29,068,306.81
CR 510- 66 Avenue to US 1	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	1.6	\$8,992,350.00	\$1,112,240.00	\$989,158.50	\$11,093,748.50
CR 510- from US 1 to Intracoastal WWY	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	0.5	\$2,854,175.00	\$348,500.00	\$313,959.25	\$3,516,634.25
CR 512 from I-95 to east of Willow Street widening project	Widening to four lanes	3.1	\$2,256,645.11	\$3,560,699.03	\$248,230.96	\$6,065,575.10
CR 512 from I-95 to CR 510 Widening project	Widening to six lanes	2.6	\$10,437,012.90	\$1,863,740.45	\$1,148,071.42	\$13,448,824.77
Indian River Blvd from Merrill Barber Bridge to 45th Street	Widening to six lanes	2	\$5,465,861.46	\$108,000.00	\$601,244.76	\$6,175,106.22

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Update



Location	Description	Length	Construction Cost	R/W	CEI	Implementation Cost (Const., R/W & CEI)
Indian River Blvd from 20th Street to Merrill Barber Bridge	Widening to six lanes with pedestrian bridge replacement	1	\$3,482,930.73	\$54,500.00	\$383,122.38	\$3,920,553.11
* 66th Ave from 41st Street to 69th Street	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets with bridges	3.5	\$18,583,333.33	\$45,377.67	\$2,044,166.67	\$20,672,877.67
* 66th Ave from 69th Street to CR 510	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets with bridges	2	\$10,619,047.62	\$25,930.10	\$1,168,095.24	\$11,813,072.96
* 66th Ave from CR 510 to Barber	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets	0.85	\$4,513,095.24	\$11,020.29	\$496,440.48	\$5,020,556.01
Oslo Road from I-95 to 58th Ave.	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided (no sidewalks); 2 new mast arm signals	3.6	\$5,921,230.25	\$1,450,522.78	\$651,335.33	\$8,023,088.35
25th street SW from 27th Ave to 58th Ave	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section	1.8	\$2,346,195.12	\$872,880.78	\$258,081.46	\$3,477,157.36
* 27th Ave from Oslo Rd to St. Lucie County Line	Widening from existing 2-lane undivided rural section to 4-lane undivided (sidewalks on both sides); 1 mast arm signal	2	\$5,000,000.00	\$788,714.55	\$550,000.00	\$6,338,714.55
* 43rd Ave from St Lucie County Line to Oslo Road	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided (no sidewalks); 1 new mast arm signal	2	\$7,275,516.77	\$877,985.42	\$800,306.85	\$8,953,809.04
* 43rd Ave from Oslo Road to 16th St	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided	3	\$10,613,275.16	\$1,316,978.13	\$1,167,460.27	\$13,097,713.56
26th Street from 43rd Ave to 58th Ave	Widening from 2 to 4 lanes divided rural section	1	\$5,608,897.00	\$872,880.78	\$504,800.73	\$6,986,578.51
26th Street from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Widening from 2 to 4 lanes divided rural section	1	\$5,608,897.00	\$487,328.40	\$504,800.73	\$6,601,026.13
Total		67.57	\$265,934,470.68	\$32,312,362.48	\$27,332,979.90	\$325,579,813.06

* Indian River County cost estimates.



Table 11: Summary of Projected Roadway Costs for Grid Densification Projects (2010 dollars)

Location	Description	Length	Construction Cost	R/W	CEI	Implementation Cost (Const, R/W & CEI)
County and City Project Costs						
Fellsmere N-S Rd 1 from CR 512 to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road in Fellsmere from CR 512 to 69th St	3.5	\$4,781,794.71	\$5,465,460.00	\$525,997.42	\$10,773,252.13
Fellsmere N-S Rd 2 from CR 512 to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road in Fellsmere from CR 512 to 69th St	3.5	\$4,781,794.71	\$5,465,460.00	\$525,997.42	\$10,773,252.13
82nd Avenue from 26th St to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	5	\$7,500,750.00	\$7,104,240.00	\$825,082.50	\$15,430,072.50
82nd Avenue from 69th St to CR 510	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2	\$3,170,000.00	\$2,841,696.00	\$348,700.00	\$6,360,396.00
82nd Avenue from CR 510 to Laconia Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	0.6	\$2,670,000.00	\$1,136,678.40	\$293,700.00	\$4,100,378.40
74th Avenue from 26th St to 37th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on 74th Ave from 26th St to 37th St	1.1	\$1,535,923.52	\$0.00	\$168,951.59	\$1,704,875.11
Fleming St from Airport Perimeter Rd to CR 512	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on Fleming St from Airport Perimeter Rd to CR 512	1.3	\$1,808,904.54	\$105,257.43	\$198,979.50	\$2,113,141.46
Airport Perimeter Rd from US 1 to Roseland Rd	Construct a 2 lane rural undivided asphalt road on Airport Perimeter Rd from US 1 to Roseland Rd	2.4	\$3,282,263.81	\$3,747,744.00	\$361,049.02	\$7,391,056.83
Fellsmere E-W Road from CR 512 to Fellsmere N-S Rd 2	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on Fellsmere E-W from CR 512 to Fellsmere N-S Rd 2	3.7	\$5,042,941.62	\$2,696,247.13	\$554,723.58	\$8,293,912.33
69th Street from 66th Avenue to Fellsmere N-S Rd 1	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	7	\$9,636,354.26	\$2,767,564.80	\$1,059,998.97	\$13,463,918.03
53rd Street from 66th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2	\$2,724,253.76	\$1,571,835.20	\$299,667.91	\$4,595,756.87
53rd Street from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	1	\$1,362,126.88	\$785,917.60	\$149,833.96	\$2,297,878.44
33rd Street from 74th Avenue to 82nd Avenue	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2	\$2,741,509.89	\$977,893.15	\$301,566.09	\$4,020,969.13
33rd Street from 66th Avenue to 74th Avenue	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	1	\$1,370,754.95	\$488,946.58	\$150,783.04	\$2,010,484.57
98th Ave from SR 60 to 4th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2.2	\$3,015,660.88	\$1,042,730.00	\$331,722.70	\$4,390,113.58
74th Avenue from 8th St to Oslo Rd	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2	\$2,740,920.49	\$0.00	\$301,501.25	\$3,042,421.74
58th Ave from Oslo Rd to 25th St	Construct a 4-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2.1	\$2,890,906.28	\$139,501.05	\$317,999.69	\$3,348,407.02
58th Ave from Oslo Rd to 25th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2.1	\$2,271,309.29	\$50,000.00	\$249,844.02	\$2,571,153.31
12th St from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	1	\$1,362,126.67	\$893,428.75	\$149,833.93	\$2,405,389.35
12th St from 66th Ave to 74th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	1	\$3,110,126.67	\$250,000.00	\$342,113.93	\$3,702,240.60

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Update



Location	Description	Length	Construction Cost	R/W	CEI	Implementation Cost (Const, R/W & CEI)
4th St from 66th Ave to 98th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	4.1	\$5,522,387.99	\$1,267,504.23	\$607,462.68	\$7,397,354.89
1st Street SW from 58th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	3	\$3,975,250.00	\$533,052.00	\$437,277.50	\$4,945,579.50
5th Street SW from Old Dixie Highway to 20th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural divided asphalt road includes new bridge	1.4	\$3,331,342.20	\$244,172.00	\$366,447.64	\$3,941,961.84
5th St SW from 58th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	3	\$4,086,380.64	\$1,194,868.03	\$449,501.87	\$5,730,750.53
13th St SW from 20th Ave to 58th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2.5	\$3,365,567.65	\$897,977.28	\$370,212.44	\$4,633,757.37
17th St SW from 20th Ave to 58th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	2.5	\$3,415,567.65	\$1,187,660.18	\$375,712.44	\$4,978,940.27
Total		63	\$91,496,919.04	\$42,855,833.78	\$10,064,661.09	\$144,417,413.91



Table 12: Summary of Projected Roadway Costs for Capacity Improvement Projects (YOE dollars)

Capacity Improvement Projects		Year ⁴				
Location	Description	2010	2016-2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035
SIS Highway Project Costs						
I-95 at Oslo Road Interchange	Construction of New Interchange	\$18,768,380	\$24,475,935	\$28,706,339	\$33,765,984	\$39,717,419
I-95 widening from Martin County Line to Brevard County Line	Widening from existing 4-lane divided section to proposed 6-lane divided section	\$92,402,352	\$120,502,359	\$141,329,902	\$166,240,052	\$195,540,748
Federal and State Roadway Project Costs						
US 1 from Highland to St. Lucie County Line	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	\$2,231,605	\$2,918,724	\$3,433,165	\$4,038,278	\$4,750,046
US 1 from 53rd Street to CR 510	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	\$13,865,542	\$18,082,122	\$21,207,423	\$24,945,344	\$29,342,094
US 1 from CR 510 to Schuman Drive	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	\$12,288,618	\$16,025,646	\$18,795,508	\$22,108,316	\$26,005,025
US 1 from Schuman Drive to CR 512	Widen existing 4-lane divided rural section to proposed 6-lane divided rural section	\$6,653,589	\$8,676,978	\$10,176,700	\$11,970,398	\$14,080,245
County and City Project Costs						
Roseland Rd- from CR 512 to US1	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to 4-lane undivided; new sidewalk on both sides; RR x-ing modification; roadway lighting; 2 new mast arm signals	\$15,096,385	\$19,459,563	\$22,558,967	\$26,152,025	\$30,317,365
CR 510- from CR 512 to 66 Avenue	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	\$29,068,307	\$37,469,670	\$43,437,617	\$50,356,103	\$58,376,525
CR 510- 66 Avenue to US 1	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	\$11,093,749	\$14,300,079	\$16,577,711	\$19,218,111	\$22,279,058
CR 510- from US 1 to Intracoastal WWY	Widen existing undivided 2-lane rural roadway to 4 lane divided roadway	\$3,516,634	\$4,533,017	\$5,255,009	\$6,091,996	\$7,062,293
CR 512 from I-95 to east of Willow Street widening project	Widening to four lanes	\$6,065,575	\$7,818,656	\$9,063,965	\$10,507,620	\$12,181,212
CR 512 from I-95 to CR 510 Widening project	Widening to six lanes	\$13,448,825	\$17,335,823	\$20,096,970	\$23,297,897	\$27,008,648
Indian River Blvd from Merrill Barber Bridge to 45th Street	Widening to six lanes	\$6,175,106	\$7,959,844	\$9,227,641	\$10,697,365	\$12,401,178

⁴ 2010 costs are in current year dollars. 2016 thru 2035 costs are in Year of Expenditure dollars.

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Update



Capacity Improvement Projects		Year ⁴				
Location	Description	2010	2016-2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035
Indian River Blvd from 20th Street to Merrill Barber Bridge	Widening to six lanes with pedestrian bridge replacement	\$3,920,553	\$5,127,704	\$6,031,489	\$7,094,572	\$8,345,028
* 66th Ave from 41st Street to 69th Street	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets with bridges	\$20,672,878	\$27,038,124	\$31,803,738	\$37,409,316	\$44,002,908
* 66th Ave from 69th Street to CR 510	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets with bridges	\$11,813,073	\$15,450,356	\$18,173,564	\$21,376,752	\$25,144,519
* 66th Ave from CR 510 to Barber	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section; sidewalks on both sides, side streets	\$5,020,556	\$6,566,402	\$7,723,765	\$9,085,120	\$10,686,420
Oslo Road from I-95 to 58th Ave.	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided (no sidewalks); 2 new mast arm signals	\$8,023,088	\$10,462,949	\$12,271,357	\$14,434,250	\$16,978,363
25th street SW from 27th Ave to 58th Ave	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided rural section	\$3,477,157	\$4,534,578	\$5,318,331	\$6,255,715	\$7,358,319
* 27th Ave from Oslo Rd to St. Lucie County Line	Widening from existing 2-lane undivided rural section to 4-lane undivided (sidewalks on both sides); 1 mast arm signal	\$6,338,715	\$8,266,349	\$9,695,099	\$11,403,911	\$13,413,912
* 43rd Ave from St Lucie County Line to Oslo Road	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided (no sidewalks); 1 new mast arm signal	\$8,953,809	\$11,676,706	\$13,694,900	\$16,108,699	\$18,947,943
* 43rd Ave from Oslo Road to 16th St	Widen existing 2-lane undivided rural section to proposed 4-lane undivided	\$13,097,714	\$17,080,792	\$20,033,024	\$23,563,952	\$27,717,224
26th Street from 43rd Ave to 58th Ave	Widening from 2 to 4 lanes divided rural section	\$6,986,579	\$9,111,231	\$10,686,010	\$12,569,476	\$14,784,914
26th Street from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Widening from 2 to 4 lanes divided rural section	\$6,601,026	\$8,608,430	\$10,096,306	\$11,875,833	\$13,969,012
Total Capacity		\$325,579,813	\$423,482,037	\$495,394,501	\$580,567,087	\$680,410,418

* Indian River County cost estimates.

⁴ 2010 costs are in current year dollars. 2016 thru 2035 costs are in Year of Expenditure dollars.



Table 13: Summary of Projected Roadway Costs for Grid Densification Projects (YOE dollars)

Grid Densification Projects		Year ⁵				
Location	Description	2010	2016-2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035
County and City Project Costs						
Fellsmere N-S Rd 1 from CR 512 to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road in Fellsmere from CR 512 to 69th St	\$10,773,252	\$14,090,371	\$16,573,875	\$19,495,108.53	\$22,931,225.49
Fellsmere N-S Rd 2 from CR 512 to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road in Fellsmere from CR 512 to 69th St	\$10,773,252	\$14,090,371	\$16,573,875	\$19,495,108.53	\$22,931,225.49
82nd Avenue from 26th St to 69th Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$15,430,073	\$20,181,042	\$23,738,058	\$27,922,017.83	\$32,843,422.54
82nd Avenue from 69th St to CR 510	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$6,360,396	\$8,318,783	\$9,785,012	\$11,509,673.11	\$13,538,314.44
82nd Avenue from CR 510 to Laconia Street	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,100,378	\$5,362,898	\$6,308,138	\$7,419,980.61	\$8,727,791.81
74th Avenue from 26th St to 37th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on 74th Ave from 26th St to 37th St	\$1,704,875	\$2,229,812	\$2,622,828	\$3,085,115.33	\$3,628,883.37
Fleming St from Airport Perimeter Rd to CR 512	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on Fleming St from Airport Perimeter Rd to CR 512	\$2,113,141	\$2,763,785	\$3,250,916	\$3,823,907.74	\$4,497,891.89
Airport Perimeter Rd from US 1 to Roseland Rd	Construct a 2 lane rural undivided asphalt road on Airport Perimeter Rd from US 1 to Roseland Rd	\$7,391,057	\$9,666,787	\$11,370,610	\$13,374,740.82	\$15,732,110.30
Fellsmere E-W Road from CR 512 to Fellsmere N-S Rd 2	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road on Fellsmere E-W from CR 512 to Fellsmere N-S Rd 2	\$8,293,912	\$10,847,635	\$12,759,588	\$15,008,534.01	\$17,653,868.25
69th Street from 66th Avenue to Fellsmere N-S Rd 1	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$13,463,918	\$17,609,502	\$20,713,271	\$24,364,095.45	\$28,658,397.35
53rd Street from 66th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,595,757	\$6,010,805	\$7,070,242	\$8,316,409.74	\$9,782,221.36
53rd Street from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$2,297,878	\$3,005,403	\$3,535,121	\$4,158,204.87	\$4,891,110.68
33rd Street from 74th Avenue to 82nd Avenue	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,020,969	\$5,259,039	\$6,185,972	\$7,276,282.84	\$8,558,766.54
33rd Street from 66th Avenue to 74th Avenue	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$2,010,485	\$2,629,519	\$3,092,986	\$3,638,141.42	\$4,279,383.27
98th Ave from SR 60 to 4th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,390,114	\$5,741,844	\$6,753,874	\$7,944,280.86	\$9,344,502.77
74th Avenue from 8th St to Oslo Rd	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$3,042,422	\$3,979,193	\$4,680,547	\$5,505,518.79	\$6,475,895.87
58th Ave from Oslo Rd to 25th St	Construct a 4-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$3,348,407	\$4,379,392	\$5,151,284	\$6,059,224.96	\$7,127,195.71
58th Ave from Oslo Rd to 25th St	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$2,571,153	\$3,362,820	\$3,955,535	\$4,652,718.80	\$5,472,785.33
12th St from 58th Ave to 66th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$2,405,389	\$3,146,017	\$3,700,519	\$4,352,754.95	\$5,119,951.25

⁵ 2010 costs are in current year dollars. 2016 thru 2035 costs are in Year of Expenditure dollars.

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Update



Grid Densification Projects		Year ⁵				
Location	Description	2010	2016-2020	2021-2025	2026-2030	2031-2035
12th St from 66th Ave to 74th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$3,702,241	\$4,842,173	\$5,695,631	\$6,699,516.68	\$7,880,342.27
4th St from 66th Ave to 98th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$7,397,355	\$9,675,024	\$11,380,299	\$13,386,137.69	\$15,745,515.93
1st Street SW from 58th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,945,580	\$6,468,339	\$7,608,419	\$8,949,443.30	\$10,526,830.46
5th Street SW from Old Dixie Highway to 20th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural divided asphalt road includes new bridge	\$3,941,962	\$5,155,705	\$6,064,425	\$7,133,312.49	\$8,390,596.90
5th St SW from 58th Ave to 82nd Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$5,730,751	\$7,495,267	\$8,816,348	\$10,370,276.52	\$12,198,093.12
13th St SW from 20th Ave to 58th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,633,757	\$6,060,506	\$7,128,703	\$8,385,174.85	\$9,863,106.68
17th St SW from 20th Ave to 58th Ave	Construct a 2-lane rural undivided asphalt road	\$4,978,940	\$6,511,972	\$7,659,742	\$9,009,812.42	\$10,597,839.96
Total Grid Densification		\$144,417,414	\$188,884,005	\$222,175,819	\$261,335,493	\$307,397,269

⁵ 2010 costs are in current year dollars. 2016 thru 2035 costs are in Year of Expenditure dollars.