



TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMISSION  
(TRANSMAC)

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

**April XX, 2025**

TransMac Members:

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

**History and Timeline**

§ 504 of the Orange County Charter (“the County Charter”), which was adopted by the voters of Orange County via ballot referendum on November 5, 2024, created the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission (“TransMac” or “the Commission”). The County Charter amendment creating TransMac stated that all members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Board of County Commissioners (“the Board”).

At public meetings on January 7 and January 28 of 2025, the Board appointed the seven members of TransMac listed above.

On January 30, 2025, TransMac held its organizational meeting as required by § 504.E of the County Charter.

In addition to the selection of a chair and vice-chair, the Commission received presentations from the County Attorney’s Office on Sunshine Law, public records, ethics, and meeting procedures; from the Office of Management and Budget on the overall county budget process; and from the Public Works department on TransMac’s duties, a timeline for completion thereof, and resources that would be available to the Commission in order to complete its duties.

§ 504.A of the County Charter sets forth the functions, powers, and duties of Transmac. Said functions, power, and duties include an annual review of proposed transportation expenditures.

Specifically, § 504.A.1 indicates that, no later than the third Friday of March of each year, TransMac shall issue a written report to 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.”

§ 504.A.1.c of the County Charter states that, during the months of February and March of each year, TransMac shall hold no less than two (2) public hearings after 5 p.m. in order to review the Proposed Expenditures.

At public meetings held on February 13, 2025 and March 3, 2025, TransMac received detailed presentations from the Orange County Public Works department on the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026.

On March 13, 2025, a public hearing was held, at which a series of votes was undertaken by TransMac on the Proposed Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026.

On March 19, 2025, TransMac issued a written report to the Board, which indicated that the Commission had voted to **ADOPT** the Proposed Expenditures as presented by the Public Works department (see Exhibit A attached to this memorandum).

Therein, TransMac noted that § 504.A.1.d of the County Charter states that the Commission’s report may also include “recommendations relating to the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of projects to be funded by the Proposed Expenditures.”

However, because of the compressed timeline between the appointment of all TransMac members and the County Charter deadline for submission of its written report, the March 19, 2025 report expressly did not contain recommendations relating to the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of projects.

Accordingly, in the March 19, 2025 report, TransMac indicated its intent to issue a supplemental report on these issues and requests that the Board accept this memorandum as such.

### **TransMac Supplemental Recommendations**

TransMac observes that the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 (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, sidewalks, and rehabilitation of existing roadways) for which TransMac was provided the Proposed Expenditure amount for each category but no specific information on the particular projects for which these amounts would be used. 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 in which the Proposed Expenditure would be utilized. For these projects, TransMac received detailed presentations from county staff and was provided access to a wealth of supplemental written 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.

In the course of the presentations provided to TransMac by county staff and the accompanying discussion amongst Commission members, one issue became abundantly clear that the Commission wants to acknowledge at the outset: current annual transportation funding in Orange County is insufficient to fully address the maintenance of our existing transportation infrastructure, to construct new improvements to existing roadways or entirely new roadway connections, or to significantly increase our investment in our public transit systems.

Two facts presented by county staff that Transmac finds especially notable as emblematic of the inadequate level of current transportation funding: one, in order to resurface all county roadways on the recommended maintenance schedule of every fifteen (15) years, the county would need to repave 395 lane miles every year.

However, due to funding limitations and rising costs in recent years, the county has proposed to resurface only 178 miles in FY 25 - 26 (less than half the necessary number to meet the recommended maintenance schedule).

Secondly, in order to complete all the roadway projects in the Long Range Transportation plan (which was recently updated as part of the proposed comprehensive plan and land development code updates that are Vision 2050 and Orange Code, respectively), the county would require \$5.31 billion dollars in transportation funding over the next twenty five (25) years.

However, at current levels, only \$2.5 billion dollars of funding would be available over the next 25 years for roadway projects. Again, less than half the need is satisfied with the County's existing revenue streams.

Notably, the \$5.1 billion dollar need set forth above **does not** include any additional funding for enhanced public transit, which Transmac members repeatedly offered their support for in the course of the budgetary meetings. Accordingly, the Commission must acknowledge that the investment required to improve both the functionality of the county roadways as well as the efficiency and convenience of public transit is surely much higher.

Because the current level of transportation funding is clearly insufficient to create the type of modern, convenient, and efficient multimodal transportation that the Commission feels is necessary to address existing safety and traffic congestion, TransMac wholly supports the pursuit of an **additional** revenue source that is dedicated to transportation improvements. The Commission looks forward to discussing the potential options for new funding sources at future meetings.

Accordingly, TransMac makes the following recommendations with full awareness of the limitations placed on the county due to insufficient revenue streams.

### Countywide Projects

As indicated in Exhibit A, TransMac has adopted the prioritization and projected amount of funding as presented in the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 (Exhibit B).

Per Exhibit B, countywide projects include 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.

Though TransMac has adopted the prioritization and projected amount of funding for countywide projects as presented, the Commission recommends that these projects receive a **greater** level of funding in future budget cycles.

TransMac finds that these projects are essential to achieve greater operational efficiency on existing roadways (through signal installation and intersection widenings) and a safer transportation system for all roadway users (via traffic calming and Vision Zero projects as well as new roadway lighting).

Significantly, county staff indicated that the intersection projects provide "the best bang for the buck" from a traffic efficiency perspective. As a result, the Commission

---

<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.

finds that these are a wise investment given the deficits in Orange County's current transportation funding and should be prioritized.

Transmac specifically notes that, with regard to new sidewalk construction, county staff stated that sidewalks provide increased safety, enhanced connectivity, health benefits, and a walkable school zone that reduces the need for busing students to local educational institutions.

As to Vision Zero projects, Transmac observes that only \$1.5 million is proposed in the current budget cycle, which is not illogical considering the Action Plan was only recently approved.

However, the Commission notes that the Action Plan lists over \$250 million worth of projects that are proposed as a means to help achieve Vision Zero in Orange County. TransMac expects that, in future budget cycles, the level of investment in these projects will be representative of the county's oft-stated prioritization of safety in their roadway improvements.

As discussed previously, the county currently has the revenue to repave less than half of the roadway lane miles per year that it would need to satisfy the recommended maintenance schedule. TransMac recognizes that maintenance of our existing roadways is paramount for the safety and efficiency of our transportation system.

### Major Projects

As indicated in Exhibit A, TransMac has adopted the prioritization and projected amount of funding as presented in the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 (Exhibit B).

Exhibit B provides the list of nineteen (19) major projects, thirteen (13) of which include new lanes being added to existing roadways or the construction of entirely new roads.

In recommending approval of the proposed expenditures, TransMac observes that many of these projects were first proposed many years ago and revenue constraints (in addition to other project specific issues) have prevented funding them in prior budget cycles.

Additionally, TransMac recognizes that many of these projects are in different phases of their production schedule (which include identification and study, design and permitting, right of way acquisition, and construction).

The Commission acknowledges that, as these projects progress further in their production schedule, it becomes increasingly difficult to make significant changes or even abandon a project. For example, as the design of a project nears

completion, it becomes costlier and more time consuming to make substantial alterations to said design. Furthermore, in the right-of-way acquisition phase, there are potential legal ramifications if the county attempted to redirect funds appropriated for this stage of the process. Finally, in the construction phase, contracts have been entered into that the county must honor.

Therefore, TransMac has recommended approval of funding for some major projects as presented that have reached a point in the process where it would be too costly or time consuming to make major changes or would potentially place the county in some level of legal jeopardy. TransMac has made these recommendations, despite some personal reservations of the members as to the project specifics (some of which are detailed below).

TransMac has concluded, based on the presentations from county staff and because of the age of some the major project proposals, the typical cross section as depicted in the roadway conceptual analyses reflect outdated notions of safe roadway design and do not adequately consider the needs of all roadway users.

Examples include the four (4) foot bike lanes on the proposed Richard Crotty Parkway, the only protection for which is a single stripe of paint. Transmac finds that such a bike lane is too narrow and dangerous to provide for safe and meaningful access for those who cycle or use a scooter as a form of transportation.

The Commission acknowledges county staff's statement that it could review the existing design for Richard Crotty provided any changes are within the proposed right of way. TransMac recommends analysis of either an on-street but physically separated bike lane or multi-use path to replace the current design.

TransMac makes similar recommendations as to the Orange Avenue project, which provides for an on-street bike lane that is buffered by two (2) stripes of white paint, which the Commission again finds inadequate and recommends re-examination thereof. TransMac notes that, because the status of this project is at 30% design, there should be a sufficient amount of time to reconsider it in order to allow for safe and meaningful access to the nearby Sunrail station (which is a stated goal, according to project documents).

In addition, TransMac notes that major projects such as the new roadway extension at All American Boulevard as well as the widening projects at Kennedy Boulevard and Lake Underhill Road all provide for twelve (12) foot wide vehicle travel lanes with four (4) foot wide unprotected bike lanes (meaning a single stripe of paint with no physical separation).

According to county staff, TransMac eleven (11) foot wide vehicle travel lanes are normally sufficient if the roadway is not subject to a large amount of industrial or truck traffic, which does not appear to be the case for the projects listed above.

TransMac recommends reduction of all unnecessary twelve (12) foot wide vehicle travel lanes in each project in order to widen the proposed bike lane and/or offer physical separation between cars and cyclists (or scooter users). The Commission makes these recommendations provided that said improvements can be accomplished within the right of way designated for each project and without otherwise significant alterations to project design for infrastructure elements such as drainage.

TransMac recommends the county continue to seek higher prioritization of the related projects at Reams and Ficquette Roads in west Orange County, which staff indicated they were hoping to have fully funded within the next five (5) year capital improvement plan.

The Commission recognizes that these existing roadways have experienced significant flooding during recent major storms and speedy improvements are essential to make these conditions safer for county residents as well as to provide for improved operational efficiency.

TransMac enthusiastically recommends approval of the funding for Pine Hills Pedestrian Safety Project, which includes a wide twelve (12) foot multi use path that will provide for safe bike and pedestrian access to nearby local schools and the Pine Hills Transfer Center.

In addition, TransMac commends the recently completed roadway conceptual analysis for Tiny Road that provides traffic calming measures such as roundabouts and raised crosswalks as well as bike and pedestrian facilities, including shared use paths on both sides, a connection to the Horizon West Trail, and pedestrian hybrid beacons.

TransMac notes that, on several occasions during conversations of the proposed expenditures for FY 2025 - 2026, county staff stated that the Commission could have its most influence on major projects that were in earlier stages of the process because it would be easier to make changes to these proposals.

TransMac plans to heed that sage advice and closely examine major project proposals such as Tiny Road and Chuluota Road to ensure they consider safety of all road users and promote all transportation modalities. TransMac concludes that, at this early stage of the process, both of these roadway conceptual analyses represent a significant step in the right direction for these corridors.

For major project proposals that have advanced to later stages in their production schedule, TransMac advises that the county continue to review their typical cross section to ensure they provide for safe, convenient, and meaningful access for cyclists, pedestrians, and scooter users. This should especially be the case where the corridor subject to the proposed improvements contains a number of trip

generators, such as educational institutions, employment centers, and transit hubs.

### Payments to Government Entities

As indicated in Exhibit A, TransMac has adopted the projected amount of funding for Lynx and Sunrail as presented in the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 (Exhibit B).

While acknowledging the funding constraints resulting from a lack of a dedicated revenue source for transportation, TransMac concludes that additional investment in our public transit is an essential element of the well balanced transportation system that the Commission seeks, having determined that providing for a diverse range of safe and efficient modalities is the **only** way to solve the traffic congestion problems in Orange County.

Indeed, TransMac finds that Lynx has already demonstrated the service improvements that can be made with increased investment. Included in the \$45 million total dollars being provided to Lynx over the next five (5) years, under the county's Accelerated Transportation Safety Program ("ATSP"), is \$6 - \$7 million dollars annually for new bus routes and increased frequency on some existing routes. One of the new routes created with ATSP funds connects the Orlando International Airport to Disney Springs.

TransMac notes that, per data provided by county staff, every existing route that has been provided increased frequency with ATSP dollars has shown positive increases in ridership. In fact, the average existing ridership increase has been 22%, an impressive increase with a fairly modest additional investment. However, the new routes and frequency increases for existing routes will be lost in five (5) years when the ATSP funding expires, if no alternative revenue source is identified.

The Commission finds it likely that, with further resources, Lynx would continue to improve service for existing riders but also attract new riders (which would have the additional benefit of removing cars from the roadway and reduce traffic congestion).

TransMac finds that future additional investment would be beneficial for all residents of and visitors to Orange County, but especially for the service and hospitality employees on which our local economy is significantly dependent.

According to information provided by county staff, the cost per mile for a transit rider is one-third of that for a car owner, when factoring in expenses such as monthly vehicle payments and insurance. TransMac concludes that reducing the transportation costs for all county residents, especially lower wage workers, should be of the highest priority.



TransMac looks forward to future presentations and discussions with Lynx and Sunrail to learn more about what could be accomplished with additional investment into these systems.

### **Summary of Recommendations**

As indicated in Exhibit A and for the reasons stated in this supplemental report, TransMac has voted to **ADOPT** the Proposed Expenditures as presented in the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 (Exhibit B).

**EXHIBIT A**



TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY ADVISORY COMMISSION  
(TRANSMAC)

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

**March 19, 2025**

TransMac Members:

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

§ 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 2025 - 2026 as provided by the Public Works department of Orange County.

At a public hearing held on March 13, 2025, TransMac voted to **ADOPT** the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026 as presented in Exhibit A in its entirety, including the prioritization and projected amounts as set forth therein.

TransMac observes that § 504.A.1.d of the County Charter states that its written report may also include “recommendations relating to the scope, work plan,

organization, and implementation of projects to be funded by the Proposed Expenditures.”

TransMac notes that all of its members were not appointed by the Board until January 28, 2025 and that its first public meeting was held a mere two days later on January 30, 2025.

Tasks undertaken at this January 30, 2025 organizational meeting included presentations by the County Attorney’s Office on Sunshine Law, public record, ethics, and meeting procedures; Commission member introductions as well as election of a Chair and Vice Chair; discussion of future meeting schedules; a presentation by the Office of Management and Budget on the overall county budget process; and a presentation by the Public Works department on TransMac’s duties, timeline for completion thereof, and available resources.

Subsequently, at public meetings held on February 13, 2025 and March 3, 2025, TransMac received detailed presentations from the Public Works department on the Proposed Transportation Capital Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2025 - 2026. Finally, at the public hearing held on March 13, 2025, TransMac voted to adopt the Proposed Expenditures as stated above.

Given the compressed timeline between the appointment of all TransMac members in late January 2025 and the County Charter requirement that the Commission provide its recommendations no later than the third Friday of March, this written report does not contain recommendations relating to the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of projects.

However, TransMac plans to issue a supplemental report that will address the scope, work plan, organization, and implementation of the projects to which it is recommending funding thereof.

This supplemental report will be prepared by the TransMac chair in draft form prior to the next scheduled meeting on April 10, 2025, at which the Commission 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.

TransMac endeavors that all future reports concerning priority and projected budget amounts for proposed county transportation expenditures, which presumably will not be subject to the compressed timeline set forth above, will contain all recommendations for Board review within a single document. The Commission thanks the Board in advance for its patience and indulgence on this occasion.

# EXHIBIT B

## ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 2025-26

Unit	Dist	Project Name	Category	Funds by Funding Type					Funds by Project Phase				Notes	
				Capital Improvement Funds <i>See Note A</i>	Capital Improvement Funds (ATSP) <i>See Note B</i>	INVEST <i>See Note C</i>	TIF <i>See Note D</i>	Proportionate Fair Share <i>See Note E</i>	TOTAL	Design	ROW / Permitting / Mitigation <i>See Note F</i>	Construction		TOTAL
<b>COUNTYWIDE PROJECTS</b>														
2720	ALL	Signal Installation	Safety	\$ 6,000,000						\$ 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/Corridor Roadway Sustainability Improvements	Safety	\$ 500,000						\$ 500,000			\$ 500,000	
2725	ALL	Vision Zero - Roadway / Intersections/ Pedestrian & Bike Safety	Safety	\$ 1,500,000						\$ 1,500,000			\$ 1,500,000	
2729	ALL	Traffic Calming Program	Safety	\$ 1,000,000						\$ 1,000,000			\$ 1,000,000	
2841	ALL	Sidewalk Program	Safety	\$ 3,299,990	\$ 3,123,300					\$ 6,423,290			\$ 6,423,290	
2900	ALL	Rehab Existing Rdways	Roadway	\$ 40,000,000						\$ 40,000,000			\$ 40,000,000	
5000	ALL	Roadway Lighting	Safety	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,308,000					\$ 2,508,000			\$ 2,508,000	
5141	ALL	East Orange County (EOC) Transportation Needs	Roadway			\$ 5,138,175				\$ 5,138,175			\$ 5,138,175	
5151	ALL	Miscellaneous Traffic Safety Projects	Safety	\$ 1,000,000						\$ 1,000,000			\$ 1,000,000	
<b>PROJECTS</b>														
2743	6	Vineland Ave Harriott Village-National Shrine of Mary Queen of the Universe	Roadway			\$ 500,000				\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000		\$ 500,000	TIF Zone 4
2752	5	Richard Croby Pkwy Sand Lake Rd	Roadway			\$ 12,100,000				\$ 12,100,000	\$ 12,100,000		\$ 12,100,000	TIF Zone 2
2883	1	Apopka Vineland-Turkey Lake	Roadway			\$ 5,490,397				\$ 5,490,397	\$ 5,490,397		\$ 5,490,397	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2027 (\$12.5M total)
2929	4	Osceola City Turnpike	Roadway			\$ 870,398				\$ 870,398	\$ 870,398		\$ 870,398	TIF Zone 3
3037	3	Taft-Vineland Rd 441-Orange Ave	Roadway			\$ 19,054,634	\$ 4,890,609			\$ 23,945,243	\$ 5,060,000	\$ 18,885,243	\$ 23,945,243	TIF Zone 3; under construction through 2029 (\$41.0M total)
3045	3/6	Hidden Ave John Young Pkwy-Orange Ave	Roadway			\$ 31,250				\$ 31,250		\$ 31,250	\$ 31,250	TIF Zone 4; under construction
3096	2	Kennedy Blvd Forest City-14	Roadway	\$ 65,306		\$ 12,244,019	\$ 1,709,761			\$ 14,019,086		\$ 14,019,086	\$ 14,019,086	TIF Zone 1; under construction through 2029 (\$50.7M total)
3097	2	All American Blvd Orange Blossom Trail-Forest City	Roadway	\$ 2,309,669		\$ 10,790,331				\$ 13,100,000		\$ 13,100,000	\$ 13,100,000	TIF Zone 1; under construction through 2027 (\$23.5M total)

Revised 3/19/2025

Page 1 of 2

## ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 2025-26

Unit	Dist	Project Name	Category	Funds by Funding Type					Funds by Project Phase				Notes		
				Capital Improvement Funds <i>See Note A</i>	Capital Improvement Funds (ATSP) <i>See Note B</i>	INVEST <i>See Note C</i>	TIF <i>See Note D</i>	Proportionate Fair Share <i>See Note E</i>	TOTAL	Design	ROW / Permitting / Mitigation <i>See Note F</i>	Construction		TOTAL	
<b>PROJECTS (CONTINUED)</b>															
5004	5	Chula Vista Rd SR 50-LA Pickett	Roadway			\$ 4,236,256		\$ 100,000		\$ 4,336,256	\$ 100,000	\$ 4,236,256		\$ 4,336,256	
5005	5	McCulloch Rd Orion-Turner	Roadway			\$ 2,275,000				\$ 2,275,000		\$ 2,275,000		\$ 2,275,000	
5024	3	Eaton Trail LA Underhill-SR50	Roadway	\$ 358,931						\$ 358,931		\$ 358,931		\$ 358,931	Under construction
5027	6	Oak Ridge-Holden Woodbury Rd Texas Ave	Roadway			\$ 15,975,811				\$ 15,975,811	\$ 1,668,000	\$ 14,307,811	\$ 15,975,811	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2027 (\$29.2M total)	
5059	4	LA Underhill to SR 50	Roadway	\$ 3,771,600						\$ 3,771,600		\$ 3,771,600		\$ 3,771,600	ROW costs through 2027 (\$6.9M total)
5064	4	Innovation Way S SR 417-SR 528	Roadway			\$ 3,195,325				\$ 3,195,325	\$ 545,325	\$ 2,650,000	\$ 3,195,325	TIF Zone 3; under construction through 2027 (\$6.2M total)	
5090	3,4	Chickasaw-Rouse	Roadway			\$ 1,810,937				\$ 1,810,937		\$ 1,810,937		\$ 1,810,937	ROW costs through 2027 (\$2.8M total)
5137	2,6	Pine Hills Pedestrian Safety Project SR 50-Bonnie Blue	Safety	\$ 3,737,448						\$ 3,737,448		\$ 3,737,448		\$ 3,737,448	Under construction
5139	1	Reams Rd Summerlake-Taborfield	Roadway			\$ 3,545,122				\$ 3,545,122		\$ 3,545,122		\$ 3,545,122	TIF Zone 4; ROW costs through 2025 (\$10.0M)
5140	1	Proquette Rd Summerlake-Oxvaltnest	Roadway			\$ 9,887,170	\$ 3,567,505			\$ 13,454,675		\$ 1,650,000	\$ 13,454,675	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2028 (\$28.6M total)	
5155	1	Tiny Rd Bridgewater Crossing Bv to Tilden Rd	Roadway			\$ 431,994				\$ 431,994	\$ 431,994		\$ 431,994	TIF Zone 4; under construction through 2028 (\$28.6M total)	
<b>Total Proposed Capital Expenditures</b>				<b>\$ 66,742,944</b>	<b>\$ 8,431,300</b>	<b>\$ 35,591,557</b>	<b>\$ 77,262,528</b>	<b>\$ 4,990,609</b>	<b>\$ 193,018,938</b>	<b>\$ 1,031,994</b>	<b>\$ 37,532,638</b>	<b>\$ 84,384,841</b>	<b>\$ 193,018,938</b>		

Payments to Government Entities		TOTAL	Notes
-	- LYNX	Transit	\$ 92,345,475 Source: General Fund (Ad Valorem)
-	- SunRail	Transit	\$ 15,342,394 Source: General Fund (Ad Valorem)
<b>Total Proposed Payments to other Governmental Agencies</b>		<b>\$ 107,687,869</b>	

**Notes**

- 1 Amounts are based on FY2024-25 Budget Amendment request, under review by the Office of Management and Budget. Budget Amendment request is subject to approval by County BCC (Jan 28, 2025).
- 2 Several funding sources used for these projects are restricted to certain types of uses (i.e., limited by schedule, geographic areas and/or dedicated to particular projects approved by the County BCC).
- A Capital Improvement Funds. Sources: Existing State Sales Tax and Gas Taxes.
- 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)

Revised 3/19/2025

Page 2 of 2