



TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMISSION (TRANSMAC)

**TransMac Supplemental Report on  
Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2025 -  
2026 Proposed Transportation Capital  
Expenditures**

**April 1, 2026**

TransMac Members:

Eric R. Grimmer, Chair  
Zachary Moldof, Vice Chair  
Patrick Christiansen  
Patrick Ferguson  
Rodney Olsen  
Mohammed Abdallah  
Jose M. Hoyos

On March 20, 2026, the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission (“TransMac” or “the Commission”) issued a written report to the Board of County Commissioners (“the Board”), which contained the final votes of the Commission on the Proposed Expenditures for Fiscal Year (“FY”) 2026 - 2027 as (see Exhibit A attached to this memorandum).

In this report, TransMac indicated its intent to issue a supplemental report on the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of the projects to be funded in FY 2026 - 2027, as it had the previous year. Transmac requests that the Board accept this memorandum as such.

**TransMac Supplemental Recommendations**

TransMac observes that the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for FY 2026 - 2027 (see attached Exhibit B) separates the expenditures into three categories: “County Projects”, what county staff referred to as “Major Projects”, and “Payments to Government Entities.”

“Countywide Projects” contains broad categories such as signal installation, intersection widening, roadway traffic safety projects, Vision Zero projects<sup>1</sup>, the traffic calming and sidewalk programs, roadway lighting installation, and the rehabilitation of existing roadways.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vision Zero programs have the goal of helping local communities eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries for all road users. On August 27, 2024, the Board adopted a Vision Zero Action Plan, which aims to achieve zero roadway deaths or serious injuries by the year 2040.

For Countywide Projects, TransMac was provided the Proposed Expenditure amount for each category as well as a list of candidate projects within each category that the proposed funds could be used to implement, subject to further consideration by staff during the budget process. The Commission finds this level of information to be satisfactory.

On the other hand, the “Major Projects” are categorized by the specific roadway or corridor. For these projects, TransMac received detailed presentations from county staff and was provided access to a wealth of supplemental materials.

Finally, “Payments to Government Entities” consists of monies provided to Lynx and Sunrail as part of the county’s annual funding obligations for operations of these transit services.

TransMac continues to recognize that the county’s current level of transportation funding is insufficient to fully address the maintenance of our existing transportation infrastructure, to construct improvements to existing roads, to build entirely new roadway connections, or to more significantly invest in our existing public transit.

TransMac acknowledges the Board’s consideration of potential ballot referendums in 2026 that could have provided additional revenue to assist the county in addressing its transportation issues and/or infrastructure needs writ large.

While TransMac did not have the opportunity to offer a formal recommendation to the Board on whether to pursue a transportation or infrastructure sales tax in 2026, TransMac looks forward to participating in the ongoing conversations regarding how to address our transportation needs with either the current levels of funding or with increased revenue from other funding mechanisms.

Additionally, TransMac recognizes that, in response to comments and questions from this Commission, county staff is working on developing a ten year work plan to supplement the existing five year capital improvements work plan (“CIP”) and the long range transportation plan (“LRTP”). As indicated by staff, this new ten year plan will focus on projects within the high injury network (“HIN”) corridors identified in the county Vision Zero plan.

TransMac is most appreciative of staff’s efforts because it will provide a greater level of information concerning prioritization of the many projects that are within the LRTP but fall outside the 5 year CIP, so that the Commission can make even more knowledgeable recommendations to the Board. Furthermore, the focus on the HIN enables TransMac to ensure that projects focusing on safety for all roadway users receive as much (if not more) prioritization than projects focused primarily on roadway capacity.

### Countywide Projects

As aforementioned, TransMac has adopted the prioritization and projected amount of funding as presented in the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for FY 2026 - 2027 (Exhibit B). However, the Commission continues to recommend that countywide projects receive a greater level of funding in future budget cycles.

TransMac observes that, while the level of funding for many of the categories within the Countywide Projects budget remain the same from the previous year, staff is proposing to allocate nearly \$1 million more dollars to Vision Zero projects. TransMac applauds this increased level of funding but that the Vision Zero Action Plan lists over \$250 million worth of projects. TransMac recommends that the County continue to shift even greater levels of revenue to this category in future budget cycles in order to develop a safer transportation system for all county residents and visitors.

### Major Projects

The Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for FY 2026 - 2027 (Exhibit B) provides a list of seventeen major projects, the majority of which include new lanes being added to or extensions of existing roadways as well the construction of entirely new roads.

As indicated in Exhibit A, TransMac voted to recommend the approval of funding for all major projects except for Chuluota Road, for which the Commission was unable to reach a majority vote on whether to recommend approval or denial of the proposed funding.

In regards to the Chuluota Road project, there was extensive discussion among TransMac members as to whether the need to widen the roadway from State Road 50 on the south end to Tanner Road on the north end had been adequately established by the roadway conceptual analysis. During this conversation, county staff informed the Commission that there had been discussion regarding a phased approach to the project, with greater prioritization given to the segment closest to State Road 50 (where most of the congestion and delay was occurring). TransMac members were generally supportive of a phased approach but were unable to reach a majority vote on its recommendation to the Board.

As for the other major projects on which TransMac recommended approval of the proposed funding, as acknowledged in last year's supplemental report, the Commission notes that several of these projects were proposed many years ago; that revenue constraints may have prevented funding them in prior budget cycles; and that the phase of the production cycle impacts the County's ability to make significant changes or even abandon the project.

TransMac must recognize that, even for major projects that have mostly or entirely completed their design or already begun right-of-way acquisition, county staff has always been receptive to recommendations made by the Commission that could be accommodated in the specific phase of that project.

Since the reports TransMac submitted to the board in the Spring of 2024, county staff has made multiple changes to the design of major project roadways for which the Commission must express its gratitude.

For example, the width of proposed bike lanes were widened and the vehicle lanes narrowed to accommodate them on the Richard Crotty Parkway and Kennedy Boulevard. In addition, for the Orange Avenue project, county staff indicated that it would be reducing the speed limit from 45 mph to 35 mph in conjunction with construction in order to make it safer for users of the bike lane. County staff reported that it is also actively working with the local community towards a more complete streets design for a separate segment of Kennedy Boulevard that meets resident needs for safety.

TransMac applauds the county staff for its openness to recommendations from the Commission and members of the local community as well as its clear dedication to making its major projects safer for all roadway users.

TransMac wholeheartedly supports the significant proposed investments into the related projects at Reams and Ficquette Roads, which are indicative of the high level of prioritization that these projects deserve. The Commission recognizes that these existing roadways have experienced significant flooding during major storms and speedy improvements are essential to make these conditions safer for county residents.

In addition to its recommendations on the proposed funding to the major roadway projects, through a unanimous vote, TransMac recommends the Board direct county staff to adopt a written policy that, for major roadway projects (such as widening projects or redesigns of existing roadways as well as the construction of new roadways) where at least eight (8) years have passed between any phase of the project (i.e. roadway conceptual analysis to design, design to right of way acquisition, right of way acquisition to construction), county staff should re-evaluate the project details to determine whether circumstances have changed to the extent that reconsideration of any or all aspects of the project is warranted.

Such circumstances may include (but are not limited to) whether previously modeled traffic projections have developed as predicted, whether the design of the project is consistent with current standards (such as for safety and efficient movement of all road users), and what changes can and should be made prior to progression to the next project stage.

As indicated above, while county staff has shown a clear willingness to consider the details of the older major projects and make changes where feasible, the adoption of a clear policy would alleviate the need for TransMac or the Board to specifically request further review of these projects. This review and the knowledge derived from it will allow TransMac and the Board to make more informed decisions about how to allocate limited county resources.

As a corollary to this recommendation, TransMac believes that a greater level of focus should be given to project completion: once a project has been selected for study and later designed, regardless of whether it falls within the countywide category or major roadway category, the county should prioritize the fully funding it in order to complete design, acquire any necessary right of way, and begin (and complete) construction.

Study less, design and build more.

### *Payments to Government Entities*

While TransMac has recommended approval of the proposed funding for Lynx and Sunrail as presented in Exhibit B, the Commission finds that additional investment in our public transit is warranted.

In the course of TransMac's consideration of the previous year's budget, the Commission learned about the Lynx ridership improvements resulting from additional county investment into increased service, under its Accelerated Transportation Safety Program ("ATSP").

However, TransMac recognizes that the ATSP program is nearing completion of its five year period and, without identifying additional funding to continue those service improvements, that increased ridership and the resulting improvement in our transportation system may be lost. This would be to the detriment of all residents of and visitors to Orange County, but especially for the service and hospitality employees who have benefited from increased service in our tourism corridors.

**EXHIBIT A**



TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMISSION  
(TRANSMAC)

**TransMac Recommendations on Fiscal Year  
2026 - 2027 Proposed Transportation  
Capital Expenditures**

**March 20, 2026**

TransMac Members:

Eric R. Grimmer, Chair  
Zachary Moldof, Vice Chair  
Patrick T. Christiansen  
Patrick Ferguson  
Rodney Olsen  
Mohammed Abdallah  
Jose M. Hoyos

§ 504.A.1 of the Orange County Charter (“the County Charter”) indicates that, no later than the third Friday of March of each year, the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission (“TransMac” or “the Commission”) shall issue a written report to the Board of County Commissioners (“the Board”). This report is to provide advisory recommendations as to priority and projected budget amounts for proposed county transportation expenditures.

“Proposed Expenditures”, as defined by the above cited section of the County Charter, includes “all capital expenditures for transportation purposes, and all payments to other governmental or quasi-governmental entities for transportation purposes, funded from any available revenue source (except community redevelopment agencies and developer contributions pursuant to a proportionate share agreement, development agreement, or development order), to be proposed in the County’s annual budget.”

Exhibit A, attached to this memorandum, is the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2026 - 2027 as provided by the Public Works department of Orange County.

At a public hearing held on March 12, 2026, TransMac voted to **ADOPT** the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2026 - 2027 as presented in Exhibit A (including the prioritization and projected amounts as set forth therein), with the exception of the Chuluota Road widening project for which TransMac was unable to reach a majority vote on whether to recommend approval of the requested funding or recommend denial of the requested funding.

Additionally, TransMac unanimously voted to recommend the Board direct County Staff to adopt a written and defined policy that, for major roadway projects (such as widening projects or redesigns of existing roadways as well as the construction of new roadways) where at least eight (8) years have passed between any phase of the project (i.e. roadway conceptual analysis to design, design to right of way acquisition, right of way acquisition to construction), County Staff should re-evaluate the project details to determine whether circumstances have changed to the extent that reconsideration of any or all aspects of the project is warranted.

Such circumstances may include (but are not limited to) whether previously modeled traffic projections have developed as predicted, whether the design of the project is consistent with current professional standards (such as for safety and efficient movement of all road users), and what changes can and should be made prior to progression to the next project stage.

TransMac requests that the Board accept the current report as satisfying the requirement in the County Charter that Transmac provide its recommendations no later than the third Friday of March.

However, as with its previous recommendations on the FY 2025 - 2026 budget, TransMac intends to issue a supplemental report that includes “recommendations relating to the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of projects to be funded by the Proposed Expenditures” (§ 504.A.1.d of the County Charter). This supplemental report will provide essential additional context to the recommendations contained within this report.

This supplemental report will be prepared by the TransMac chair in draft form prior to the next scheduled meeting on April 9, 2026, at which TransMac intends to adopt said report subsequent to further discussion with its members. Upon adoption, the supplemental report will be forwarded to the Board for review.

# EXHIBIT B

## Orange County Public Works Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures Fiscal Year 2026-27

Unit	Dist	Project Name	Category	Funds by Funding Type					Funds by Project Phase				Notes		
				Capital Improvement Funds See Note A	Capital Improvement Funds (ATSP) See Note B	INVEST See Note C	TIF See Note D	Proportionate Fair Share See Note E	TOTAL	Design	ROW / Permitting / Mitigation See Note F	Construction		TOTAL	
<b>COUNTYWIDE PROJECTS</b>															
2720	ALL	Signal Installation	Safety	\$ 8,000,000						\$ 6,000,000				\$ 6,000,000	
2721	ALL	Roadway Safety Traffic	Safety		\$ 3,000,000					\$ 3,000,000				\$ 3,000,000	
2722	ALL	Intersection Widening	Intersection	\$ 3,000,000						\$ 3,000,000				\$ 3,000,000	
2724	ALL	Intersections/Concur Roadway Sustainability Improvements	Safety	\$ 500,000						\$ 500,000				\$ 500,000	
2725	ALL	Vision Zero - Roadway / Intersections/ Pedestrian & Bike Safety	Safety	\$ 2,450,000						\$ 2,450,000				\$ 2,450,000	
2729	ALL	Traffic Calming Program	Safety	\$ 1,000,000						\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000	
2941	ALL	Sidewalk Program	Safety	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,123,300					\$ 6,423,300				\$ 6,423,300	
2990	ALL	Rehab Existing Rows	Roadway	\$ 40,000,000						\$ 40,000,000				\$ 40,000,000	
6000	ALL	Roadway Lighting	Safety	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,794,400					\$ 2,994,400				\$ 2,994,400	
5141	ALL	East Orange County (EOC) Transportation Needs	Roadway	\$ 1,000,000						\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000	
5151	ALL	Miscellaneous Traffic Safety Projects	Safety	\$ 1,000,000						\$ 1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000	
<b>PROJECTS</b>															
2743	6	Vineland Ave Marriott Village-National Shrine of Mary Queen of the Universe	Roadway				\$ 1,012,696			\$ 1,012,696	\$ 512,696	\$ 500,000		\$ 1,012,696	TIF Zone 3&4
2752	5	Richard Crotty Pkwy SR 436-Clean	Roadway				\$ 6,000,000			\$ 6,000,000		\$ 6,000,000		\$ 6,000,000	TIF Zone 2;
2883	1	Sand Lake Rd Atopka Vineland-Turkey Lake	Roadway				\$ 2,500,000			\$ 2,500,000			\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2027
2929	4	Orange Ave Osceola City-Tumpike	Roadway				\$ 2,350,000			\$ 2,350,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,300,000		\$ 2,350,000	TIF Zone 3
3037	3	Taft-Vineland Rd #41-Orange Ave	Roadway				\$ 5,491,285			\$ 5,491,285	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 1,791,285	\$ 5,491,285	TIF Zone 3; under construction through 2029
3096	2	Kennedy Blvd E of All American to Wymore Rd	Roadway	\$ 4,370,874		\$ 8,429,126				\$ 12,800,000		\$ 2,000,000	\$ 10,800,000	\$ 12,800,000	TIF Zone 1; under construction through 2029 for west segment
3097	2	All American Blvd Orange Blossom Trail-Forest City	Roadway	\$ 10,633,676			\$ 2,738,812			\$ 13,372,488			\$ 13,372,488	\$ 13,372,488	TIF Zone 1; under construction through 2027
5004	5	Chulavita Rd SR 50-LA Pickett	Roadway			\$ 3,540,574				\$ 3,540,574	\$ 2,540,574	\$ 1,000,000		\$ 3,540,574	
5005	5	McCulloch Rd Orion-Tanner	Roadway			\$ 1,600,000				\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 100,000		\$ 1,600,000	
5024	3	Econ Trail Lk Underhill-SR50	Roadway				\$ 1,400,000			\$ 1,400,000			\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,400,000	Under construction
5064	4	Innovation Way S SR 417-SR 529	Roadway				\$ 1,400,000			\$ 1,400,000		\$ 1,400,000		\$ 1,400,000	TIF Zone 3;
5090	3.4	Lk Underhill Rd Econ-Rouse	Roadway			\$ 1,800,000				\$ 1,800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,000,000		\$ 1,800,000	

## Orange County Public Works Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures Fiscal Year 2026-27

Unit	Dist	Project Name	Category	Funds by Funding Type					Funds by Project Phase				Notes		
				Capital Improvement Funds See Note A	Capital Improvement Funds (ATSP) See Note B	INVEST See Note C	TIF See Note D	Proportionate Fair Share See Note E	TOTAL	Design	ROW / Permitting / Mitigation See Note F	Construction		TOTAL	
<b>PROJECTS (CONTINUED)</b>															
5137	2.0	Pine Hills Pedestrian Safety Project SR 50-Bonnie Brae	Safety	\$ 1,600,000						\$ 1,600,000			\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	Under construction
5139	1	Reams Rd Summerlake-Taborfield	Roadway	\$ 2,458,289			\$ 20,941,711			\$ 32,400,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 28,900,000		\$ 32,400,000	TIF Zone 4;
5140	1	Ficouette Rd Summerlake-Overstreet	Roadway			\$ 5,303,200	\$ 10,296,457			\$ 15,599,657	\$ 100,000	\$ 15,499,657		\$ 15,599,657	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2028
5154	1	Avalon Rd/CR 545 US 192-Harborg	Roadway					\$ 2,525,326		\$ 2,525,326		\$ 2,525,326		\$ 2,525,326	
5156		University Blvd Safety Goldenrod -SR436	Safety	\$ 4,379,220						\$ 4,379,220	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,879,220		\$ 4,379,220	
<b>Total Proposed Capital Expenditures</b>				<b>\$ 81,892,059</b>	<b>\$ 8,917,700</b>	<b>\$ 20,672,900</b>	<b>\$ 63,130,961</b>	<b>\$ 2,525,326</b>	<b>\$ 177,138,946</b>	<b>\$ 5,903,270</b>	<b>\$ 24,125,326</b>	<b>\$ 79,742,650</b>	<b>\$ 177,138,946</b>		
<b>Payments to Government Entities</b>				<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>Notes</b>						
		LYNX	Transit	\$ 92,345,475											Source: General Fund (Ad Valorem)
		SunRail	Transit	\$ 15,342,384											Source: General Fund (Ad Valorem)
<b>Total Proposed Payments to other Governmental Agencies</b>				<b>\$ 107,687,859</b>											

Notes 1 Amounts are based on FY2026-2027 Budget Request, which will need to be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and is subject to approval by County BCC (Jan 28, 2025). Several funding sources used for these projects are restricted to certain types of use (i.e., limited by schedule, geographic areas and/or dedicated to particular projects approved by the County BCC). Capital Improvement Funds. Sources: Existing State Sales Tax and Gas Taxes.

A B Capital Improvement Funds (Accelerated Transportation Safety Program). Source: Existing State Sales Tax.

C INVEST in our Home for Life. Source: Countywide Capital Construction Funds (Ad Valorem).

D Transportation Impact Fees (TIF). Source: Developer funded.

E Proportionate Fair Share: Developer funded.

F Right of Way Acquisition (ROW)